73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members to turn off their laptops, their cell phones, and their pagers. And we ask our guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Samuel Hale of the Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Springfield. Reverend Hale is the guest of Representative Poe."

Reverend Hale: "Let us pray. Eternal Father, we come at this moment today thanking You first for this day and for the privilege to see this day, to be a part of it. We ask Thy blessings now upon this Assembly, these men and women whom Thou has created. We pray that You will touch their hearts and minds, that as they deliberate today, as they act and decide, those matters that are on their agenda. We pray, eternal Father, that You will burden their hearts and minds with Your agenda for the people of this great state, whom Thou has created and whom Thou sustains. We pray now, Lord, that their minds and hearts might be in tune to Your word, Your will, and Your way, that whatever results from their actions, You will get the glory. And it will be done in such a way and to such ends that those whom You have ordained and created and sustained in this state might be blessed on Your terms. Have Your way now that Your will might be done and not ours. In the name of Him, who came and was the fulfillment of the law, we pray and ask it all. Amen."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Parke."
- Parke 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 Collins is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Hultgren is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 116 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 509, offered by Representative Novak. 510, offered by Representative Novak. 511, offered by Representative Novak. 512, offered by Representative Watson. 513, offered by Representative Bellock. 514, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell. 515, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell. 516, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. 517, offered by Representative Black. 518, offered by Representative Boland. 519, offered by Representative Pankau. 520, offered by Representative Burke. 521, offered by Representative Burke. 523, offered by Representative Stephens. 524,

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

offered by Representative Osmond. 525, offered by Representative Younge. 526, offered by Representative Younge. 527, offered by Representative Younge. 528, offered by Representative Lang. 529, offered by Representative Parke. 531, offered by Representative John Bradley. 532, offered by Representative John Bradley. 533, offered by Representative Millner. 535, offered by Representative Novak and 536, offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read 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. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on November 06, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1921. Correction, that is referred to Executive Committee, 'direct floor consideration' for House Resolution 396. Again, Rules recommends 'assignment' to Executive Committee of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1921 and 'direct floor consideration' for House Resolution 396. Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, November 06, 2003, reported the same back with

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' for House Bill 3828; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1676 and Table Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1935."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Reitz. Mr. Reitz, do you wish to call your Motion on House Bill 1186? On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Total Veto Motions, there appears House Bill 1186. Mr. Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1186 is an Override Motion of the Governor's Veto on the 65 mile an hour speed limit. It allows trucks to drive on interstates, rural interstates only, at 65 miles an hour. And I'd appreciate the House's consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that House Bill 1186 shall pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The Motion requires 71 votes and would be final action. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support my colleague's Motion to override this Veto. This Bill was very thoroughly debated in this and the other chamber last year. It is not a new measure, it has come before us at least, if memory serves me correctly, about five or six times in the last ten years. We appreciate the indulgence that many of the Chicago area and suburban Legislators gave to us in rural downstate areas last year on this Bill that we've worked on for years. I find it somewhat disingenuous of the American Automobile Association after the Bill had

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

passed to write the Governor and ask for him to veto it. When, in fact, in testimony in the committee when this Bill was heard, and the Sponsor can correct me if I'm wrong, the latest study that was quoted by the American Automobile Association and Foundation for Traffic Safety called... that to improve safety between cars and trucks you need to have a uniform speed limit. In fact, they cited the hazards caused by the differential in speed limits on rural interstate highways. I would simply, once again, ask those of you who voted for this Bill last year or who did not stand in strong opposition... let me remind you that this Bill does not impact the Chicago area. This only affects interstate or four-lane divided highways in rural areas. And the Federal Government designate what is a rural or urban interstate highway. It does not raise the speed limit on two-lane roads, it would not raise the truck limit... truck speed limit on the toll road, it would not raise the truck speed limit on the Dan Ryan, the Kennedy, the expressway, or any of those expressways in the Chicago area. It simply enables traffic on rural interstates to move at the same speed. And I... I... again, I'm incredulous that the AAA asked the Governor to veto this after years of work on it when their own study indicated that a greater traffic hazard was created by the different speed limits and, in... in fact, we should have a uniform speed limit. I urge an 'aye' vote on the Gentleman's Motion to override."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osterman."

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

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Osterman: "Just a quick question, Representative Reitz. You sponsor this Bill for the first time this Session, am I correct?"

Reitz: "That's correct."

Osterman: "And under your stewardship, it was the first time in about seven years it ever got out. Is that correct?"

Reitz: "That's correct. Yes."

Osterman: "What do you attribute that to?"

Reitz: "Well, I think a lot is... is... one is the testimony in committee, there really wasn't much organized opposition. And as the Representative said earlier that, you know, the studies that we used even... I... and I believe that irregardless of what the speed is, vehicles traveling at the same amount of speed is safer than staggered speed limits. And, you know, I... I don't know what to attribute it to other than the... the Body voted to send it out."

Osterman: "Your fine stewardship."

Reitz: "Thank you."

Osterman: "Let me ask you this question. A previous speaker mentioned that this only deals with rural roads. I-55, does this Bill include I-55?"

Reitz: "Yeah."

Osterman: "The full length of I-55 or parts of I-55?"

Reitz: "No, parts of I-55. Whenever... when it gets to any urban areas where... they have the ability to reduce the speed to 55, as it is now, or whatever the... the speed would be. But

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

in urban areas, there will be different posted speed limits."

Osterman: "Isn't it true though that many road safety groups have said increasing the speed limit to 65 for trucks is gonna put motorists in danger? And the braking speeds for those trucks, that this is gonna put people in danger and possibly more injuries and deaths due to lack of braking time if the trucks are tryin' to brake in the case of an emergency."

Reitz: "I've seen studies on both sides. I mean, basically that it's... it's... there's... you know, with anything. There's some aspects where maybe it is a little unsafer, but it's safer in other aspects. If they're all traveling, less have to have to go around and pass someone and... and things of that nature."

Osterman: "Okay. I appreciate that. And to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was soundly defeated five out of the last six years. It was done so because many people believe that increasing the speed limits for trucks in the State of Illinois is gonna be more dangerous and it's gonna cause more accidents and deaths and injuries on the roadways when those vehicles have to stop. I appreciate the concerns of the downstaters that want to do this, but there are many people from around the state that drive those roads. We all drive down from northern Illinois to come here, we drive by the trucks. And many of them, as I am driving 65, are flying past me. So, I'm real interested in how we're keeping track of those speed limit on trucks. But I would

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

ask you all, in the interest of safety for the roads in Illinois, to defeat this measure."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of this learned Body, this Bill passed significantly when it came through during its initial passage. I strongly support the Sponsor for several reasons. As the owner/operator of two 80 thousand pound trucks, I've spent a lot of time in them. And the safety factor has been recognized nationally by having a uniform speed limit because at least 40, and I think I'm correct in saying as many as 42, but I know I'm correct in stating that 40 states have a uniform speed limit. I find it very interesting that the Illinois State Police and IDOT were both neutral on this issue when it initially came through this learned Body, now they are opposed. One might ask, why would that happen? I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, individually contact any state trooper and I honestly believe that the vast majority would say they support a uniform speed limit. believe that's why the Illinois State Police were neutral when this matter came through. The obvious answer that they're in... that they don't support it at this point in time is the Governor wants this Veto to stand and quite frankly, we all recognize that the State Police and IDOT work for the Governor and they must take his posture on this. Reality is reality, if 40 to 42 states recognize it is far safer to have a uniform speed limit, Ladies and Gentlemen, recognize the necessity for that. We are on the

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

cutting edge here of some excellent legislation that our Governor wants to stop. I encourage you to support your Sponsor. This is excellent legislation to override the Governor and I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative... all right, I have some questions. I... I got a call from the... from IDOT and they said that their concern on, and I can't speak for all of their concern, but a concern they brought to my attention was that... that there were more serious accidents involving trucks when the speed limit was raised to the level that you want to raise it. How do you answer that question?"

Reitz: "Well, I... I think there's studies on... as I told the Representative earlier, there's studies on both sides that show that it's... it's safer. The last study that AAA put out, that's what they cited. They think there's a higher impact on, you know, if trucks are traveling at a higher speed. But there... the studies that we indicated earlier that we heard testimony in committee and... and used the numbers as is that it's safer if everyone's traveling the same amount of speed. I mean, it's like with any legislation that we pass here there, you know, there are positives and negatives. I... I happen to believe that if trucks are traveling at the same... all vehicles are traveling at the same amount of speed, it's safer than if they're not."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Parke: "Now, are the st... one of... the study you were referring to..."

Reitz: "Excuse me."

Parke: "I'm not finished, Representative."

Reitz: "Okay."

Parke: "The study that I'm referring to, the AAA Foundation for Tra... Traffic Safety, is that one of the studies you were referring to?"

Reitz: "That's the... that's the study... or the information that the Governor's Office indicated that they... they vetoed this on."

Parke: "Now, in their report it said that calls for improving safety between cars and trucks, citing the hazard of differential speed limits. Are you aware of that and can you tell me if they came out against this legislation, why does their report show that one of the problems was the hazard of differ... differential speed limits, which you've been referring to? Do you have any idea why on one hand the report would say this part of it and the other hand they would be opposed to it?"

Reitz: "No, I can't answer that."

Parke: "And this Bill does not affect suburban or Chicago area?"

Reitz: "Correct."

Parke: "And will this put us in line with other states around us?"

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Reitz: "Yes, there are. There's at least 40 states that have this legisla… currently have the same speed limits for all vehicles."

Parke: "How 'bout... does that apply to all the states surrounding Illinois? Are you aware..."

Reitz: "I believe... I think all of the surrounding states have..."

Parke: "So, all the other states have increased..."

Reitz: "And some have higher speed limits."

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

Reitz: "Some have higher speed limits, actually. But... but they're all..."

Parke: "So, all the other states have raised their speed limit for trucks?"

Reitz: "Correct. Uniform speed limits, whatever it is."

Parke: "Well, thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen,
I... I guess I don't understand the objection that is coming
from IDOT if, in fact, all the other surrounding states
have raised their speed limits and even the AAA report has
said that there is a hazard of differential speed limits.
So, I am going to suggest the Body to take a good look at
this. But I will be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Typically, we're finding Illinois ranked somewhere in the forties on a lot of things when it comes to funding. But I have an interesting document here that says that Illinois should not risk more truck-related crashes and that we are ranked sixth in the nation in the number of large trucks involved in fatal

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

crashes, which are actually documented with the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration. This... if we increase the speed limit in Illinois we could essentially go from sixth to first. In 2001, IDOT reported 16,481 crashes involving trucks. And, with all due respect to the prior speakers, three states allow trucks to travel at the same highway speed as passengers in vehicles. And their increase in fatal crashes were 27 percent. It actually takes a truck that is carrying a heavy load a significant amount of time to... it takes them 335 feet before coming to a complete stop. Testament to that is this huge accident that occurred on I-90, which can demonstrate the potential of what happens at these high speeds. Let's think about this and... and support the Governor on it. It's also opposed by IDOT, the State Police, FOP, and AAA. Nobody wants trucks moving this fast. We have a bad enough history in this state with trucks. Let's support the Governor. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Brauer."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I have a couple quick questions. I... I think that when we look at this thing there's been more in... misinformation on this Bill than in any one that I can remember in my brief time here. I guess my first question is how many states have this Bill in effect already?"

Reitz: "Forty other states."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Brauer: "Forty other states. Do you have an idea what the average length of time is that this has been enacted?"

Reitz: "No, I don't have that... I don't have that number. But a number of them have been for a number years they've had uniform speed limits."

Brauer: "So, this has been around for quite a while."

Reitz: "Correct."

Brauer: "Do you have an... any information that the states that have it, have they gone back and gotten away from the uniform speed limit?"

Reitz: "No, none... none that I know of."

Brauer: "Well, to me that kinda says it all. That if they went ahead, they've enacted this legislation, and they've kept this legislation, that that means that this is good legislation."

Reitz: "I would agree, yes."

Brauer: "I plan to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Reitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1186 pass, the Veto of the Governor not withstanding?' The Motion requires 71 votes and this is final action. 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 71 'ayes' and 39 'noes'. And Representative Feigenholtz is recognized. Feigenholtz. Did you wish to speak, Representative Feigenholtz?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, I do. Representative Munson..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Representative, are you seeking a verification? All right. The La... the Lady has requested...

Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Sponsor, who is beloved by all Cub fans, she did not make a request for a verification prior to the… you announcing the vote."

Speaker Madigan: "I did announce the vote. No, I didn't. I said there are 71 'ayes' and 39 'noes'. And I... that's not... that's not the... that does not go to the declaration of passage."

Black: "That's true."

Speaker Madigan: "Excuse me."

Black: "Technically, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Madigan: "There's a set..."

Black: "...you are correct."

Speaker Madigan: "...recitation."

Black: "You are correct."

Speaker Madigan: "And I did not go all the way. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm... I'm not going to make any comment on that remark."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Okay."

Black: "I... I would say, even though the Representative and I are... are Cub fans, and I know sometimes you hold that against us, I would still question as to whether her request was, in fact, timely. You... you did not take the record, I... I... I agree. And I know you're a fair man, but I... I would say that because Representative Feigenholtz only moves at 55 miles an hour, she was just a little too late."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "There is a request for a verification. And we need the staff to retire to the rear of the chamber and we need the Members to be in their chairs. Staff to the rear of the chamber. Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner, would you take your chair, please? Mr. Morrow, would you take your chair? The staffer talking to Mr. Scully, to the rear of the chamber. Mr. Scully, please sit down. Mr. Davis, please sit down. Mr. Osterman, please take your chair. Feigenholtz, take your chair. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting 'yes'."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
Acevedo, Bassi, Bellock, Berrios, Biggins, Black, Boland,
Bost, John Bradley, Richard Bradley, Brauer, Burke,
Churchill, Cross, Cultra, Daniels, Will Davis, Delgado,
Dunkin, Dunn, Eddy, Flider, Fritchey, Granberg, Grunloh,
Hannig, Hassert, Holbrook, Howard, Jakobsson, Lou Jones,
Kosel, Leitch, Lindner, Joseph... Eileen Lyons and Joseph
Lyons, Mautino, Mendoza, Meyer, Miller, Millner, Bill
Mitchell, Jerry Mitchell, Moffitt, Myers, O'Brien, Osmond,
Pankau, Parke, Phelps, Poe, Reitz, Rose, Sacia, Saviano,
Schmitz, Slone, Smith, Sommer, Soto, Stephens, Sullivan,
Tenhouse, Turner, Verschoore, Wait, Watson, Winters,
Wirsing, Yarbrough, and Younge."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Saviano."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano. Mr. Saviano. Remove Mr. Saviano."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Acevedo."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Acevedo. Remove Mr. Acevedo."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin. He's in the rear of the chamber."

Feigenholtz: "Could you take the roll?"

- Speaker Madigan: "There are 69 'ayes' and 39 'noes'. And the Motion fails. Representative Eileen Lyons. Motion on House Bill 2895. Do you choose not to offer the Motion? On page 3 on the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 577. Representative Eileen Lyons."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 577. Representative Eileen Lyons. Representative Lyons."
- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 577... is a... a Bill that will provide for the use of a voice stress analyzer by any fully trained, certified law enforcement officer. It also provides that that law enforcement officer... as I said be only use it... investigative aid in a criminal investigation. And I'm asking... I'm making a Motion to Concur with this Senate Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 577?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 577. This Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Lang, did you wish to call House Bill 920? Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 920. This passed out of the House as a shell Bill and it came back with one Amendment from the Senate. The Amendment deals with the student member of the Northeastern Illinois University Board of Trustees. And this Bill would do two things. First, it would limit that member to one one-year term. Second, it would allow a graduate student to be on the board. That's all it does, it passed the Senate easily. I would ask your concurrence."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has... has Mr. Scully voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mautino, did you wish to move

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Senate Bill 783? It's concerned with insurance. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 783, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was amended yesterday and it affects the Comprehensive Health Insurance Policy for the state. It puts us in... in accordance with the federal guidelines for that program and will also retrieve about \$2 million from the Federal Government to help support and fund the HIPAA CHIP section. And what that does is those people who lost their jobs and their benefits due to a closing, for example, a steel mill, will be able to access these funds. And it pays for about two-thirds of their premium. We had a unanimous vote on it. There is no one who stands in opposition and I thank you for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I just want to make sure that... you've mentioned the steel plants and, I believe, the initial action was filed by the United Steel Workers. But I ha... I have two or three plants in my district that have closed and the production moved offshore and that qualifies for the Trade Adjustment Act and Trade Recovery Act. So, if... if a... and it's unfortunate that this happens, but it does.

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

If... if a worker is out... put out of work by a plant that has moved offshore or transferred production offshore and the designation of TAA is applied by the Federal Government, then that employee can also petition CHIP. You don't necessarily have to be a steel worker in order to do that, correct?"

Mautino: "No, that's... that's correct. And..."

Black: "All right. So, it..."

Mautino: "...it would affect anyone who's covered under the Trade
Adjustment Act, which are..."

Black: "All right. That's what I wanted to make sure."

Mautino: "...many of our folks."

Black: "So, if you're affected by a closure that was adjudicated by the Federal Government as a TAA-eligible program, then you will have access to CHIP?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "And there's something that this additionally does. For some of the people at your plant and at my plant, which is the LTD Steel, Dr. Miller's plant, which was Acme Steel, who were impacted by that, they didn't meet the qualifications to get the health care tax credit. And that's 65 percent of the premiums paid by some of the most vulnerable people. They'll receive that benefit. This will allow some of your people who did not meet that criteria to now enter."

Black: "All right."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Mautino: "So, this will increase that enrollment, cost the state no additional dollars."

Black: "Well, I know on behalf of the several hundred workers in my plant that have suffered that, thank you for your work on... on this issue. And it makes a tremendous difference in their lives while they continue their search. Some have gone back to school under the Trade Readjustment provisions, some are still looking for work. And certainly, if they can provide health insurance for their families and get the tax credit, that's a tremendous burden off their day-to-day worries. I appreciate your work. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Eddy. Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Eddy: "Members of the House, I'd like for you to help me welcome the eighth grade class from Hutsonville Grade School in Crawford County, Illinois. They're in the gallery over here."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 2700. Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig, this concerns the Member projects."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When we sent the Governor the budget last year, this last May, you may recall that in an effort to be fair to all Members of the Assembly, both in the House and the Senate, we reapproped every project that had not yet been spent out, as far as what our staff knew. The... the Governor, in some cases, rightfully eliminated some projects that had spent out, but in some cases there were some errors that were made, I think, because of miscommunications as to what had been spent and what had not been spent. So, the intent and the intentions of overriding the Governor on this veto line is to simply put us back in the same position that we were in May when we adjourned, that all the projects that were there would continue to go forward. The Governor still retains his right to decide when to release those projects, if ever. But we believe that it's important that they be in the budget book and... and on the record. And so, that's... this is the method that we need to employ in order to reinstate those programs. So, I'd be happy to answer any question and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig, the parliamentarian advises me that we will need leave to consider all of these items on one vote. And is there leave? Leave is granted. You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Has Mr. Joyce voted? Has Mr. Brady voted? Has Mr. Brady voted?

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Mr. McKeon, under the rules, we finished debate. But we'll give you leave. We are on Roll Call. Mr. McKeon."

McKeon: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's some confusion as to what the question is we are voting on here."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Hannig... Mr. Clerk, dump the Roll Call. Ladies and Gentlemen, please give your attention to Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig, please explain the Motion again."

Hannig: "The... the Motion is to override the Governor's Veto so that the Member projects that we had included in the budget in the final days of May, when we... when we adopted a final budget and that were inadvertently and in an... and in error vetoed by the Governor because he thought that they had spent out or that he thought they were in a different place in the budget, we need to reinstate and restore those programs on the books in the same position they were in May. As I said, the Governor will retain the right, as he always does and every Governor always does, to decide when and wh... and how these projects will be released. But we think it's important for Members who have worked very hard to get these projects on the books, that they remain there and this is the method that we have to now employ in... in order to reinstate them. So, this isn't anything new, it just puts us back in the same position that we were in May."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Mulligan: "Repr... Han... Representative Hannig, when you're speaking about Member projects, you're talking about projects that have been rolled over from prior years that were already allocated in the budget, which many communities have already expended those dollars and are waiting to be reimbursed."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, you're correct."

Mulligan: "Do they also include some of the projects that were ongoing select projects in communities that are spent over a long period of time that the Governor's Office inadvertently cut out of the budget in the Department of Natural Resources and in other areas that were ongoing projects that are just expended slowly over a period of time?"

Hannig: "These were... these are mostly IDOT projects and there's another... there's another Bill to address some... some errors that the Governor made with some of these additional ones. I'm, you know, you may have some of what you're talking about in this one. You may have some of what you're talking about in another Bill. But we're trying to reinstate all... all of those because they were errors. The Governor did it in error."

Mulligan: "All right. And so, basically, these are not new money or new projects. These were projects that were already allocated in previous budgets that needed to be rolled over so that either the money that's already been expended and the bills coming due could be paid or Members

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

who have people that were relying on that local community government would get that... those funds. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Representative, you said it much better than I have."

Mulligan: "All right."

Hannig: "You're exactly right."

Mulligan: "Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to go to Roll Call, again. The question is relative to House Bill 2700, 'Shall the items contained in the Gentleman's Motion shown on Supplemental Calendar #2 do pass notwithstanding... do pass not... notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor.' And this requires 71 votes. in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Has Mr. Capparelli voted? Has Mr. Parke voted? Terry Parke, the Gentleman voted? Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 100 'ayes', 16 'noes'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Three-fifths Majority... the items contained in the Gentleman's Motion shown on Supplemental Calendar #2, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor, do pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor, is hereby declared passed. Page 2 of Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 794, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Mautino."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 794, a Bill for an Act concerning state audits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 794 is a Bill which we amended yesterday for the auditor general. And this would apply the new standards... standards that are known as the 'yellow book' to the Illinois statute controlling the audits. About five... the 'yellow book' has changed about three or four times. These are the new federal standards that we actually must implement. And I'm joined by Representative Biggins from the Audit Commission. There is no opposition. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1014. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1014, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Grunloh, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Grunloh on the Amendment. Mr. Grunloh on the Amendment."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Grunloh: "Yes. I would like to... I would like to move the Bill forward."

Speaker Madigan: "Correct. And we need you to explain the Amendment."

Grunloh: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "What will the Amendment provide?"

Grunloh: "The Amendment was originally House Bill… excuse me one second here. The Amendment, it was originally House Bill 3853 as the accreditation and recognition of nonpublic schools. It basically takes all the language that was in the original House… in that House Bill and moves it into Senate Bill… Amendment #... Senate Bill… to the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1014."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, you're a little taller than your predecessor, so you're... you're speaking over your microphone just a tad. So, if you would... might be able to speak into the microphone. When was the... when was... Did you take this Amendment to committee?"

Grunloh: "Yes, I did."

Black: "And was that yesterday?"

Grunloh: "That was yesterday."

Black: "Okay. I'm trying to find the... All right. So, it's

Amendment #1 and what was the committee vote?"

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Grunloh: "The committee vote was... there was 1 'present' and the rest were in favor of the vote. I don't know the exact number, but..."

Black: "One was 'present' and the rest were in favor, but how did they vote? Did they vote 'yes' or 'no'?"

Grunloh: "They voted 'yes'."

Black: "Oh, okay. And how many were present, one?"

Grunloh: "No, I think there were... I believe 13 present. I'm not... I'm not sure of the number."

Black: "Oh."

Grunloh: "But there was..."

Black: "Was this..."

Grunloh: "...there was 1 'present' and the rest were... were 'yeses'."

Black: "And there was a quorum present, I assume."

Grunloh: "Yes, there was a quorum present."

Black: "All right. So, this is a... was a valid committee vote?"

Grunloh: "Yes, it was."

Black: "All right. What... what's the underlying difficulty that the Amendment is trying to correct?"

Grunloh: "For the past 25 years, it's been the practice of the State Board of Education to recognize and give accreditation to nonpublic schools. Due to budget constraints they elected to stop doing that process."

Black: "Now, when you say 'they' elected to stop doing that process, who is 'they'?"

Grunloh: "The state board."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Black: "The State Board of Education. So, have you checked with the Governor? Is this Amendment all right with the Governor?"

Grunloh: "I have not checked with the Governor."

Black: "Oh, my. Because this will require money won't it?"

Grunloh: "Yes, it will require money."

Black: "All right."

Grunloh: "Which was approved... which we voted on yesterday."

Black: "All right."

Grunloh: "There's no... there no appropriation for any additional monies in this Senate Bill."

Black: "So, are you doing a trailer Bill for the money or..."

Grunloh: "No."

Black: "...are you just doing this for a... a press release? And are you serious or..."

Grunloh: "Of course, I'm serious. There... there's..."

Black: "Is that your middle name? Representative Hartke said that was your middle name."

Grunloh: "There's no appropriations in this Bill, Senator. I mean, Representative."

Black: "There's... So, we're gonna rectify this budgetary problem with no money?"

Grunloh: "The appropriations was passed yesterday, as I just said."

Black: "Oh, the appropriation Bill was passed yesterday."

Grunloh: "Yes."

Black: "There for a minute I thought you could... you could settle all of these budgetary problems with no money..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Grunloh: "No, as I said earlier..."

Black: "...we should move you down to the Office of Management and Budget. All right. So, in other words, the Amendment... if we pass the budget to restore funding, then why do we need a substantive Bill?"

Grunloh: "We don't want... we want to keep the accreditation process going. Right now they're doing it administratively. We wanna do it stat... we wanna make it statutory that they continue to do it. So, in future years, if we have a budget problem, we don't see this..."

Black: "All right. All right."

Grunloh: "...same thing come up again."

Black: "Okay. Well, thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. We'll... we'll not ask for a Roll Call on the Gentleman's Amendment because I think he needs a little time to have staff brief him on what he's trying to do. He is following in the footsteps of a... of a highly respected, distinguished Legislator and perhaps you should call your predecessor before we get... we're gonna let the Amendment go on, on a voice vote, but then we're gonna have to have a Roll Call vote and you're gonna have to certainly be a little better prepared to answer some of these questions at that time. But we'll let your Amendment go on, but I make no promises about the resultant Roll Call vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "To the Amendment. To the previous speaker's comments.

I think they were misguided and I thought they were very

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

unfortunate to be said because I believe that Representative Grunloh has done a fantastic job describing this Bill. I think we all understand what it does. I think if you don't wanna understand, you don't wanna understand for other reasons, not for the reasons that Mr. Grunloh did. And I think that it's unfortunate that we're playing politics here with such an important Bill that will affect our students and our children. So, let's drop the partisan politics and let's get to the issue here of what we should be doing."

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

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Grunloh. Mr. Grunloh. Mr. Grunloh on Third Reading, final passage."

Grunloh: "I'm sorry, Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "We are now on Third Reading..."

Grunloh: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "...final passage."

Grunloh: "Okay. Once again..."

Speaker Madigan: "And this is where Mr. Black will be very helpful to you. So, go right ahead."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Grunloh: "Okay. Once again, this Bill deals with accreditation and recognition of nonpublic schools. For the past 25 years, the state board has been doing that. This year they elected to stop doing that. I think it's very important that, for our nonpublic schools, they continue to receive state accreditation. There are several items that... several things that... that they could get value out of that accreditation: textbook programs, grants, continuing education for teachers, participation in IHSA sports and a few other items. So, I think it's important that we do it. Right now, we have parents of around 314 thousand students in the State of Illinois that choose to provide funding out of their own pocket for education and they also choose to continue to fund public education through their property taxes. So, I think the impact if we were to stop this accreditation could... could have a negative impact on us and add to... to our cost for education in the State of Illinois. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Yes. Representative, do you have a copy of the Amendment with you?"

Grunloh: "Yes, I do."

Black: "All right. On... on line 3 of the Amendment the language is, 'by replacing everything after the enacting clause with

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

the following.' Does that mean that Senate Bill 1014 no longer exists as it was originally constituted?"

Grunloh: "That's true."

Black: "So, the Amendment becomes the Bill?"

Grunloh: "The Amendment becomes the Bill and the language in the Bill is... is..."

Black: "All right. Okay. On line 25 of the Amendment, on definition, a nonpublic school means any nonprofit, non home-based. Now, that means that you are not... and it is not your intent to expand the accreditation to home schooling. That... that is not, as I understand it, currently under the purview of the accreditation unit. Correct?"

Grunloh: "The... the language of this Bill is... is... is identical to the existing accreditation policy that's... that's currently... currently being done. There's no expansion or..."

Black: "Okay."

Grunloh: "...no reduction of what's currently being done."

Black: "And so..."

Grunloh: "It's the same program."

Black: "...the original language of the accreditation Bill, you know when that was adopted?"

Grunloh: "No, I do not. But it has an update..."

Black: "Ten years ago, a hundred years ago."

Grunloh: "I have no idea."

Black: "All right. If a..."

Grunloh: "I know that... I know... I know that for approximately the past 25 years that the state board has been doing it."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Black: "If... if a... if a private school, parochial school, would not be accredited by the State of Illinois, what would the potential impact of that be? I've had conflicting reports. Some say it doesn't make any difference, some says... some say it makes a considerable difference."

Grunloh: "Okay. There's a few things. And let me just read down the list of some of the things that accreditation will allow them to do. Many of the student scholarships and financial... financial aid opportunities would Participation in inter... interscholastic possible. activities at high school level including athletics of the IHSA sports would not be available to them if they were no longer accredidated (sic-accredited). Many public and private grants and matching grants would no longer be available. The materials provided through the textbook loan program would no longer be available. It provides a greater opportunity to enroll in professional development programs with the accreditation in place. Credit for student teaching also is... is a result of this accreditation recognition. Credit for teaching experience for salaries and retirement benefits. The opportunity for a cancellation of a teacher student loan. Easy student transfers and also the foreign exchange student. All of those... all of those would have a ... "

Black: "That..."

Grunloh: "...would have an..."

Black: "...that was very..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Grunloh: "...would be affected if we were to have that accredited."

Black "...that was very well done. Did staff prepare that for you?"

Grunloh: "No."

Black: "Did you prepare that?"

Grunloh: "The Catholic Conference prepared that."

Black: "They... My compliments. They did an outstanding job.

Representative, the... the appropriation Bill that will

enable the accreditation unit to carry out its duties, how

much money was that, a hundred thousand dollars, a million

dollars? I can't remember."

Grunloh: "It was 300... excuse me. It was \$350 thousand, is what their estimate was. It was in a \$1.2 million line item."

Black: "All right. Okay. Now, has the Governor... Have you talked to the Governor? I mean, have you asked the Governor if it's all right to... you know, the Governor is a... is a stickler on this budget and rightfully so. Have... Do you have the Gov... Have you talked to the Governor about the fact you're adding \$350 thousand to a very, very tight budget?"

Grunloh: "No, I have not, but I think that if we... if we... if we take the state's own... own estimate of \$75 hundred per student which is what it would take to..."

Black: "All right."

Grunloh: "...educate, provide housing and... and not provide housing, but provide the facilities and all that. Seventy-

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

five hundred dollars per student times 314 thousand students..."

Black: "Okay."

Grunloh: "...that's \$2.3 billion annually if we were to take the leap that those private schools would close and put those students into public schools."

Black: "Well, would you be willing to take the Bill out of the record until you can clear this with the Governor? I... I don't..."

Grunloh: "No."

Black: "...want you to get into trouble with your Governor."

Grunloh: "I'm... I... I've not talked to the Governor, but I would not be willing to take the Bill out of the record."

Black: "Are... are you and the Governor close? Do you..."

Grunloh: "I don't..."

Black: "...do you jog with him or..."

Grunloh: "I don't know if he's in the building or not. I don't know how close we are, Sir."

Black: "Well, you've just asked the \$64 thousand question, but I'm not gonna pursue that. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I simply want to welcome Representative Grunloh to the House of Representatives where he has presented not only his first Amendment, but now his first Bill. And to my good friend and colleague from McHenry County, lighten up, take a pill, take a pill either from Canada or Chicago or McHenry County. Lighten up, Representative. Ya know, come on. Good job, Representative."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, with... with respect to some of the language in the Bill. I'm gonna refer to, on the second page of the copy I have, the tenth line, where it states that secondary schools... 'elementary and secondary nonpublic schools may voluntarily seek the status of nonpublic school recognition.' Are there schools that do not seek that recognition to... to your knowledge at this time?"

Grunloh: "It's my understanding that there are several schools that do not seek that recognition."

Eddy: "Does the line that says this status may be obtained by compliance with administrative guidelines and review procedures as prescribed by the State Board of Education.

Does it concern you at all that the State Board of Education has the... the ability in this Bill to prescribe the guidelines, given the fact that it was the State Board of Education that decided not to recognize those schools to begin with which caused this Bill to be started? Does that concern you?"

Grunloh: "You know, that they agree... I think, first of all, that the language remains the same as what it had before. Ya know, if we were not... if we would have not funded this, I might be more concerned that... that they might want to change the language or change the accreditation policy. Since we funded it yesterday, I think that I'm not so concerned about that."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Eddy: "Okay. And finally, the language states that the procedures must recognize that some of the aims and financial basis of nonpublic schools are different from public schools and those aims will not be identical to those of public schools. Can you give me some examples of those types of items that pub... private schools, under this, can be allowed that public schools cannot be allowed, some of those specific differences are?"
- Grunloh: "Well, I think, you know, religious teachings. You know, the way some of the private schools are funded. You know, I think there's several issues. The differences between the public and the private schools that would affect… could've possibly apply here."
- Eddy: "So, for example, private schools can... can probably get some funding or be allowed some policies that public schools could not have. There may be some nuances there due to the nature of the school."

Grunloh: "Yes, yes, yes."

- Eddy: "And finally, the only other question I have is whether or not you believe that a \$350 thousand appropriation in yesterday's Bill is an appropriate amount of money for the private schools accreditation process?"
- Grunloh: "Well, I don't know exactly what the process is in the board of education. I have an idea and it seems like a... a fairly large dollar amount to do what they're doing, but that's the numbers that they... that they presented, so it seems to be a little bit high, but..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

"Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill. Eddv: Private schools that have been obviously necessary. accredited by the State Board of Education as you mentioned for decades were in some danger of not being accredited and recognized and really it boiled down to the students who we needed to be concerned about. So, this is... this is legislation that will solve that problem. And I intend to vote for this legislation. The concern I have is the process that's used to accreditate private schools is the same as it was before this Bill's introduced the funding... the regional offices of education are the ones that are doing the recognition process with some aid from the State Board of Education. My concern has to do with the fact that there's \$350 thousand being spent on this, but I applaud the Bill. I think it's ... it's necessary and I intend to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'll forgo my usual giving a new Member a hard time on his first Bill because this is a very important piece of legislation. But I'll get ya another time, Representative. I have a very diverse district. I have many kids that go to private high schools and what we've done this last spring is put at risk their ability to go to college. What Mr. Grunloh has done here is craft a piece of legislation that will make sure that the proper accreditation is accomplished so that colleges all over America know that students that come out of Illinois high schools, whether they be public or

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

private, are qualified to go to college. So, this is a critical piece of legislation in my district. I applaud the Representative and strongly suggest your 'aye' votes."

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 Representative Monique Davis voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar #3 there appears House Bill 2671, a Motion by Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Mo... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Override Motion to restore funding for community colleges. You may recall that last year there was an effort within the community college group to rewrite the formula that distributes the money that we grant to community colleges. And of course, as always is the case whenever there is rewrite of a formula, there's gonna be winners and there's going to be losers. And the good news was that everyone agreed that the new formula was something that we needed to do for the long run and they further agreed that in the short run that we would implement a hold harmless to help those schools that would be losers to the transition into the new formula. The Governor signed the underlying legislation that creates the new formula, but he reduced some of the funding in the hold harmless and so we

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

find that many of the schools that were on the losing end of this formula will now have to raise tuitions, some of them are talking about replacing their or they're replacing their adult education dollars or cutting their education dollars and I'm advised that the Richland Community College in Decatur has had to reduce the number of students admitted to programs such as nursing and surgical technology, which are clearly areas that allow individuals to get good training for good jobs. So, I would respectfully ask the Members of the Assembly to take a look at what we're trying to do here. We're trying to make the deal that was cut between the community colleges, we're trying to make that work. This money was... was appropriated and I believe all the community colleges throughout the state, even those that were losers, agreed to the formula change. They agreed to the hold harmless and we're now simply trying to make that deal whole. So, I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. Will the... the Speaker yield, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Beaubien: "Sponsor yields? Do you have a number on this that...
that it's gonna cost the budget?"

Hannig: "He reduced it in half, so there's 3.7 that were cut...
that was cut and 3.7 that remains."

Beaubien: "So, it... we're restoring... They cut it what, 50 percent?"

Hannig: "Yes."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Beaubien: "So, we're restoring approximately 1... over 1,5. So, the cost to the budget's a little over 100... \$1,500,000?"

Hannig: "There... there was like... it would be 7.4, I guess, is was we appropriated and 3.7 was cut and we're asking that an additional 3.7... that that 3.7 be restored."

Beaubien: "So, what we're asking that the budget to spend 3.7 million more?"

Hannig: "We're asking that the 3.7..."

Beaubien: "Speaker, I can't hear."

Hannig: "Okay. We passed in June... in May, 7.4. That's what we needed to fully fund the hold harmless. The Governor cut it in half and we're asking that it be restored to its full amount."

Beaubien: "So, the num..."

Hannig: "The value of that cut is 3.7."

Beaubien: "So, the... we're restoring \$3.7 million."

Hanniq: "Yes."

Beaubien: "I just wanted to make sure everyone in the House understood the fiscal impact of that Bill. Going back to the original agreement which I seem to have some recollection of and again, I can hardly hear him because of all of the noise. You indicated that the junior colleges had agreed to this, but that both the winners and the losers?"

Hannig: "Yes. There was a consensus that this was a formula that made sense, but clearly, as we know, whether it's general state aid to our schools or any formula, when you change the formula, you create winners and you create

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

losers. The losers agreed that if they could be held harmless for a period of time, that they would be okay. I think it's three years."

Beaubien: "And just out of cur... I could look on my computer.

What was the vote on that? That passed probably unanimously or close to it?"

Hannig: "Are you talking about the budget Bill or the substantive Bill? Both of them, I think."

Beaubien: "The original Bill. The original Bill."

Hannig: "I think both Bills passed with overwhelming margins.

I'd have to look..."

Beaubien: "Well, let's... that's what I assumed since it's an agreed Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speak... Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This... I appreciate Representative Hannig and you mentioned it in your remarks is that Richland Community College which is in my district was cut about, I believe, a hundred and thirty thousand dollars, roughly, some trustees have come to me about this. This serves Macon and Dewitt County. With our unemployment rate is over the statewide average, over the nation average, this is a util... a resource that we certainly need in Macon and Dewitt County, so I certainly support this and urge the House to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Not to be redundant.

Representative Hannig has explained this very clearly and I

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

thank him for... for this Motion and I thank the Speaker for letting the Motion be filed and called. I think, as Representative Hannig always does, he has given you a very clear and forthright picture. I think everyone of us in this chamber represent a community college district and when this Bill left last year, I believe everyone had an understanding that the City Colleges of Chicago would be helped and that the other community colleges would be held harmless for a period of three years. I believe the Governor and I don't want to put words in the Governor's mouth, but I think that the Governor realized that this line item Veto was done in error because I think we had a firm commitment on this Bill. And it takes a... a big person to admit that perhaps something was not done the way it was originally understood. So, I think all this does is to restore the Bill that we passed last May in good faith. thank the Speaker and Representative Hannig for bringing this forward and quite frankly, I thank the Governor for not standing in strong opposition and restoring something that I felt, maybe I'm wrong and if so I apologize, I felt that the Governor had agreed to this last spring and it sometimes is... it takes a big person and a gesture to say, whoops, I may have been a little hasty in this line item This helps every community college in the reduction. state. I know of no community college that stands in opposition. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall lines 17 to 22 on page 18 of House Bill 2671 be restored, notwithstanding the

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Soto voted? Has Representative Soto voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the items on lines 17 through 22 on page 18 of House Bill 2671 are hereby declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. House Bill 2716, a Motion by Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Motion #3 is an effort to restore \$316,600 for funding of the Family Practice Residency Program in the Department of Public Health budget. So, Representative Feigenholtz has been working very hard to restore this money as chairman of the House Human Services Appropriation. This is an item that I believe that the Legislators on both sides of the aisle feel very strongly about and so, I would urge your 'yes' vote on this... on this Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this because this will help the family physicians and in any case, we need to help the health care in Illinois right now and by restoring this small amount of \$316 thousand it will be extremely essential in smaller programs of health care throughout the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

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

Representative, is this just the money for the family physicians?"

Hannig: "This Motion is, Representative. That's correct."

Mulligan: "So, just this Motion... but is it gonna be one total

Bill that includes everything or is it just this
particular..."

Hannig: "Representative, I'm advised that there are... there's like five Motions on this particular appropriation Bill for five different items. This is just one of them."

Mulligan: "So, when it's all done, we have to vote on the whole Bill?"

Hannig: "No. We will vote on each... the Bills have passed and the Governor has vetoed some of these lines and so now this is an effort..."

Mulligan: "All right. So, each one stands alone, if you vote for it?"

Hanniq: "Right."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Hannig: "So, now if there's a Motion to restore this particular
line with this particular Motion."

Mulligan: "Would be on its own?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan. "The question is, 'Shall the items on lines 27 to 30 on page 81 of House Bill 2716 pass, notwithstanding the item Veto of the Governor.' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

who wish? This Motion requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Three-fifths Majority, the item on page 81, lines 27 to 30 of House Bill 2716 is declared passed, not withstanding the item Veto of the Governor. On House Bill 2716 there appears a... Motion #4. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This would restore \$33,100 for funding for the psychotropic medication for the mentally ill clients. This is in the Department of Human Services' budget and the Governor's original intention for this funding is to be made up from the prescription drug advocates, but the recipients of this grant money do not believe that they can recoup the funding in this manner. So, at this time, for this small amount of money, we're asking that the Governor's Veto be overridden. And I'm advised that the Office of Management and Budget from the Governor's Office is now in agreement with this proposal and with the override."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Beaubien: "Again, I have trouble hearing. What's the dollar amount involved so that everyone will know what that is?"

Hanniq: "It's \$33,100."

Beaubien: "I think we can... I think we can live with that.

Thank you."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock, Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this amount is for the psychotropic medicines for the mental health. The \$33 thousand which is... Is that correct? Can I clarify that?"

Speaker Madigan: "That's what Mr. Hannig has stated. The Gentleman stated..."

Hannig: "Yes."

Bellock: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "...it concerns \$33 thousand."

Bellock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Right."

Bellock: "I wanna strongly urge the group to vote for that because this is extremely important to the mental health issues in the State of Illinois for the \$33 thousand for medications 'cause we all know how important medications are in keeping mentally ill people back in their jobs and their quality of life. So, I urge you to vote 'yes' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Representative, will there be any other Motions filed to override in this area? Do you have other... other overrides?"

Hannig: "Representative, I believe there are at least three others."

Parke: "For mental health?"

Hannig: "I mean, we need... we need to vote on each one..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Parke: "Do the... the other three, did they relate to mental health... restoring mental health funds?"

Hannig: "One's in the Department of Human Services, the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Human Services, so..."

Parke: "Great, but what are the subject matter of the three?"

Hannig: "Teen REACH, Alzheimer's and homeless youth, so..."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the item in line 18 on page 25 of House Bill 2716 be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk, are we voting on an item reduction or a reduction? Are we voting an item Veto or a reduction Veto? The Clerk advises... Mr. Hanniq... Mr. Hanniq and staff, the Clerk advises that we are voting on a reduction Veto, not an item Veto. Any disagreement? So, we'll change the question. The question is, 'Shall the items on lines 18 to on page 25 of House Bill 2716 be restored, notwithstanding the... be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' That's the question. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the item on line 18 to 22 page 25 of House Bill 2716, is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. Mr. Hannig on a Motion #5."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a reduction Veto and we're asking that we restore \$500 thousand for a homeless... for the Homeless Youth Program. This money was appropriated by our House Human Services Committee and the Governor used his Amendatory Veto pen to reduce it. I know a number of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle have asked that we file this Motion and proceed with this override. So, I would move that we restore funding, \$500 thousand in funding, for the Homeless Youth Program. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of restoring this \$500 thousand back into the budget. Not too long ago, the House Human Services Committee had a hearing and we discussed with all of the statewide providers how Illinois has only 28 beds for youth who have no homes. I know that the myth out there is these children have run away from their families, but what we heard in committee that day sadly is that these... some families actually run away from their children. So, I would appreciate it if everybody would vote to restore this money. It's gonna go for wonderful things for children in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do rise in support.

As the previous speaker indicated, we have over 15 thousand homeless youth, nonwards and we have about a hundred and

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

twenty-four beds. Last night while we were eating dinner, in every town and municipality at least seven young boys or girls were turned away and were put out to sleep in the In Chicago, they might be able to lay by Lake Michigan, but in the rural areas, they're layin' on some farmland, some dark road. Last night while we were eating dinner, a young lady with a small baby, because her mother kicked her out, is tryin' to find a place to sleep. talkin' about addressing something that is a human services where young teenagers and I would... if there's anything I ask this year, as I chair Human Services and I work with these communities every day from Harrisburg to Chicago, we have to do the right thing here. And I would ask for your total support. I have called each and every one of you last night and I was able to get the commitments and I pray that your commitments will be here today in form of a 'green' light. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to my colleagues in the House. This is a very, very important issue for the young people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I certainly do not question your devotion to this particular cause, but it brings light to something that I think we could do this piecemeal and you certainly have the votes to do that, but I have a bigger concern. Maybe you can en... alleviate some of the concern

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

The minimum wage increase kicks in in that I have. January. We have thousands of workers contractually bound to human service providers and the state has made no provision for them to pay those workers the higher minimum wage come January. Now, I don't know whether your side of the aisle has a supplemental appropriation in mind or a Resolution in mind, but many of the human service providers, that I've talked to in the last month, say that statewide probably the minimum amount to get them through fiscal '04 will be in the neighborhood of 5 to 7 million dollars. And I... it's fine to put a half a million back here certainly for homeless prevention or a half a million here for another... to do some things with it for those who are mentally ill, but the bigger issue out there is, we can restore some of these line items and it's not to say that they all aren't worthy, my concern is, we're about out of time in the Veto Session. The bigger problem is how are any of these human service agencies going to provide service when they don't have the money to meet the higher minimum wage that takes effect in January. anything you can... some of us on our side of the aisle would like some direction from your side of the aisle. How are we going to address that? 'Cause now... then you're talkin' some serious money."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think you make a very valid point. Clearly, we will work with the Governor to try to resolve these issues. This particular override does not address those issues. So..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Black: "And... and I understand that and I apologize because quite frankly, the Speaker is being very kind because I wasn't speaking to the Motion and he certainly could rule me out of order. But you see what our fear is, you can vote for this, you can vote for a few others, maybe you add back \$2½ million, but we... we're not discussing something that's going to have a tremendous impact on these human services provider in January and if there is a plan, perhaps it could circulate in the near future. Thank you very much for your indulgence."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Millner."

Millner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of words. First off, we all in this chamber know these children are at risk, they're homeless. And those children who can't find shelter who are homeless will many times get involved in illegal activities. So, we can invest the money today for the homeless kids or invest it in the Department of Corrections and that's probably the choice. So, I'd urge your vote for this."

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, 'Shall the item on line 1 page 61 of House Bill 2716 be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, the item on page 61 line 1 of House Bill 2716, is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. On the

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Order of Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House Bill 3828. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? House 3828."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3828, Second Reading of this House Bill, a Bill for an Act regarding environmental safety. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Well, Representative Coulson, House Resolution 396."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 396 is a Resolution that is asking for the House Human Service Appropriations Committee to meet and discuss the proper budgeting of the funds received as a result of the passage of the Job and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003. As you know, we... we'll be receiving about \$700 million in additional funding for Medicaid funding and I believe we need to make sure that we are accountable to where those dollars are going. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Novak in the Chair."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution be... House Resolution 396 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Having received the required Constitutional

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Majority, House Resolution 396 is hereby declared adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1 there is House Bill 2716. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? Okay. On Motion #1, Mr. Hannig, the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig on a Motion."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This reduction Veto and this Motion is to restore \$551,900 of funding for the Teen REACH Program in the Department of Human Services' budget. Teen REACH partners with Boys and Girls Clubs to provide supervised out-of-school time activities for at-risk youth. This was, again, an item that the House Human Services Committee felt very strongly about. And I would now urge that we restore this funding to the Governor's budget. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor'll yield."

Beaubien: "I just, again, for the benefit of the Members of the chamber, I wanna get the cost of this to the budget."

Hannig: "It's \$551,900."

Beaubien: "For what is known as the Teen REACH Program."

Hannig: "Yeah. This would be the amount that we're asking to be restored."

Beaubien: "Thank you very much. I just wanna make sure everybody knows what the number is and what is gonna come out of the General Revenue Fund."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Millner."
- Millner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This, too, will clearly make a difference. We see so many of our children using, taking advantage of this program and the research is very clear. It's consistent that those kids involved in this program will be significantly less likely to be involved in criminal activity, be more likely to be involved in... in programs that are productive and will also be better students. So, I highly urge my fellow Members here to vote for this. Thank you."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Osterman."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point on this legislation. Teen REACH Program is a program that affects teens around the State of Illinois and the reduction that was taken out has shown a harmful effect on the programs in these communities that are helping teens. There's been staff reductions. There's been a decline in enrollment. Prior to this year, the Teen REACH Program has jumped from 23 thousand kids to 31 thousand kids. We wanna make sure that teens across the state are able to take advantage of this important program to help them in their lives. And I would simply ask for support of this measure."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Lady from Lake, Representative Ryg."
- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in strong support of this restoration of these funds. Again, this... this is a

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

proven effective program. Even during its peak, less than one-quarter of the agencies that applied were able to receive funding. I see this as important in terms of prevention. We either pay now or pay later. This is a small amount of money to reduce the risk of teen pregnancies, juvenile... criminal activity and substance abuse. So, I, too, add my support for this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes. I would just ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Novak: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the item on page 56 line 34 and page 57 line 1 of House Bill 2716 be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor vote... all those in favor voting signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This action requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the required Constitutional Majority, the item on page 56 line 34 and page 57 line 1 has received the Constitutional Majority of House Bill 2716 is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. Mr. Hannig, Motion #2 on House Bill 2716. Mr. Hannig."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Motion asks that we restore \$1.65 million for funding for the Alzheimer's Program in the Department of Public Aid. This is one of the items where I received a lot of mail in the last few months from people who have loved ones who need this service and have simply asked us not to turn our backs on citizens, in many cases senior citizens, who are fighting this awful disease. So, I'm asking that you join me in restoring \$1.65 million to this program and that we... and that we override the Governor's Veto and that we restore this funding to this item. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor'll yield."

Beaubien: "It is my understanding that we're appropriating this money to be paid out from the General Revenue Fund, but do we not in fact receive the 50 percent match back from the Federal Government for this program?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, we do. In fact, we were, by moving the program, the Governor was able to capture the federal money. So, we were able to make our dollars go further by changing that this year."

Beaubien: "So, I... the point is the net effect on the General Revenue Fund is not 1.65, it's half that amount, approximately, 'cause we get the money back from the

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Federal Gov... We pay it out, apply for the money, the money comes back."
- Hannig: "Yeah. Representative, you're correct. We... we do budget at a gross amount. That's correct."
- Beaubien: "Okay. I just wanted the General Assembly to know that 'cause the net effect is 50 percent of the number.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Novak: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Hannig to close."
- Hannig: "Again, I would just ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. The question is, 'Shall the item on page 5 line 24 through 25 of House Bill 2716 be restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr... Mr. Smith, Michael Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the required Constitutional Majority, the item on page 5 line 24 and 25 of House Bill 2716 is declared restored, notwithstanding the item reduction of the Governor. On page 2 of the Calendar is House Bill 3835, Mr. Flider. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3835, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Speaker Novak: "Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar is House Bill, excuse me, Senate Bill 1049. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1049, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Novak: "Mr. McCarthy on Floor Amendment #2."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 does become the Bill, so anything that was on Senate Bill 1049 before the Amendment was added yesterday is gone. This... this is an Amendment that basically affects the Park District Code. It addresses a problem and it only addresses a problem in areas of the state that are covered by both a park district and a parks and recreation board. It has to be a double taxed issue or else this section would not apply. So, since the Amendment will become the Bill, I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment and I can answer any questions on Third Reading."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. And on that question, the Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is really a product of a park department and a park district, both of which I represent. They have been in negotiations for quite a long time. Both sides have made some pretty serious concessions. Both sides have

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

made some pretty serious feet in cement, also. They have not been able to work out... work it out. I really wish that... that it wasn't involved in legislation and that it was worked out in the local level. That has not happened as of yet. Maybe this motivation will do it, but I am very concerned that this particular piece of legislation will become a lawyer's full employment Bill for the next two years and that dollars that are to go to programs and notch kids in the park districts won't happen. So, if the passage of this legislation moves people off of stuck into the place where tax dollars are spent as they should be, then perhaps it should go on. Because I represent both sides of the issues, I will be voting 'present' on it. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor'll yield."

Black: "Representative, does the Amendment become the Bill?"

McCarthy: "Yes, it does."

Black: "All right. My only concern about this Bill and I intend to support it..."

McCarthy: "I appreciate that."

Black: "...those of you who live there certainly know more about this issue than I do. My only concern is and I wish you would take this under consideration, I think this... this should have a sunset clause in it because once... once the

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

referenda decides the question in your area that law sits out there for five, ten, fifteen years and my fear is, could be used for mischief in other parts of the state where, for example, in my district where you have tremendous county conservation district operating parks. I would be much more comfortable and I intend to vote for your Bill, but perhaps you could do a trailer early in the next Session that upon the conclusion of this referenda give yourself a one or a two-year window of opportunity to revisit. But please, consider putting in a sunset clause so that this referenda provision will go away and could not then be used somebo... by somewhere... some other district in the state who have more of a axe to grind than... than this issue appears to be."

McCarthy: "I thank you for the suggestion and I certainly would support trailer legislation that would have that in it."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I think that we understand that the Legislator is trying to solve a problem in his local district. I have no fault with that. However, the way the legislation is written does bother me and it oughta bother every Member of the General Assembly. The Illinois Park District Association has serious concerns about the language in the legislation. Representative, the previous speaker had indicated that he thought perhaps it can be used by other legal entities to do things that the Sponsor does not

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

intend it to do. What I would ask the Sponsor to do is to work with the Senate Sponsor to try and figure out and work with the State of Illinois Park District Association to tighten that language up so that it achieves what the Sponsor wants to do and does not open it up in a way that can be used by others that he did not intend... that he did not intend to have used. The problem, of course, is that this Bill is... affects every... becomes a law of the State of Illinois which is much bigger than the Sponsor's small area of concern that he's trying to address, his citizens. I would ask that you take a good, hard look at this legislation and see if it's something that solves the problem or perhaps you might wanna send a message to the Sponsor to see if there's a way that we can tighten it up before it goes to the Senate. But just one moment, please."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Lady from McHenry, Representative Kurtz."

Parke: "I'm not done."

Speaker Novak: "Oh, I'm sorry. Proceed."

Parke: "Thank you. Does this... does this forgive debt? There's a question that we need to know."

McCarthy: "I'm having trouble with the speaker. The contracted indebtedness that currently exists for the properties that would be affected by this area will go on until the bonds are satisfied. We wanna make that very, very clear because we don't want people reading the newspaper and thinking next year they'll only have one... one tax line on their tax

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

there's approximately \$700 thousand The... contracted indebtedness that will continue on properties until they are satisfied by the bonds. Both myself and Representative Kosel have tried to make that very clear to the people in the area. We don't want 'em coming back to us in a year and saying, you told us it was gone and it's not. That will continue. As far as the sunset, I did agree with Representative Black earlier. far as... Representative Meyer had some concerns. I also said I would support trailer legislation in the future that stated that this is for affect of existing park districts and existing park and recreation boards that exist at the time that the Bill becomes law. I think that would be a good change, so we don't have people pulling shenanigans 'cause I understand that your concerns are genuine. I do say as far as making it statewide, if any part of this state is double taxed for one service, I think the people of that area have a fundamental right to say, we wanna sign our petitions, we wanna go to referendum and we wanna be taxed once for one service and not twice. And I think you would agree with me on that."

Parke: "Thank you. One last thing is that you said you're gonna have a trailer Bill?"

McCarthy: "I said I would be supportive of trailer legislation.

I think Representative Meyer will probably introduce the
Bill, but I certainly will be supportive of that Bill."

Parke: "Okay. Well, would you, in the trailer Bill, could you consider the sunset because, again, once... once you've

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

solved your problem that ought… we oughta have it done and ov… off the books then."

McCarthy: "I wouldn't want to speak for Representative Meyer, but I'm very sure that he would probably go along with that. If he didn't want to, I would present my own Bill with the sunset legislation, as we discussed with Representative Black."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Lady from McHenry, Representative Kurtz."

Kurtz: "...Mr. Speaker. I wanna congratulate Representative McCarthy in... of researching this and bringing it to fruition. And I do urge an 'aye' vote. In my very fastgrowing district, why we have this overlapping of two villages and park districts. And also, I do want to urge the Representative to follow or pursue the suggestions of Representative Black. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor yields."

Hamos: "So, Mr. McCarthy, this Bill, in fact, is a statewide
Bill. Correct?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Ma'am."

Hamos: "Okay. So, this has nothing to do with Representative McCarthy's park district? Any one of us that has a municipal park district and also has some small portions with special recreation districts will be able to go to

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

referendum and take dollars away from the municipal park district by basically deannexing themselves. Is that what this Bill does?"

McCarthy: "No, Ma'am. Not the municipal park district. Ιt would be out of a park district and stay as part of the municipal parks and recreation department. It was the opposite of what you said, but it's basically that. But it only, only, only applies to areas of the state where they are being double taxed for one service. You have to prove before you can use this Bill that you're in an area where you're being taxed by a park district board and you're also being taxed through your municipal levy or your village or city, so you're paying double for one service. And this has been tryin' to worked out for a couple years. We had a nonbinding referendum about three years ago. Ninety-two percent of the people in that area said, we want out of this. I mean, who could blame 'em, who wants to pay double taxes, but if... So, I... your question is that... your answer is that what you said is actually backwards. It's the opposite as far as going from a park district to a city."

Hamos: "Well, again, let me ask it a different way. In the City of Evanston, which I represent, there is a parks and recreation department that is... is able to get or the Skokie Park District, let's call it. They're able... they have their own tax base and they have property taxes that they are able to generate from all the taxpayers in Skokie. Now, in one corner, let's say, there's a special recreation district that's been established or does establish itself,

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

then somehow there would be a carve out so that the underlying Skokie Park District would no longer be able to collect from the people in that special recreation district. Is that... is that right?"

McCarthy: "If they were served by both the municipal park and rec board and they were served by a park district, not a special recreation association. By a park district, then they could avail themselves of the measures in this Bill."

Hamos: "Okay. Well, I..."

McCarthy: "But it would have to be an impetus by the people there. They would have to come forward and have to do the petitions. They'd have to go to their board. would have to put it on, the referendum on the next ballot and then the people of their area would have to vote on it. If there are areas... Now, yesterday the park representative could not come up with one area in the state where people are currently served by two bodies and are happy with the service so much. But if they were happy with the service, they would never ask for the referendum, they would never go to petition. These are people who could take advantage of this. First of all, they'd have to be double taxed and they have to take the impetus on themselves to go out and get the, you know, requisite number of petitions which is 10 percent of all the homeowners there and then they have to go to the referendum and have to pass the referendum. So, it's a very affirmative act by the people."

Hamos: "Well, I do think, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this is a big Bill. This has nothing to do with just Representative

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

McCarthy's district. This probably affects all of districts and we should go home and investigate possibilities because the biggest fallacy here is that when people live in one corner of a municipality, the example I gave was the was Skokie Park District which excellent park district, and somehow in that corner that's... if they're able to do this, what this does, this somehow assumes that the people who live there don't use park facilities in the rest of the municipality, do not use the entire... all of the entire park district and that is the problem with this is that it treats, I mean, it... it... it undermines the tax base of the municipal park district that provides services to all the people throughout the district. And I urge a 'no' vote. I don't know if we're voting on this Amendment or just putting it on. certainly urge a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote until we have a chance to go home and investigate this further."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St...
from Fayette, Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Come on, people, you're either on the taxpayer's side or on the... trying to make sure that some government agency isn't the benefactor of being... of people paying taxes twice. I under... trying to understand the concerns of some who are saying that, well, this is onerous, this is a plot, this is a conspiracy to... to ruin park districts around... around the state and that all city government is gonna take advantage of this to... to steal their park district away. That's just not the case. The

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Representative has a problem. The problem is that people in his district are paying taxes twice for the same service. This lets them decide if they wanna continue to do that. The Gentleman has suggested that in a trailer Bill he will support putting a sunset on this legislation. Let's get it done now. They shouldn't have to pay extra taxes one extra day. I support the Gentleman's Motion."

- Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Mr. McCarthy to close."
- McCarthy: "I'd like to thank the former speaker for his comments. I think they were right on target. I think the speaker before that, I mean, if she's standing for double taxation for one service, I think that that's a little bit wrong-headed. I think that we should speak loudly to this. I do wanna thank Representative Kosel. She really has worked hard with both of these areas to try them to make a amicable settlement. I think her comments earlier where she said maybe in the two weeks between now and its going over to the Senate they may come to their senses and have a settlement and I would welcome that as well. So, I appreciate your support on the Amendment."
- Speaker Novak: "The question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 to House... Senate Bill 1049 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1049, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "The... As we discussed earlier, the Amendment is the Bill. I think we've discussed it enough on the Amendment. So, other than saying that you're doing a wonderful job today, Speaker, I would proceed to a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might correct, I'm the Gentleman from DuPage, now."

Speaker Novak: "Oh, excuse me. DuPage County."

Meyer: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor'll yield."

Meyer: "Representative, we've already had some discussion on this and I certainly thank you for the time that you spent with me on my concerns with it... with your legislation and certainly for the time that we took yesterday in the hearing on it. However, I still have some questions that I would like to ask ya. Under this legislation, would it allow a municipality to still form a recreation board in a territory that is currently... where there's a currently an existing park district?"

McCarthy: "This legislation doesn't directly affect that. The current State Law... whatever it says in the current State Law this minute would not be affected by anything in this legislation. So..."

Meyer: "So..."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

McCarthy: "...they would... they would still have to follow the parameters that are in the statutes today."

Meyer: "Okay. So, this does not prevent that from happening and it would allow for that to take place in the future, thereby setting up a scenario where you would have a... a recre... a municipal recreation board and also a park district in the same territory is my concern."

McCarthy: "I agree and that was part of the concern that was addressed when we said that we would support trailer legislation saying that this is only for existing boards. However, I don't want to mislead by saying whatever's in the statutes today, as far as establishing a park and recreation board, would still be there tomorrow with or without this legislation."

Meyer: "Well, the part, though, that would not be there under the existing is for that municipal-owned or municipal-run recreation board to, in fact, take away the tax base of the existing park district. And that is... at the crux of my concern that..."

McCarthy: "Correct. But you do understand..."

Meyer: "...this legislation does not address that."

McCarthy: "It does not. You see, in order for that... this legislation to address that, a city now served by a park district would first of all have to go through all the hoops and whistles to set up their park and recreation board and then they would come back with another referendum to, you know, work with this, you know, this Bill. So, as far as the actual setting up that parks and recreation

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

board in any municipality, that would be handled under current statute. They'd have to go through all of that first, though, because in order to apply under this Bill they have to be in an area that is double taxed. So, they... they would be in that until they set up their park and recreation board."

- Meyer: "That part I understand, but it still sets up the contention point at which that could exist in the future whereas under current law that does not exist."
- McCarthy: "Correct and that's why we said we support the trailer legislation about existing boards at the time of the Act."
- Meyer: "Would... through this will the newly-formed recreation board, if that in case would take place... if that would take place, then be enabled to through a referendum disconnect from the existing park district board? I think you may have answered that. I just wanted to clarify it."
- McCarthy: "If there were an existing parks and rec board at the time of the legislation, yes."
- Meyer: "Well, what happens to any park district property or assets located in that disconnected territory?"
- McCarthy: "The... the current statutes, that I have a copy of here, basically state the disconnection of territory would not be permitted if the park district has ownership of a park located in the territory to be disconnected. As we mentioned in committee yesterday, there are... there is no park property in this area, whatsoever. They have never seen fit to put a park in there, so that does make this

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

disconnection, you know, much easier and legal according to the current statute."

Meyer: "Well, your... your scenario that you have in your district, I fully understand what you're trying to do and I... I would certainly support the fact that I don't believe that anybody should be ta... double taxed for any type of thing in this state. So, I don't have a problem at all with that aspect with what you're attempting to do, Representative, and I really want to go on record for saying that. I believe that there should be some remedy found to alleviate that double taxation. However, I am going to have to reluctantly stand in opposition to your Bill because I think it is much too broad. It's not just something simple that addresses your specific circumstances there. And I certainly wish anything that we could pass on as a message from this Body to the two taxing bodies or the local taxing bodies that you represent there to get their heads together and get this thing straightened out and agreed to, I think we should do. Unfortunately, I don't believe that I... I can lend support to voting for this legislation at this time because I think it is much too broad. It does need that trailer legislation. I wish there was time in this... in this Session to actually put together a simple Amendment. Unfortunately, we have run out of time and therefore, it does leave a very broad-based Bill. I believe it opens up Pandora's box. Unfortunately, there's no guarantee that any legislation, whether I suggest it or you suggest it, in the future will every be

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

passed through this House or through the Senate and signed into law by the Governor. And that is the crux of my concern. It is that simple. And I truthfully wanna support you in your endeavors to alleviate the double taxation problem for people. I don't have a problem with that at all. I... I... I am shocked that it is actually happening. I wasn't aware that those types of cases exist. But with this legislation, I just think it's too broad. I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Mr. McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "I do think that the former speaker's concerns were genuine, but I think the concerns of these people that are paying double taxes for close to a decade, their concerns have to be recognized as well. I think we're gonna move this thing forward and hopefully, it will get the tax bodies, as one of the Representatives said earlier and Representative Meyer said as well. But I would appreciate your affirmative vote on this and I'm sure the people of the affected area would certainly appreciate it."

Speaker Novak: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1049 pass?' All those in favor vote by signifying 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This action requires 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Majority, Senate Bill 1049 is hereby declared passed. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on House Bill 2700, I believe that you have Motions to reconsider the vote."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2700. Representative Beaubien, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Motion #2 for this Bill passed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. I filed the Motion on behalf of reconsideration of the Bill. And I would urge people to support that... that Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. On the question to reconsider, I would just suggest to my colleagues that we visited this issue yesterday. We had a thorough debate on the question and the issue received, I believe, over... well over the amount of votes that were required for the override. It doesn't seem to me that there's any need to revisit the issue today and in fact, I don't believe that the amounts of money that are... that are in... on the table are actually numbers that are... that are the problem. And in fact, I would suggest that the amount of money that we overrode yesterday was within parameters of at least what the Governor's Office talked about in a news release that they issued in October. And while I certainly won't say that I was not a party to that agreement, I was not in that meeting, I do respect all of us as Members and I do believe that all of us as Members

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

have... should have an opportunity to do the duties that we have. So, I would just suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we have... we have revisit... that we have visited this issue, that we have spoken on this issue. Today is the final day that we can take any action on this issue here in the House of Representatives concerning the Veto overrides or the Motion to reconsider them. And so I would respectfully urge Members on both sides of the aisle to stand with what we did yesterday to defeat this Motion to reconsider... Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker should this receive 60 votes, I would ask that there be a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Speaker, just to request a record Roll Call vote."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. It's a Motion to reconsider the vote. Those in favor of reconsidering will vote 'yes'; those against reconsidering will vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brauer and Wait. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 49 'yes' and 64 'no', the Motion fails. Is there a need to proceed to the other Motions? So, the other Motions will be withdrawn. Page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate-Bills Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 963. Mr. Burke, Mr. Burke, 963."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 963, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Floor Amendment #1, it passed out of committee yesterday. It would simply remove from statute any mention of the Crisp Law having similarities to the Wirtz Law. The courts had found the legislation unconstitutional and it simply removes the language from the statute. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on Senate Bill 963 is it correct that that Bill has been read a second time, previously?"

Clerk Bolin: "That is correct."

- Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 963, a Bill for an Act concerning commercial transactions. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My remarks would be identical to the remarks made

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- in the passage of the or the adoption of the Amendment.

 And if there's any questions, I'd be available to answer."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'... Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I have a potential conflict of interest on this Bill, so I'll be voting 'present'."
- 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? Soto. Mr. Delgado, did you wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative May on House Resolution 522."
- May: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Resolution 522, it's a joyous occasion, the hundredth anniversary of the Jewish Community Centers in Chicago. I thank my colleagues who have joined me in recognizing this group that serves the cultural, social, educational, recreational communities in Chicago and especially our most vulnerable communities. So, I... I just thank you for this opportunity to wish them well."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 41, 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 both Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 6, 2003, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 18, 2003 at 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Adjournment Resolution. Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Black who apparently is not prepared to adjourn."
- Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair regarding the bulletin. On the bulletin it says we're to bring our laptop, AC adaptor, batteries, cables, dongles when I return for the second week of Session. I don't know where my dongles are? Am I gonna be held responsible? I haven't seen my dongles in... since the day we got these things. I don't even know what a dongle is."
- Speaker Madigan: "With your permission, can I ask Mr. Mapes to respond?"

Black: "Yes. I know he is our technological guru."

Mapes: "A dongle is the connecting cable that goes between the laptop and the wiring to LIS. That this..."

Black: "And that's what Mr. Brown is holding up?"

Mapes: "Yes, Sir."

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

- Black: "If our dongle is gone, will we be fined or do we have to pay for it?"
- Mapes: "No, Sir. You won't be fined and if it is available, in your possession, if you could return it the next week of Veto Session."
- Black: "I... I will do the very best I can to find my dongle and turn it in at the appropriate time."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado. Delgado."
- Delgado: "Mr. Speaker, a personal privilege. Just some... one of our colleagues left their glasses here and if they're lookin' for 'em, right here at Representative Soto's desk. Your eyeglasses are here."
- Speaker Madigan: "Giles. Mr. Giles."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Someone inadvertently vote my button on the Motion to reconsider House Bill 2700. My... my vote was in the 'nay' column. I would like for you to change that to the 'yes' column."
- Speaker Madigan: "The record will reflect your request."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 18 at 12 noon. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 18 at 12 noon."
- Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 First Reading and introduction of House Bills. House Bill
 3894, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act
 concerning finances. House Bill 3895, offered by

73rd Legislative Day

11/6/2003

Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. House Bill 3896, offered Representative Churchill, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 3897, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning counterfeit drugs. House Bill 3898, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning drugs. House Bill 3899, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 3900, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 3901, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act in relation to open meetings. House Bill 3902, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3903, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act regarding educational labor relations. First Reading of Introduction of House Resolutions. these House Bills. House Resolution 530, offered by Representative Madigan. House Resolution 534, offered by Representative Ryg. Bills are referred to the House Rules Committee. Resolutions are referred to the House Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."