142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off their laptop computers, their cell phones and their pagers. And we ask our guests in the gallery to rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield."
- Lee Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most sovereign King who art the Lord of Lord and the King of Kings. The reigning and ruling authority. Father, we come before You humbly asking for Your divine guidance. For Your word has instructed us that we are to lean not toward our own understandings, but rather in all of our ways we are to acknowledge You. And that You in return would direct our paths. So, Father, our prayer today is for this Your people is that You will order our steps, for the steps of a righteous people, You have said they are ordered of the Lord. We ask this in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Verschoore."
- Verschoore 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."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Monique Davis, Karen May, and Harry Osterman are excused today. And if the House will indulge me, I'll tell you why Harry's not here. It's because he and his wife Peggy welcomed their first child last June 3rd. Jack... Jack Mathew... Jack Mathew Osterman is a strapping baby boy and, of course, a good Democrat."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Daniels is excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 114 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Committee Report. Representative Barbara Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measure/s and or Joint Action Motions was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, June 09, 2004, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 3835. Referred to the House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1048, offered by Representative Art Turner. House Resolution 1049, offered by Representative Kosel. House Joint Resolution 92, offered by Representative Flider."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1046, offered by Representative Younge. House

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Resolution 1047, offered by Representative Poe. And House Resolution 1050, offered by Representative Hultgren."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have a Motion to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 2123 can be heard in Elections, that the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4 to House Bill 3835 and a subject matter hearing on the Fiscal Year Budget Implementation Act be heard is State Government, that this subject matter screening assessment and support services be... be heard in the Fee-For-Service Initiative Committee and that the subject matter of the 2004 supplemental appropriation be heard in Appropriations Human Services."

"Before we move to the Motion put Speaker Madigan: Representative Currie, let us go back to the matter of the Agreed Resolutions. The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor of the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Now, on the Motion of Representative Currie to suspend the posting requirements for the committees, which are listed on the blue piece of paper which I hope all of you have. Is there anyone did not... is there anyone who does not have this? Would the Pages please distribute these. Are there Republicans that don't have these? Mr. Crawford is right behind you, Mr. McGuire. All right. The Lady has moved to suspend the posting requirements for the committees listed on the blue piece of paper. Mr. Black... Mr. Black supports

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

the Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Motion And the posting requirements shall adopted. the committee hearings suspended for recited bу Representative Currie and reflected on the blue handout, which should be in the hands of all Members. Ladies and Gentlemen, the... the plan will be for the House to stand in resear... recess, pending action by the Senate. We expect to receive three Bills from the Senate. One would provide for a supplemental appropriation of \$850 million to provide for short-term borrowing in the Medicaid program. A second would be a substantive Bill related to the appropriation that I just mentioned. And lastly, there would be an additional supplemental appropriation Bill. We will await action by the Senate, but in the meantime we have scheduled these subject matter hearings in our committee so that when the Bills do arrive from the Senate we will have heard the matters in the committee and we can move immediately to consideration of those matters having arrived from the Senate. Any questions? There being no questions, the House shall stand in resear ... recess to the call of the Chair. Mr. Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of information. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my district is the hometown of President Ronald Reagan. Memorial services will be there starting Thursday of this week at 10:00 in the Dickson Christian Church. There will be a memorial service in honor of the death of Ronald Reagan, the 40th President of the United States. On Sunday

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- at 2:30 in Tampico, Illinois, which was the birthplace of Ronald Reagan, there will also be a memorial service. If any of you would like to attend any of these services and want information you can certainly call my local office and check with them. I believe at the Dickson service the Governor will be there. Speaker Hassert is going to be there. Peter Fitzgerald will be there and of course all of the local political types will be there as well. So, anyone that would like information or would like to attend, please call my local office, area code 815-625-0820. Jerry Robinson is there. She will give you information and make sure that seating is available for you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Once again, the House shall stand in recess at the call of the Chair."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 85 is referred to the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. Supplemental Calendar #1 has been distributed and on that Calendar there appears the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, Senate Bill 2123. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2123, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

 On the Order of Concurrence there appears House Bill 953.

 Mr. Hannig, on House Bill 953."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the substantive Bill that creates the Medical (sic-State of Medicaid) Provider Relief Fund so that the Illinois can borrow \$850 million and use that money to maximize the... the state... the federal match on Medicaid spending. So, this has been a proposal that has been out there for a period of time. Initially, the thought was that this would become part of the... the end of Session budget that we would do for our '04 supplemental and an '05 new budget. But unfortunately, as we stand here today in June, there is no '05 budget under consideration. is important that we move forward with this supplemental appropriation for the '04 budget so that the State of Illinois can take advantage of this window that will close on June 30th from the Federal Government with match. this is language that's been negotiated between the four caucuses and the Governor's Office. It would set up this special fund. The State of Illinois would borrow \$850 million and put the money into this fund for the sole purpose of providing payments to Medicaid providers. the end of July 1 any money that remains would go to the General Revenue Fund, from which we would repay the \$850 million. So, this is a sub... a substantive Bill to the appropriation companion. Together they will allow us to maximize our... our federal match and collect about \$25 million more from the Federal Government than if we... if we take no action. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, can you tell us a little bit more about how this will work? It's \$850 million?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Parke: "And we're gonna bor... borrow that?"

Hannig: "We would borrow the money. The money would go into this special dedicated fund."

Parke: "How... okay, wait. Your gonna borrow it. How long is it... how long do we borrow it for?"

Hannig: "Representative, in order for this... the Governor to borrow money he has to enter into an agreement with the Comptroller and the Treasurer. And so, the terms of that agreement that they would all three sign would spell out the repayment."

Parke: "So, is this considered short term borrowing?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Parke: "So it'll will be short-term borrowing and then do we have any idea... is it ninety days, a hundred and twenty days, six months?"

Hannig: "Representative, those... those items would be negotiated between the Governor, the Comptroller, and the State Treasurer. So, in other words, whatever they... those three Constitutional Officers could agree to, that's what we could go to market... in other words, we... unless all three agree, we simply can't borrow the money."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Parke: "But it's expected to be repaid in a short period of time?"

Hannig: "Yes."

Parke: "And because of that we get a matching funds from the Federal Government?"

Hannig: "We can maximize our match. That's correct."

Parke: "And it... and how much money will we get returned from the Federal Government under their matching system?"

Hannig: "We estimate that the net to the state will be about \$25 million, 20 to 25 million."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner, in the Chair. The Lady from Peoria, Representative Slone, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Slone: "Representative Hannig, the 25 million extra dollars from the feds, will that go toward the repayment of the loan or for other purposes?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, the repayment from... of the loan will come out of the General Revenue Fund. The fact is though that if we pay these Medicaid bills before June 30, as apposed to after July 1, we can collect an additional \$25 million that will be in the General Revenue Fund and will be available."

Slone: "But it won't be earmarked for the repayment of the loans specifically?"

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Hannig: "No. The... the repayment of the loan will be something that the Comptroller will do based on the terms of the agreement. But he will have to ensure that there is adequate cash in the bank to make... to make those repayments."

Slone: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, as we discussed in committee that even though all these funds are going into a special Medicaid Borrow Provider Fund, as of July 1, 2004 the money would come out of that fund if... for Bills that haven't been paid and rollover to General Revenue."

Hannig: "Representative, we created... at the request primarily of the Senate Republicans, we created a special fund, we will create a special fund... by this proposal to put the borrowed money, the 850 million, into a borrowed fund where it will be earmarked and appropriated only for the medical providers. The match will roll into this fund and then at the end of it... it will probably be exhausted, but if at the end of fiscal year there's any money left that would go into the General Revenue Fund. Then from the General Revenue Fund we'll have to repay the 850."

Mulligan: "Right. So, it will have to be repaid, although we don't know the exact time it would be repaid and... but you... you assume that the negotiation or the agreement for

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- borrowing this money will include the fact that it all has to be... it's supposed to only go to pay Medicaid bills and it all has to be repaid within a certain time?"
- Hannig: "Yeah. They... the actual appropriation language will say that it can only be paid to medical providers."
- Mulligan: "All right. Do you believe that the money that we paid that's put into this fund will be first-in, first-out to pay for the Medicaid bills?"
- Hannig: "That's what the agency indicated in committee,

 Representative. That's correct."
- Mulligan: "All right. And... and there are supposedly are on hand one point some billion bills that could be paid with money on hand and this borrowing money?"
- Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."
- Mulligan: "And whatever bills are turned in between now and...
 what date would the provider have to have the bill in to
 come under this?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think they indicated there's about a two week lag time. So, we're hope... hopefully..."
- Mulligan: "It has to be okayed like in... within another week."
- Hannig: "Yeah. I mean, we'll... we'll make every effort to move every bill through as quickly as we can, obviously because of this additional match."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, even though there... there might be some concern about the money if it wasn't spent being transferred in the General Revenue Fund the feeling is and it seems pretty well documented that there's enough bills that we would definitely spend that money to pay those

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

bills and very little of it would be left over as of July 1?"

Hannig: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I... let me... let me focus on one issue that I... I'm having a little difficulty reconciling. The deadline for this is June 28th. Why have we waited until overtime Session to advance this? We... we've known of the federal reimbursement rate, haven't we? Since probably January."

Hannig: "Right. That's correct. Representative, I... the first thought by the administration was that this would become part of the Session ending budget that we hoped we would pass at the end of May. That there would be a FY04 supplemental and then it would roll right into the FY05 budget that we would... we thought we would pass at the end of May. Well, that didn't happen so now we're here in June. The agency now is asking us to make this special effort because the clock is ticking and... and it's about a 20 million, \$25 million item."

Black: "All right. Representative, one thing that I... correct me if I'm wrong, there is no specific language in this Bill that I see that says the state must use all of this money

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

to pay off Medicaid debt. It appears that any money that may not be spent by July 1 could then revert to General Revenue bills."

Hannig: "Well... well, Representative, let me read you the language in the companion, it's the companion appropriation Bill. It talks about the sum of 29 million... excuse me, it talks about the... the sum... excuse me, Representative, I had the wrong page. It talks of the... the sum of \$850 million is appropriated to the Department of Public Aid from the Medical (sic-Medicaid) Provider Relief Fund, which is what we're creating here, for medical assistant payments to medical providers. So, I think the... that we se... first of all, by this... this substantive Bill we create this special fund. It's a segregated fund. And then we appropriate the money from this fund only to medical providers. So, I think it's a... it's a very tightly drafted proposal that will ensure that medical providers get this money."

Black: "But Gary, why isn't there specific language? If... if you read this very carefully it says that all of the borrowed funds are to go to pay Medicaid... Medicaid bills. And I don't... I don't think any of us would disagree with that... that concept. However, it also goes on, as I interpret the language, that says any of this borrowed unspent on July 1, 2004, which is the new the fiscal year, could then be used for General Revenue purposes. Do... you're talking about a companion Bill and I'm not familiar with that. I assume there's a trailer."

Hanniq: "No..."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Black: "All I want is some reasonable assurance that the Office of Management and Budget won't pay... they'll pay \$500 million in Medicaid bills with this borrowed money and then roll \$350 million on July 1 into the General Revenue Fund."

Hannig: "Rep..."

Black: "Which is not your intent, but I don't see anything that would really stop that."

Hannig: "...well, Representative, the... the match from the Federal Government will expire on June 30th. So the... the Department of... the Governor's Office of Management and Budget has every incentive, and the Department of Public Aid, to push every bill that they can through the system and get it paid so that we can get that additional bonus match from the Federal Government."

Black: "All right. For the record, would it be your intent that the Office of Management and Budget use all of the borrowed funds to pay down our Medicaid debt on or before June 30, 2004?"

Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Black: "Okay."

Hannig: "And that's the purpose of this substantive Bill."

Black: "That..."

Hannig: "Rather than put the money in GRF, we've created this special fund..."

Black: "All right."

Hannig: "...for that purpose."

Black: "And... and that's all that I'm concerned about. But you're aware that there is a glaring loophole that if they

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

don't spend it by that date it could revert to GRF. That's not your intent, you've clearly said that. I don't think it's the intent of anyone in this chamber. And I think the record would clearly reflect that if we find later that that happened, I... I think the sense of the Body would not look favorably upon that. For the reason... I mean, I think we're going to have an... a signed agreement on this borrowing and when we talked about getting federal money... you know, I wish that we could pass a Bill that says the ... the media can't use the term 'federal money' because somehow that's free. You know, like they print it in the basement of the Capitol and it's free. It's our tax money coming back to pay Medicaid bills that are burdening this state. And one of these days we're gonna have to discuss that very fact. The fastest growing part of our budget is Medicaid and we're going to have to get a handle on this. And one of the reasons I'm going to vote for this Bill is it also creates the Medicaid Managed Care Taskforce. We rank about dead last in the number of Medicaid patients in a managed care format. We have to get a handle on our Medicaid cost or, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it will... in a matter of less than a decade it's going to take 75 percent of all of the money we have in our General Revenue Fund just to pay Medicaid expenses. This can't continue. The Bill... thank you very much, Representative.

Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Black: "Some of you may look at this and say oh I'm not going to do this, we don't have a budget, I... I... there might be a way to funnel this borrowed money into General Revenue. And the Speaker, I think, Speaker Madigan has made it very clear he... he will look askance at anymore borrowing or playing games with borrowed money. I take Representative Hannig at his word. The intent of this Bill is to leverage the federal reimbursement of our tax dollars coming back from Washington and paying down \$850 million of Medicaid debt. That is a vital function of the state and some of our payments are now stretching out, again, to 90 days or This... this Bill, regardless of the regardless of the late hour, you might question why we didn't do it in May, all of those are good reasons. But I can't think of a single good reason to vote against this Bill and... and cheat ourselves out of \$25 million of our tax money that we sent to Washington. Our taxpayers expect us to be more aggressive in bringing those federal dollars that they pay back to Illinois. I think it's a good Bill. I hope you'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig to close. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield just a second?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Cross: "Representative Hannig, I was not out here. I just want to clear... clear something up and if you've addressed it I apologize. But I want to make sure that this is very clear for the record on the repayment of this money. Now, I know

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

that, as part of this Bill, that there's no language in here with respect to when it's... when it's to be repaid. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, the... the Comptroller, the Treasurer, and the Governor will have to come to some consideration on the terms of repayment of this note..."

Cross: "I understand."

Hannig: "...even before we can borrow the money."

Cross: "I... I just... my agreement, or at least my understanding...
and I talked to both the Treasurer's Office and I talked to
the Comp... or I talked to John Filan an hour ago. Asked if
he was in an agreement that this would be paid back in a
hundred and twenty days. Are you aware of any other
agreement other than it being repaid in a hundred and
twenty days?"

Hannig: "Representative, I... I have to simply confess that I'm not aware of... of any other agreements. I think that... that I'm advised that that is correct."

Cross: "Okay. And I know there's been discussion about ninety...
there's been discussion about, you know, six months, eight
months, but the people... many people felt like this should
be paid back sooner than later and that we're now at a
hundred and twenty days. And that's... to best of your
knowledge, that's your understanding?"

Hanniq: "That's correct."

Cross: "Okay. And that's my understanding with talking to Director Filan. Just wanted to make sure... and I appreciate that. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an opportunity for the State of Illinois to maximize our federal match to collect an additional \$25 million from the Federal Government, to drive down the payment cycle to about 15 days, and to take a look at the managed care option and how that might benefit the State of Illinois. It's passed the Senate with overwhelming support. It had initially been thought of as something we would do as part of our budget... our end of Session budget. Unfortunately, that's been tied up and it's... it just important that we move forward with this proposal today. And so, I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "You've heard the Gentleman's question, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 953?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The voting is now open. 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 114 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2746. Representative Hannig on Senate Amendment 1."

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

This is a companion appropriation Bill. So, what we did in
the previous Bill is we set up the fund so that we could
accept the borrowing. Once the money comes into the fund

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

the agency needs to have the appropriation authority so that they can spend it. This gives them the \$850 million only for Medicaid providers. That's all it does. I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Just for clarification, this is the only subject matter in this... in this supplemental?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Parke: "That's it?"

Hannig: "850 for this and nothing more."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, if the \$850 million, which goes into a line to pay bills for Medicaid, is not completely used it will then fall out of that line at the beginning of July 1, '04, right?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. And it's the same issue that we're talking about as to where the money would go and go back to the General Revenue Fund? And we're voting on the supplemental just for that amount of money, the 850?"

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- Hannig: "For 850 million for the purposes of allowing the Department of Public Aid to pay, from the Medical Provider Fund, for medical assistance payments to medical providers. Nothing more than that can be done."
- Mulligan: "All right. On that \$850 million is supposed to be part of the total sum of Bills that will generate an additional 25 million in the extra match from the Federal Government that we have until the end of June?"
- Hannig: "Right. We can... we can... by doing this today, we can... we can generate an extra 20 to 25 million as opposed to waiting 'til July."
- Mulligan: "And the extra cost... or the cost for this amount of money will be approximately \$5 million to borrow the money that will generate 25 million. So, it's about a net of 20 million?"
- Hannig: "Yeah, a net of about 20 to 25 million."
- Mulligan: "Are the proceeds for... or the payment that comes up for the amount that it's gonna cost us going to come out of the 850?"
- Hannig: "I didn't hear the question. What was it?"
- Mulligan: "The amount that the borrowing cost for this 850 million, is that going to be out of the 850 million or 855 million? I mean, are we gonna get..."
- Hanniq: "This... this is..."
- Mulligan: "...845 million back because the pro... the net cost of the loan will come out on top?"
- Hannig: "...this is an appropriation measure. This is a spending Bill. And so, it allows the Comptroller and the department

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

to spend up to \$850 million on these, you know, on... on medical providers of Medicaid. So, the..."

Mulligan: "So, what I'm asking is the net proceeds that are gonna... we're allowing 800... a supplemental for 850. Are the net proceeds gonna be at 850? Or are we paying the loan cost out of that?"

Hannig: "So, if... I'm advised that we'll get the full 850 and that... that they'll... they'll net... that the cost of putting this together will be an item that will be out of General Revenue."

Mulligan: "All right. So, we're just... so that's the only reason? The 850 is a supplemental to go to Public Aid, but the cost of borrowing will come from another line item..."

Hannig: "Right. In the General Revenue."

Mulligan: "...that the Comptroller and the Treasurer and the Director will agree on?"

Hannig: "Right. That's correct."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2746?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. 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 114 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- have House Bill 30... on the Order of Nonoccurrences, we have the House Bill 3835. Representative Flider."
- Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the House not concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4 with House Bill 3835."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise?"
- Fritchey: "Thank you. Just for clarity, 'cause I have some recollection of what this legislation had done before.

 We're just curious what it... what the nonconcur Motion does at this point. What's in those... what's in the Amendments?"
- Flider: "Well, this legislation, as... as it was originally passed by the House of Representatives, would have required that Veterans' license plates be manufactured in the United States, and preferably in Illinois if such a facility exists. The Amendments that were placed on the Bill make it... make it a challenge in that they would create a brand new series of license plates, and as result they really don't relate to the specific original purpose of the Bill. And given some of the discussion that I had this morning prior to a committee meeting, it... and the Sponsor in the House... or, excuse me, in the Senate, Senator Shadid, we believe it would be the best approach to nonconcur in the Amendments and send this Bill to the Governor in its original form."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Fritchey: "So, if we nonconcur procedurally where does this leave the Bill?"

Flider: "I'm sorry?"

Fritchey: "Where would this leave us procedurally if we nonconcur?"

Flider: "Well, then we would send the Bill back over to the Senate and we would ask Senator Shadid to agree to recede from the Amendments."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you, I appreciate it."

Flider: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "No further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4 to House Bill 3835. On the Order of Resolutions... on the Order of Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 85. Representative Gordon on Senate Joint Resolution 85."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Joint Resolution 85 does the same thing that the Resolution that we passed out of the House a few weeks ago regarding the pay raises for the General Assembly this year, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, has the Sponsor of the Resolution spoken to the Resolution? All right. So, with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a prepared statement that I would like to read into the record. Most

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

of you probably realize that the House has already taken action on the Compensation Review Board report. in the last week we were here we adopted a Resolution which, in effect, rejected the report of the commission's. It said we wouldn't take the pay raise. We sent that to Senate. The Senate then today adopted Resolution, a Senate Resolution, and let me read this statement. SJR 85, the matter which is in the record, is Senate's version of a Resolution to reject recommendations of the Compensation Review Board concerning compensation for state officials. As you may recall, the is already on record as rejecting House recommendations, having adopted HJR 75 on May 27, The Compensation Review Board report received by the House on April 1, 2004 recommended that the salaries of all officials under the jurisdiction of the Compensation Review Board be adjusted to reflect the annual cost of living adjustments that were provided for as vested components of salary in the 1990 report and in SJR 192 of that year. The board, in this year's report, did not recommend any other adjustment in salary levels. This year's report also urges the General Assembly to amend the Compensation Review Act so that future reports of the board are filed in oddnumbered years rather than the even-numbered years. could not have been clearer in our rejection of the board's report when we adopted House Joint Resolution 75 a few weeks ago. We simply resolved 'that the 2004 report of the Compensation Review Board is hereby disapproved, in whole,

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

in accordance with Section 5 of the Compensation Review That's it. By rejecting the board's report in its entirety, we made clear that we are against any increase in salary, whether it be as a result of a COLA or otherwise. Now, on the final day for the Senate to disapprove of the 2004 report, without any notice to the House, the Senate has passed over to us another version of a Resolution that is intended to achieve the same result as HJR 75, but with less clarity. SJR 85, the matter in the record, resolves that the board's 2004 report is 'approved insofar is the report does not recommend any increase in salary level.' The problem is that the board did recommend an increase in salary level, and that is by virtue of the COLA, which the board views as a vested component of salary. But SJR 85 says more. It further resolves that the recommended restorations of the COLA for FY03 and FY04 are rejected. So, these two passages in SJR 85 are internally inconsistent. Finally, SJR 85 rejects the recommendation for filing reports in odd-numbered years. I will try to add some clarity to what the Senate has presented to us. By adopting SJR 85, we will once again reject the 2004 report of the Compensation Review Board in its entirety. We will say, once again, that we are against accepting the COLA and we are against any other increase in salary. I ask for the adoption of SJR 85 and thank you, Mr. Speaker." Speaker Turner: "Sponsor's moved for the adoption of SJR 85. All those in favor should vote... To the Gentleman from

Vermilion, Representative Black."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

"Yeah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I always appreciate the fact how quiet it is when the real Speaker delivers a... a statement, but in all due respect, I'm just an old country boy and I didn't even get a 'C' Constitutional Law. I didn't even go to law school. have no idea what he said. I mean, it sounded to me like it was inconsistent, we passed a better one, they didn't pass a very good one, we're rejecting, but maybe we're accepting, therefore and whereas. What are we doing? this some kind of law school exercise in that in rejecting we're accepting? Seriously, that... that statement caught my attention in that it sounds as if the Senate Joint Resolution may be flawed. And if that's the case, then... then... are we accepting a cost of living increase or are we not accepting a cost of living increase? With all of the covers and window dressing and everything stripped from it, we both have to pass an identical Resolution. evidently aren't going to call the House Resolution, we're evidently going to call the Senate Resolution But the Speaker's statement was, to me, somewhat ambiguous in that their... their Resolution may not be, what's the word, accurate or well drafted and therefore... I... I'm... and I'm not trying to be cute here. I really do not understand whether we, in fact, have rejected a cost of living in toto or whether the Senate Resolution may be flawed and we may, in fact, find ourselves the recipient of a cost of living. I... I would like some clarification on what we just heard."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to respond to the Gentleman's question. Again, the precise and exact language from the House Resolution read as follows 'that the 2004 report of the Compensation Review Board is hereby disapproved, in whole, in accordance with Section 5 of the Compensation Review Act.' To me, that sounds pretty clear."

Black: "That was my Bill. I thought it was very clear."

Madigan: "Right. Right. I've already referenced the Senate language, and my attempt to clarify this for you is simply to say, as you said in your remarks, for the salary increase to be rejected it requires action by both chambers. And when the Senate declined to consider the House Resolution and sent a Senate Resolution, as I mentioned in my remarks without notice, they created a situation where potentially we will leave here on the last day without both Chambers having acted on the same Resolution. That's why I am suggesting that we vote 'yes' to reject the report so there's no question that the House is of record as against the pay increase. In the case of the House, we're gonna do it twice."

Black: "Well, we... we usually have to carry more than our share of the load. I know you agree with that. Mr... Will the Sponsor yield for some additional questions?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

"Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, in light of the Supreme Court decision, to me there seems to be some confusion as to whether a cost of living emolument is in fact a salary increase or a cost of living increment. And I filed today House Bill 7306, which we may get to in Veto and we may not, that just simply goes back to our original Compensation Review Board language and says there will be no cost of living increments suggested by the Compensation Review Board, period. They will either say it's a base salary increase or no base salary increase. It would seem to me that we're headed down a path where someone who was interested in the legislative branch as a coequal of the three branches could file a lawsuit and say that, in fact, we were diminishing... our salary was being diminished during our term of office. Because the Governor, if I recall, said he would veto any attempt to raise our pay through cost of living or any other means. Are we getting into some sticky legal questions here about whether a cost of living increment is, in fact, a salary increase... I don't ... that wasn't the way I interpreted it when we got into this language some time ago. Let me defer to your legal expertise. Do you think by doing what we're doing today, is there going to be some challenge to this action? you anticipate a legal challenge to this action?"

Madigan: "First of all, if you're deferring to my legal expertise, you may be in trouble."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Black: "I... I've checked your record and you got above a 'C' in Constitutional Law. In fact, you were here when we wrote the Constitution. No. No. Don't laugh, it was in 1970."

Madigan: "There's no need to take us into ancient history."

Black: "The 1970 Constitution, not the 1870."

Madigan: "I think your question is, do I anticipate that our action today may precipitate an action in the courts. And let me be of record, that is not my intent by taking this action. My intent is as stated, to make sure that we're very clear that we don't want the pay raise. That's my intent."

Black: "I appreciate that. In following up on that, all of the budget documents that I have looked at all year, there was never any money in the '04 budget to pay a cost of living increase, so I don't know how you can get a retroactive cost of living anyway. There's no money in the budget to do it, and I'm not certain that we have the ability to reject an FY05 cost of living for the incoming General Assembly that wouldn't be seated until January. In fact, wouldn't the '05 cost of living not go into effect until January 1 of 2005?"

Madigan: "I'm really not in a position to answer that question."

Black: "Okay I... I think this is so... getting to be so confusing, that's why I filed the legislation. And I... I agree with you, I think we need to go on the record. And for those of you who are perhaps less than enamored of the Speaker's Motion and my previous HJR 75, if you'll look at all the

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

budget documents, there's no money in there to grant any cost of living emolument to us anyway. And as I believe, the Governor, as he is so often wont to do, before he read the report said he would veto it anyway. So, I think it's kind of an exercise in futility. I thank the a... thank the Gentleman for his patience and I intend to vote 'aye' for the Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Turner: "The Speaker indicates he will."

McCarthy: "The paragraph 1 of the Senate Joint Resolution talks about 2002 and 2003. Did the Compensation Review Board mandate an increase for July 1 of 2004? Was there a COLA in that Compensation Review Board as well?"

Madigan: "Could you restate your question?"

McCarthy: "My question is, did the Compensation Review Board authorize a COLA increase for July 1 of 2004? Meaning the next fiscal year, in their review board."

Madigan: "The next fiscal year is '05."

McCarthy: "'05. Well, July 1, 2004, 'cause it references '02 and '03. July 1 of '02 and July 1 of '03 in the second paragraph of the Resolution. But we were talking about the Compensation Review Board for the upcoming year, which I

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

would think was July 1, 2004. So are we saying that there was a COLA also that was determined for the next year?"

Madigan: "They didn't speak to that."

McCarthy: "So they only speak in the past? These are so... when they come through at this they... they say that..."

Madigan: "Yes."

McCarthy: "...it was only... so they made no decision about what was due for... or what was reasonable for the following year?"

Madigan: "Yeah. That answer's 'yes'."

McCarthy: "The answer is 'yes'?"

Madigan: "Yeah. The answer's is 'yes'."

McCarthy: "So my question is, could this Senate Joint Resolution be written in a way that we are refusing the COLA that was applicable two years ago and one year ago, but not refusing the COLA that is applicable for the upcoming year?"

Madigan: "The answer is 'no'."

McCarthy: "So, your intent is that if you vote 'yes' for this, you are absolutely saying that you do not deserve the raise, that we do not deserve the COLA, and that if you thought that the Members of the Legislature do deserve the raise and do deserve this COLA for their public service, then the proper vote would be 'no' in that case?"

Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy, I would... I would delete the use of the word 'deserve' and I would simply say, as I said on my earlier remarks, that my intent is to make sure that the House is crystal clear, we don't want the raise."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- McCarthy: "Okay, but if you're a person who believes it is deserved, then the proper vote would be 'no'."
- Madigan: "Well, you... you can come to your own judgment, you usually do, you usually reach your own judgment."
- McCarthy: "Thank you. Sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. But... okay, so if you're a person that believes that the... the COLA is long overdue, after refusing it the last couple years, I believe that just as in House Joint Resolution 75 the right vote was 'no', I would also encourage a 'no' vote on this Joint Resolution."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you. Will the Speaker yield? I assume you will.

 Just one quick question. Did President Jones indicate to
 you at all why he didn't just take a vote on our
 Resolution?"
- Madigan: "Well, the answer is 'no', and I will reference you back to my earlier remarks. There was no notice that this was to be considered in the Senate."
- Lang: "And you don't.... do you have any inkling as to why he wouldn't have just taken a straightforward Resolution and voted on it?"

Madigan: "No, I do not know."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias, for what reason do you rise?"

Mathias: "Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Mathias: "I'm... I also was not a Constitutional expert and... but I did read, and I'm sorry I didn't bring it with me, the Compensation Review Board proposal... or their recommendation, I should say. Generally, a Compensation Review Board, generally, does the proposal for the following year. In other words, it can't go back... or I shouldn't say it can't go back, but it's to determine what our salary will be for the year starting July 1 of the following year after the report comes out. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is 'yes'."

Mathias: "So, in effect, it recommended that we get a COLA, starting July 1 of 2000... As I was saying, it doesn't... the COLA... in other words, did it make a recommendation for a COLA increase starting July 1 of 2004?"

Madigan: "The answer is 'no'."

Mathias: "Okay. Then, obviously, we wouldn't be voting for any increase in salary or COLAs by supporting this. If we vote for... again, I think what Representative McCarthy was getting at is when by voting on this we are not saying okay, we're... we're rejecting some COLAs or some increases, but accepting future increase in our salary or COLA."

Madigan: "You're correct in your statement."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Dunkin: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Well, he's not the Sponsor, but he's answering the questions."

Dunkin: "Excuse me. Ya know, I'm... I'm just a little confused still. I, too, did not attend law school and I'm somewhat perplexed with what we're actually doing here. Because it says here, according to this analysis, that we are rejecting the report... we're disapproving of the Board's report in whole, then we're reducing it in whole proportionally. I... I'm trying to figure out if the glass is half full or half empty and sort of what's the real common speak towards this here."

Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin, my view would be that all of us, all of us in the Legislature would have been better served if the Senate had taken up the House Resolution. But they didn't, they sent this Resolution. And I'm simply saying that an important thing to understand is that if either chamber does not reject, then there will be a salary increase. And I'm sure that a strong majority here in the House wants to be of record that we are not for the salary increase. And therefore, out of a concern for... in an exercise of caution, I'm suggesting that the House take action two times, not just once. But, we would've all been better served if the Senate had simply taken up the House Resolution."

Dunkin: "If... if they duplicate what we're doing."

Madigan: "Had they just taken our Resolution. We adopted our Resolution a few weeks ago."

Dunkin: "Right."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Madigan: "They were in a position to take that... take action on that Resolution. They chose to do it a little differently, put us into a position where I think we should act twice so there's no confusion, no question that we are against the salary increase."

Dunkin: "Now, is... is there a Constitutional timeline or restriction that we're dealing with here, within this...?"

Madigan: "Well, there's a legal requirement in the statute that requires that action be taken today. Today is the last day. Had we gone beyond today, without both chambers taking action, the salary increase would have gone through. So, had we not acted on the Senate Resolution, you know, had we adjourned and gone home and not acted on this Senate Resolution, the pay increase would have went into effect."

Dunkin: "And we should be against the pay increase?"

Madigan: "Well, I... I think a strong majority here would say they're against the salary increase."

Dunkin: "Oh, really? Well..."

Madigan: "I... we'll find out, we're gonna take a vote."

Dunkin: "Okay. Well, in... let me say this here, I... ya know, I'm a new kid... ya know, I'm a new person here. But my mother always told me, 'Boy, if you can get yourself a pay raise and it doesn't hurt anybody, get yourself a pay raise.' I mean, we travel the furthest, the budget that we deal with is the biggest, the lowest paid on the totem pole, I don't think we should feel less than just because we're politicians or we're state elected officials 'cause we wanna accept a simple cost of living adjustment. Some of

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

us do this, actually, full time. I don't think it's a bad thing, ya know, to modify yourself or adjust yourself slightly, especially if another board that's independent of us is recommending it. Now, maybe that's not politically correct or expedient for some of us who are running in elections, but I think that if we take ourselves seriously and our jobs seriously, a simple cost of living adjustment should be in order. Now, if... if some of us who are, ya know, way high above the food chain of what we're talking about here in terms of accepting a slight adjustment, is there a possibility maybe that we can donate the cost of living adjustment to our favorite charity or somewhere else, or not accept it? I'd be willing to vote for that. But I think, you know, there are a number of hardworking Legislators here in this chamber, from my short experience here, and I don't think that that is politically not correct. So, I'm gonna encourage a 'no' vote for this legislation as well."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from McHenry, Representative Kurtz, for what reason do you rise?"

Kurtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. Yes, indeed, it does hurt people if we do vote a 'no' because that takes money from the working poor, the frail, elderly, the disabled, all of the people that work to keep this government going that aren't in the legislative positions. Vote 'aye'."

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions... no...

Representative Giles, the Gentleman from Cook, for what reason do you rise?"

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know I just felt compelled to say this. You know, we play so many games in this chamber. Members that want to vote against this, that want to vote for this Resolution, if... if the pay raise or the cost of living increase were... were to go into effect, would you say in your heart that you would not take it? And so, you know, we play so many games down here. And... and so, you know, the truth to be said that this is all a political ploy. I mean, ya know, this is about is this gonna go on the newsletter, somebody's newsletter, something out in somebody's district. That's what this is about. And so, you know, I think every decent human being deserves a cost of living increase. I mean, it's just... fair is just fair. You know, I don't ... I don't know how much... I don't know how much this Bill costs. should... should say how much this Bill costs. I'm sure it doesn't cost as much as wanting to build a super-max prison. I'm sure of that. I... I know you don't want me to go there, but I can go there. So, you know, if... if every Member... just as we have the scholarship waivers, if every Member that votes 'yes' on this legislation and if this were to pass that they would honestly in their heart turn this down."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McKeon, for what reason do you rise?"

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- McKeon: "To the Resolution, Speaker. I... in reaction to one of the previous Speakers, I've been here a long time, but I do know at least half of the time I've been here we've been trying to get a cost of living increase of 2 percent for some of the lowest paid, vulnerable workers in... in this state. And we have not been able to produce a simple 2 percent cost of living or cost of doing business increase. I think it is absolutely reprehensible for us to even consider accepting a cost of living increase when we can't give it to those people that serve the needlest clients in our districts. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Resolution and let's get on with this... the business of running this state responsibly. Vote... take off bold."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll keep my remarks very brief. I just want to thank Representative Gordon for doing an outstanding job of explaining her Resolution. And I don't know who... I don't know who her young staffer is over there in the... in the blazer, but he did a pretty good job, too."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 85. All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? With that, the Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having...

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're prepared to adjourn for today. The plan is to adjourn upon the adoption of a Resolution memorializing the passing of former President Ronald Reagan. Before we go to that Resolution, I simply would like to thank the Members for coming here today. I'd like to thank the Leaders, Representative Cross, Senator Watson, Senator Jones for responding to my suggestion that we come down here today to consider the request from the Governor for borrowing authority in order to facilitate the payment of Medicaid bills and to gain \$25 million for the General Revenue Fund that would not have been available without the action that we have taken today. In addition, I think that it's appropriate, given our status in an overtime Session, that we are in the process of responding to a request from Representative Cross and Senator Watson that we move a Bill that would put President Bush on the ballot for purposes of the November election as a clean Bill without any other items in that Bill. The Bill was reported out of committee today, was read for a second time. It'll be read on Third Reading the next day that we are back here in Session. You all know that we are in overtime Session. You know that this has become very contentious. Negotiations have become very difficult and I think it is very helpful for the overall process that we all came to Springfield today and

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

passed these two pieces... moved these two pieces of legislation. It's more symbolic than anything else because it symbolizes that if reasonable people come together, we'll be able to solve the budget in past that we find ourselves in and we can move on to other matters which need consideration by the General Assembly. So, again, thank you for coming down here, we'll do the Reagan Resolution and then you can get back on the highway and go home. Thank you very, very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

Bost: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Bost: "My point would be that I would only hope that as these issues that we have came and dealt with today, that we do not ignore the medical malpractice issue that is in this state at this time. The problems that we're dealing with... and I'm getting calls on a regular basis from my local hospitals on the amount of people that are having to be transported out of this state to have care to which might save their lives. And I'm wondering at what point do we finally start moving those pieces of legislation which are out there to try to cure this problem. Will we come back in for a special day? I hope that each of you, I know I am, will encourage the leaders to... from the Democrat side of aisle, on both the House and the Senate, to come to some sort of Resolution, work with us on our side of aisle to achieve some sort of balance so that we can keep our docs,

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

we can keep our people safe. And... and I know that people at this late in the day are probably getting tired of hearing this, but probably not near as tired as those families that are in danger in my area of everyday wondering if their doctor's gonna be there tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Turner: "On House Supplemental Calendar #2, we have SJR 87. Representative Cross and Representative Jerry Mitchell. Death Resolution, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Gentleman from Lee... Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate... Senate Joint Resolution #87.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois General Assembly were deeply saddened to learn of the death of President Ronald Reagan on June 5, 2004; and
 - WHEREAS, Ronald Reagan was born on February 6, 1911, in Tampico, Illinois, the first American President born in Illinois; as a youth, he worked as a lifeguard at Lowell Park in Dixon, Illinois, and he graduated from Eureka College, located in Eureka, Illinois; and
 - WHEREAS, Ronald Reagan was a man of humble beginnings, working as a radio announcer, entertainer, union leader, and corporate spokesman; and
 - WHEREAS, His marriage to actress Jayne Wyman gave him three children: Maureen, an adopted son Michael, and Christine, who was born four months premature and died the day after her birth; and

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- WHEREAS, Ronald Reagan later married Nancy Davis on March 4, 1952, his steadfast partner for the next 52 years, who served her country with distinction as First Lady, who would later make public appearances on behalf of her ailing husband, and who became the primary caregiver for the aging President; together, Ronald and Nancy had two children, Patti and Ronald; and
- WHEREAS, Ronald Reagan was elected to two terms as Governor of California, bringing conservative politics to the forefront in California, taking office with a sizeable state budget deficit, reducing taxes, and leaving the Governor's Office eight years later with a modest financial surplus for California; and
- WHEREAS, After two previous unsuccessful bids for the Republican nomination, on November 4, 1980, Ronald Reagan was elected President of the United States of America; on January 20, 1981, at the age of 69, Ronald Reagan was sworn in as the country's 40th president, to quickly become known to the world as the "Great Communicator"; and
- WHEREAS, President Reagan worked to restore the founding principles of this country by upholding individual responsibility and personal liberty; his actions and words sent a strong message, both domestically and globally, that the United States remained vigilant and that he, as President, would use the country's strengths to the advantage of the American people; and
- WHEREAS, By rebuilding the U.S. military, the country regained a formidable position from which America could better fight

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

the Cold War, standing against the Soviet Union, and ultimately, bringing down the Iron Curtain once and for all; his foreign policies further helped to bring about the collapse of the Berlin Wall without bloodshed or loss of life, offering the German people the support and fortitude of the American principle of freedom; and

- WHEREAS, Many at the time were critical of "Reaganomics" and its overall effect on the country's economy; today many historians and economists believe that the principles and doctrines worked to restart the California economy and worked to revive a Nation and its financial structure; and
- WHEREAS, The social reforms proposed by President Reagan were similarly criticized; when he first proposed that welfare recipients should be required to work, he was rebuked as being cruel and unjust, but today to do otherwise would jeopardize the welfare recipients' dignity; and
- WHEREAS, After eight years in the Oval Office, in January 1989, President Reagan returned to his California ranch, and on November 4, 1991, the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in Simi Valley, California was dedicated; and
- WHEREAS, On November 5, 1994, President Reagan disclosed that he had been diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease, continuing to show courage and fortitude by publicly facing the debilitating disease of age; and
- WHEREAS, On October 11, 2001, President Reagan became the longest-lived president ever, besting the nation's second President, John Adams, who had lived 91 years; and

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

- WHEREAS, On July 12, 2003, the United States Navy commissioned its newest aircraft carrier, the "USS Ronald Reagan", the first carrier to be named for a living president; and
- WHEREAS, On June 5, 2004, the world was told its faithful servant, President Ronald Reagan, had passed away at his home in California; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we mourn the loss of President Ronald Reagan, while we honor and celebrate his dedication and service to the People of the United States of America and the world at large; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, to the Ronald Reagan Museum at Eureka College, and to the family of President Reagan."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am very proud and very humble to even be able to speak on a matter as important to this to America. Ronald Reagan was a great man. Whether you agreed or disagreed with his policies, you had to agree that he had a passion for America. And he made Americans believe again in themselves and in their country. He wanted nothing more than to leave an America stronger and prouder then it was when he took office. He'll always hold a special place in my heart 'cause we shared several parallels. Both grew up

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

in small towns, we're both baptized in Christian churches, and we both graduated from Eureka College. In fact, played 4 years of football for the same football coach, Ralph McKenzie. We both wound up running for office and serving people. I had several opportunities to meet Ronald W. Reagan, both at Eureka College and at Dickson High School. The charisma that the man has is awesome. Dutch Reagan was a very, very humble man, at the same time a very proud man. If you have the opportunity to go to Tampico, Illinois and see his birthplace and meet the folks there, they will tell you how proud they are that their favorite son did as well as he did. If you have an opportunity to go to Dixon and go through the boyhood home and visit the petunia festival and hear the people speak so highly of the Gentleman from Illinois that made it. Everyone in that part of the state is extremely proud of Ronald Reagan. He was a man of the people. He was a man that when he spoke you felt like he was speaking directly to and you can't help but be in awe of his greatness. We'll never forget those famous words during the Cold War, 'Mr. Gorbtraf... trof (sic-Gorbatrof), tear down this wall.' And it was down. He ended the Cold War. He started an economy that we enjoyed for 10 to 12 years before we've now had to fight through another recession. The things that he stood for are important to every man, woman, and child because he believed strongly in freedom, freedom for each and every American, and not only Americans, but everyone in this world. Mr. Speaker, I'm very, very proud to have the opportunity to speak of Dutch

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Reagan. My condolences go to his family, and give a limitude just one little thought to his daughter Maureen, who did so much to bring us all to a new awareness of Alzheimer's Disease and what this quiet thief of our memories can do. None of us are immune and the fight goes on to find a cure. God bless you, Ronald Reagan. Rest in peace. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that all Members of this chamber be added to this Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill for what reason do you rise?"

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I was very fortunate to have the great opportunity to attend the 1980 Republican Convention, which was Ronald Reagan's first, and to go to the Inaugural Ceremonies after he was elected, and also to go to the 1984 Convention and the Inauguration following that. And throughout the course of the time that President Reagan was in office there were numerous occasions were I was in his company, including one time where I actually had the opportunity to have lunch with him in the White House. I think there were about 15 of us in the room in... in the Cabinet Room right off the Oval Office. And it's an experience, if you... if you can well imagine, it just sends tingles up and down your spine to be in the White House with the President of the United States. And the times that I was with Ronald Reagan it was amazing that when he was in front of you and he shook your hand and talked to you, it was like you were the only person on the face of the earth. And he wasn't, as so many

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

of us are... people maybe look and you say 'hi' to somebody, but your looking at the next person coming down the line or you're trying to think about what you're gonna say for speech or what you're gonna do during the dinner or what you're gonna do at some point later in your schedule. was like he was 100 percent focused on you and he just wanted to know about you. And he had probably the softest hands I could ever remember of any individual of all the thousands of hands I've shaken. And I'm sure, of course, that being President of the United States that was, you know, he had manicures and people that could take care of But he was just such a presence when you were with him. The... I've never experienced that with any other person in my lifetime, the way he was. And I think that what he did in his Presidency was because of his heartfelt beliefs. He was not a person that was about to change. He knew what he believed and that's what he was gonna be. he was very much at ... at comfort and ease with what he was and who he was. And I think that, you know, historians, when they try to judge Presidencies, they look at Presidencies in terms of whether or not a person was the President during time a change, whether there were great wars or great eve... social events that created change. And I think that historians are gonna treat Ronald Reagan very well, pro... perhaps a lot better than any of us ever expected because of the fact that he shepherded a massive change in world politics at a time when many of us grew up during the Cold War never anticipated that life would be

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

any different. And yet he saw a different path and he went down that path and the Berlin Wall did come down and the Old Soviet Union did split apart and life has changed for all of us. Maybe for the better, maybe for the worse, maybe we have different problems today than we did then. But, when you experience 40 years of the Cold War it sure was refreshing to all the sudden have the wall fall. I think historians will say that Ronald Reagan was a great President. And I know that in the years that... in his decline in having Alzheimer's that he grew further and further from us, that we didn't have the opportunity to hear his words of wisdom or to see him at conventions. And I... I know that for those of us who kind of grew up politically in the years of Ronald Reagan, we're going to miss him very much. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you rise?"

Moffitt: "Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I certainly want to second the eloquent comments that have been made by the prior speakers. We hear President Reagan's connection to Tavico (sic-Tampico) and to Dixon. There's another connection in Illinois that sometimes gets overlooked. Actually, it's a double connection to the Reagan family, and that's Galesburg, Illinois. Ronald Reagan started first grade in Galesburg and attended second grade and then moved to Monmouth. Nancy's grandparents lived in Galesburg and she spent a lot of time in Galesburg in the summers in her younger years, growing up visiting

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

her grandparents. So, it's an added connection and probably a connection to a Presidential family that people in Galesburg, perhaps, will never have again. The human touch that he brought to the Presidency when he came to Galesburg campaigning in 1980, I had my little daughter with me out at the airport, I think she was in first grade at the time, kindergarten or first grade, and he's coming along the fence shaking hands. And I had her up on my shoulder and steadying her with... with one arm and reached over the chain lank fence to shake hands with the other, he shook my hand and went on by. He got two or three people, four people on down and he got a glimpse out of the corner of his eye of... of my daughter sitting up on my shoulder. And he said... said, 'I missed a young lady back here, I want to go back and shake hands with her.' And he came back and shook hands with my daughter. She remembers it to this day and, of course, she's been telling that story in her community of her relationship with Reagan. But it's just the kind of the person he was. He... he con... was concerned about everybody, and he... he saw a little girl who... who wanted the opportunity to shake hands and he came back to do just that. He did instill confidence and made us believe in ourselves. And frequently he'd say about America, the best is yet to come. And that's what we always hope it is. In closing, there was a quote that Reagan... President Reagan would frequently use. And I think it sums up his life. And it says as follows, 'And whatever else is said about me when I'm gone, I hope it will show

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

that I appealed to your greatest hopes, not your worst fears, to your confidence, not to your doubts.' Mr. President, that's exactly what you did. We thank you for that. God bless you, President Reagan."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner, for what reason do you rise?"

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I would reiterate all the comments that... the eloquent comments that everybody has made. But every once in a while we don't know the connections that we have with people. And I saw something in the Sun-Times that chronicled Ronald Reagan's life that sort of tickled me the other day. And that was... I was aware that my mother-in-law, Violet Linder, who is now 94 years old, attended Eureka College with President Reagan. And at one time her father, my grandfather-in-law, was president of that college. And when the Sun-Times chronicled his life and talked about the various things that he had done, they talked about him in college leading a protest. And... leading a protest protesting the teachers' salaries were not enough and then it said, 'And the President Burt Wilson quit after that.' So, Ronald Reagan made my grandfather-in-law quit the presidency of Eureka College. But I'm sure that he had good intentions in mind."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mitchell moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 87 and requests that all Members be added to the Resolution. With that, all in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. Opinion of the

142nd Legislative Day

6/9/2004

Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Currie now moves... now moves that the House stands adjourn until the call of the Chair and the House will convene in Perfunctory Session on Friday, June 11, at 12 noon. So, the House stands adjourned until the call of the Chair and that the House will convene in Perfunctory Session on Friday, June 11, at 12 noon. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. Opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned."