69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests to turn off their laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers and we ask our guests in the gallery to please rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Paul Cox of the Elm Street Christian Church in Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Cox is the guest of Representative Poe."

Pastor Cox: "I'm thankful to be here today and I want you to know that the prayer that I offer is just one of many. There are people all over this state who daily pray for you and are thankful for your labors. Shall we pray. Heavenly Father, we thank You for this day. We thank You for the freedoms we enjoy as a nation. We thank You for the freedom we enjoy as a state. And we pray, Father, that You would continue to bless us and these individuals, Father, who serve this state, who represent the people. We pray Your grace upon them, Your mercies upon them and we pray, Father, that they might stand for the things that they know are right. We know there are differences here, but differences often compliment. We know, Father, that in marriage there has to be differences for it to work right and we pray that today they might work as a good marriage. We just pray, Father, in all things that You might be glorified because these individuals might seek Your strength. And we just pray, Father, that all might be done correctly as they serve and work for the good of the people. Watch over all of us and bless us, for this is my prayer in Jesus' name. Amen."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Reitz."
- Reitz et al: "We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of American 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 Representatives Bailey and Jones are excused today. Go Sox."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present."
- 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 Mahoney: "The following Resolutions are referred to the House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 686, offered by Representative Feigenholtz. House Resolution 688, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 689, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 696, offered by Representative Sacia. And House Resolution 699, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flider."

Representative Flider: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Representative Flider: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to call your attention to a couple of people up on the right side of the chamber in the balcony. I have with me here today as our guests, Mike McWilliams. He's a second grade student at Arthur Grade School and he is here in Springfield today with his grandfather, Mac McWilliams, and he's... Mike is here because he's getting some treatments for his sore leg. So, if you'd please welcome Mike McWilliams and his grandfather. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 2 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 2108. Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 200... 2108 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang on Amendment #1."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a cleanup Bill which is agreed by all sides. We passed the Bill earlier this year that deals with the payment of prevailing wage. This Bill just cleans it up and allows contractors to not have to report start times and end times of their employees during the day, they still have to report the hours. And I would move pass... adoption of the Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Parke: "Representative, this is the Amendment that was presented in Labor yesterday?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "And you had stated that everybody had signed off so the business community is okay with your Amendment. This is something agreed."

Lang: "Yes, it was their... I'm sorry to interrupt. It was their proposal, Sir, and the language was agreed."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further questions? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment by adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2108, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment became the Bill.

I would ask your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a... extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 2928. The Chair

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- recognizes Representative Lindner. Lindner. Lindner. 2928."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2928 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lindner, has been approved for consideration."
- Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a land transfer, a land conveyance in my district of a parcel of property that's being sold at fair market value. It was DNR property. They cannot use it anymore and we have... the appraisals have been... three certified appraisals have been presented."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Black: "Representative, I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. The appraisals have been attached and are on file?"
- Lindner: "Yes, they are. Three certified appraisals."
- Black: "Who's transferring the land? Is it a public entity to a private entity?"
- Lindner: "Yes, it is. It's DN... DNR owns it now."
- Black: "And the... what is the appraised value?"
- Lindner: "The appraisals are not in the file but they have been filed."
- Black: "But it's... it's..."
- Lindner: "They are on file and I don't know what the appraised value is."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Black: "The Clerk has it on file?"

Lindner: "Yes, it is."

Black: "All right, thank you."

Lindner: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting... by saying 'yes'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2928, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lindner. On Third Reading."

Representative Lindner on Third Reading."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, the appraisals are on file. It is a transfer that have been agreed to by all parties and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Washington voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1681. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1681 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. When we created resident... subcircuit judges in Lake and McHenry County a year and a half ago it was never the intention to add new judges in either county, yet there is some ambiguity in the legislation making some believe that in Lake County there will be three additional judges and in McHenry County two additional judges. I believe the legislative transcript makes clear that that was never the intent of the Bill and this measure today, Senate Bill 1681, clarifies that new judges were not intended. I would appreciate your support for this cleanup measure and I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "I believe that the legislation that was passed at the end of the Spring Session did not create new judges but it did create new circuits. It created the 22nd Circuit and it created the 19th Circuit. And in this empowering statutes it assigns the judges based on a population threshold. And

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

if we pass this Bill McHenry County would be the only circuit in the state that didn't have three full circuit judges. Is that correct, Leader?"

Currie: "I can check that. I don't have the map with me just at the moment, but it's on its way."

Tryon: "Okay. I believe that there's no other legitimate function that we... no better legitimate function than we can... that we have as a General Assembly than to fund our judicial system so we can have a fair and equitable judicial system. And in the end, the question comes, do they need additional judges? And when you look by splitting the circuits what has happened, Lake and McHenry County have become the circuits with the highest case filings and the highest adjudicated cases per judge in the state. And I think it's imperative that we keep this system equal, fair, and And certainly, if I didn't feel there was the equitable. need to add the additional judge, I would support you. But that need does exist. And I can't support that."

Currie: "Well, I would just make the point that there are population figures that would encourage the addition of judges. This measure is intended to clarify that it was not the intent of this Assembly to add new spots, regardless of population in these two new circuits. So again, if you want to introduce a Bill that expands the number of judges... I don't think I've met anybody from any county that doesn't think more judges could be justified, but I think the important point here is that we don't wanna undo a process that was, itself, legitimate a year and a half ago. So, again, I would urge your support for this cleanup measure."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

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

Currie: "So, I have the answer... I have the answer to your question."

Tryon: "Okay."

Currie: "And it seems to say that you'll have six circuits judges, four in sub circuits. Two... two at large, right."

Tryon: "Okay. But Leader, this would in fact though put McHenry County in the position of having the least amount of full circuit judges of any circuit in this state, correct?"

Currie: "I don't think that's accurate. I think that you're wrong but I will..."

Tryon: "Well, the legis..."

Currie: "I thought I had the whole list of circuits and I'll try to get that for you."

The legislation as it stands now would only Tryon: "Okay. provide for two full circuit judges in McHenry County, and in every circuit in the state there's at least three full circuit judges. And I'd like to speak to the Bill. believe that this is special legislation that affects Lake and McHenry County differently and unequally compared to other circuits in the state. I believe the problem that we have is the State Board of Elections has already certified those positions to be positions for the next election cycle. And the question that I have ultimately is can the General Assembly undo an election cycle in the middle of an election cycle? Does the election cycle begin when the judges positions are certified by the State Board of Elections? Does the election cycle begin when the judges file? But I don't believe that it's an inherent need for the State of

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Illinois General Assembly to undo an election cycle in the middle of an election cycle and I feel that the state has to keep the judicial system equal, equitable, and fair, and this legislation will not do that. So, I cannot support it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hultgren."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Hultgren: "I just have a question again on why this wasn't addressed in the initial legislation?"

Currie: "The answer is that it was a drafting error and it isn't that it wasn't addressed, it's just that there is ambiguity in the statute. The drafting was not as elegant as it ought to have been, but the intent is clear. There was never an intention to add new judgeships."

Hultgren: "Another question. If you specifically reduced a judgeship from Will County, why didn't you also reduce judgeships in Lake and McHenry County?"

Currie: "You are accurate and I don't remember the reason for that change."

Hultgren: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm really glad this Bill... this change is taking place today. I'm gonna be voting 'no'. I disagree with what this legislation is doing and it reminds again... I think this was something else, an issue that we addressed in Veto Session, if you remember. It was a very rushed piece of legislation that was pushed through. We didn't have hearings in the districts to be able to look at the legislation. Sounds very reminiscence of maybe of something that's gonna happen a little bit later

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

today. But I think, again, this is a reminder that our job is to go through things and work through things. Obviously, there was an attempt to try and clarify this. I don't think even the clarification has been done properly in this case, so I won't be supporting it. But I also want to say beyond this Bill that Veto Session is a bad time to push through big legislation, as was the case in the oversight on this legislation and also is the case maybe in other legislation that might come up in the future. So, I encourage all my colleagues to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Question of the Chair. Does this Bill have an immediate effective date?"

Speaker Madigan: "The answer is 'yes'."

Churchill: "So, for... in order for this Bill to become law prior to the March 21 primary date, it would need 71 votes here today?"

Speaker Madigan: "If called and passed before January 1 of 2006."

Churchill: "So, it would require 71 votes today."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I would call your attention to the board. This Bill has nothing to do with court grandparent-aware training. Absolutely nothing to do. It has to do with a creature of the General Assembly in judicial subcircuits. And this is primarily... and I'm not...

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

I'm not casting any aspersions, it's primarily a creature of the Democrat Party. And it appears that the Democrats, in their haste last year to change an ad and manipulate and maneuver some judicial subcircuits, made a mistake that might... good heavens, there might be a Republican judge in one of these subcircuits. And so, now it's time to change the language. And as my colleagues who live in the area have already stated, it's the Republican subcircuit that seems to be taking the brunt of the corrective language at this point. And for that reason and the reason that it takes 71 votes to become immediately effective, I would urge my colleagues on my side of the aisle to vote 'no' or 'present' on this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Cleanup legislation, I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in fav... 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... have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 people voting 'yes', 54 people voting 'no'. The Bill is hereby declared lost. The Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Under Rule 60... 69(b), I have the right to have reconsideration of this measure and the opportunity to move it back to Second Reading for purposes of an effective date Amendment."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has asserted her rights under the rules and therefore the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1124. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1124 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1124, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hassert."

Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 1124, which passed out of the Senate unanimously, amends the Vehicle Code. Allows rental car agencies, when contracting with corporate business kinds, to impose additional charges, also known as pass-through charges, when negotiating their business contracts. I'll be happy to try to answer any questions."

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

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

Hassert: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Brosnahan: "Brent, I recall... I think we considered this legislation last spring, isn't that correct?"

Hassert: "Yes."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Brosnahan: "And I seem to recall when we were discussing this Bill in the spring there was some opposition to it. I think maybe Enterprise Car Rental, they were one of the opponents. And I just wanna make sure, it's my understanding that... that Enterprise and all the other car rental companies are... they're not in opposition to this Bill anymore. They're either neutral or they're in favor of this Bill, isn't that correct?"

Hassert: "Yes, Representative, either neutral or they're in favor."

Brosnahan: "And also, when this Bill came up in the spring, I believe the City of Chicago... I don't know if they were opposed to the Bill but they certainly had some concerns. I think when we discussed this Bill in the spring, I believe the City of Chicago is... they were in the middle of some lease agreements involving Midway Airport and the rental car companies and I know they had some concerns about this, but it's my understanding that lease has been completed and that the City of Chicago is now neutral on this legislation, so they're not opposed to the Bill either, correct?"

Hassert: "That's correct."

Brosnahan: "And the bottom line what this will do, this will increase the airport revenue for the City of Chicago, isn't that correct?"

Hassert: "That's correct."

Brosnahan: "All right. Thank you very much and I'll just ask everyone for support on this legislation. Thank you."

Hassert: "Thank you."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 77 people voting 'yes', 37 people voting 'no'.

 This Bill, having received an extraordinary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1208. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1208 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins. Biggins."
- Biggins: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, this is a Bill regarding land transfers for the City of Oakbrook Terrace... Village. Sorry, this... my penance... my thoughts of penance are wandering here. I better fix my microphone. Thank you. This Bill has amended now, it's for the Village of Oakbrook Terrace. And it's a minor correction to some language that needed correcting and it's been done and I would request an 'aye' vote. Be glad to answer any questions anybody has."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins... Mr. Biggins, despite your normal eloquence, my attention was distracted. So..."
- Biggins: "Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. There are things affecting us today that are beyond our control, sometimes

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

even beyond these walls. And I can understand how you might have other thoughts. But back to my important..."

Speaker Madigan: "If you could just tell us your Motion."

Biggins: "My Motion. I would move that we adopt the Bill... vote for... pass Senate Bill 1208."

Speaker Madigan: "So you move for the passage of the Bill."

Biggins: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, the Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, 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 78 people voting 'yes', 38 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Const... super Constitutional Majority, is hereby declare... Bill's declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears... for what purpose does Mr. Black seek recognition? Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Black: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, from time to time staff members leave, both Democrat and Republican staff. I've never figured out why, it has to be one of the best jobs that you could ever find in the State of Illinois. But we're about to lose one of our very good staffers and I'd like all the Republicans to wish her well. This is Beth Bears' last day with us. She will be going to London and studying for her graduate degree at the University of North London in England. She says if you're over there, look her up and her

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

dormitory room is a place where you can stay while she is working on her graduate degree. Beth, we wish you the very best and thank you for all your hard work."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

I would like to reference Representative Parke: "Thank you. Frankenholtz (sic-Feigenholtz). Where Representative? I can't see her. Where is she? Where is Representative... oh, there you are. Representative, last night you and I had an opportunity in the midst of the White Sox game to discuss what we thought would be a real great opportunity to root our Sox on. But somebody was a naysayer. Somebody said they knew the inside track of what was gonna happen to that game and that it was gonna come back to Chicago so that money could be made, but neither one of us agreed with that, right? And we made ... we made a little... we took a game of chance, did we not? And one of our colleagues, to his credit, has come over and shared with us our moment of glory. So maybe you can share with Representative Dunkin how it feels to lose a game of chance to us. And so, I just wanted to know if everything went well in your opinion on the White Sox game?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "I don't know if the Body can hear me, I have this thing on my microphone here. Mr. Parke, yeah, last night there was great fortune to be had for you and I because Mr. Dunkin just couldn't figure it out. He couldn't figure out

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

that last night when the White Sox won the World Series that actually it had been divined by a higher power that this is gonna happen. And by the way, I would like to, as the person who has Wrigley Field in their district, someone who's been a lifelong Cub fan, congratulate each and every one of the Sox fans, not only here but in the City of Chicago, for what happened last night. We are all very, very proud. A little in shock, but very, very proud. Slightly jealous, but very, very proud. And last night I was wondering what Andy MacPhall was doing up in the North Shore, probably shedding a few tears while having a cognac and thinking about how... how many times us Cub fans are going to have to say 'wait until next year.' But, I'd like to congratulate everyone nonetheless, and thank you for mentioning our good fortune."

Parke: "Perhaps Representative Dunkin might want..."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, one second, please. We have a Resolution to be considered today that's concerned with the World Champion Chicago White Sox. And Monique... Representative Monique Davis, had you planned to speak about our World Champions? How about you, Mr. Dunkin? Because we'll get to that on a Resolution later in the day. There will be a Resolution later in the day. It will be concerned with the World Champion White Sox. So, Representative Monique Davis. Davis."

Davis, M.: "This is not about the World Champion White Sox. This is about Representative Constance Howard's son who is in the Southwest..."

Speaker Madigan: "Please."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Davis, M.: "...Airline magazine because he is a captain..."

 Speaker Madigan: "Yes."
- Davis, M.: "...for... he's a captain, he was a... whatever they come before that, and he flies airplanes for Southwest. And I think it's such a wonderful thing to have one of our Member's sons as a captain of the airline who flies peoples... people thousands of miles. He has five children, he's married, and he lives in California. And I'm just proud to say that I know Constance Howard and her husband, Phillip."
- Speaker Madigan: "Now Mr. Dunkin, did you wish to talk about something other than the World Champion Chicago White Sox?"
- Dunkin: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and my wonderful colleagues, who along with myself are simply... just simply elated that the Chicago... the World Champion Chicago White Sox actually won the series. I'm very proud to have a decent portion of the Sox field and the parking lot in my district. I simply was under the impression that they wanted us to win it in Chicago. We all wanted it to be in Chicago. I think that many of the great Chicago fans wanted to see them win it over there on 35th in my district. And I'm just so elated that they won the championship. So, I, too, share everyone's joy this afternoon. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you for your cooperation, Mr. Dunkin.

 On page 2 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1920.

 Mr. John Bradley. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1920 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments.

 All notes have been received."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

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

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the General Assembly, this is a Bill to eliminate riverboat gambling in the State of Illinois. This is not a stunt, this is not a publicity attempt, and this is not a gimmick. This is about the future of the State of Illinois and the public policy of the people of the State of Illinois. We all know the story of Adam and Eve in the Bible, how Adam and Eve were tempted with the forbidden fruit. In the mid-1990s, the riverboat industry came to Illinois and tempted the people of the State of Illinois and the General Assembly with forbidden fruit of riverboat gambling, promising us that it would save our state, that it would save our economy, that it would rebuild our communities. And that just hasn't happened. Riverboat gambling has been bad for Illinois. has been a drain on our economies and it should be eliminated. Let me address this in three points. Myth #1: riverboat gambling is good for the economy. Riverboat gambling is a drain on the economy. Dr. Earl Grinols and Dr. John Kindt, the leading economists on the issue of gambling in the United States and potentially the world, came and testified in committee, where this Bill got out on a vote of 8-1, and they indicated that riverboat gambling is bad for our economy. Remember, the State of Illinois does not get one dime, one nickel, one penny from gambling unless

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

someone goes to a riverboat and loses more than that one nickel, that one penny, and that one dollar. We only obtain revenue from losses. And the statistics show that... Thompson and Gazel report from 1996, the leading statistic on the issue shows that 85 percent of that money comes from Illinoisans. In order for the State of Illinois to receive the money that we receive off riverboat gambling, people from our society have to lose over a billion and a half dollars per year. That's a billion and a half dollars that could be going back in our local economies. billion and a half dollars that could be paying for local family-owned restaurants and businesses. But yet, that money goes to nonlocally-owned riverboats that send it out of the state. Economists will tell you that if you put a dollar in a local economy, it will go around that economy up to seven times. If we had that \$2 billion that's lost on Illinois riverboats each year back in the Illinois economy it would more than make up for whatever potential short-term loss we might think that we would have from this. Myth #2: riverboat gambling is good for schools and communities. Go tour the communities where riverboat gambling is. Go tour East St. Louis, see what it's done for that community. Unemployment has historically been higher in communities with riverboat gambling. The counties don't share in the riverboat gambling money. The communities surrounding the community that has riverboat gambling don't share in that money. The counties are broke. The majority of schools that are in counties and in communities that have riverboat gambling are on the financial aid watch list. Wasn't this

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

sold to the people of the State of Illinois as a way to fund education and rebuild our schools? Yet, our schools in these very communities are broke. How is that good public policy? How is that good for the State of Illinois? How is that good for our citizenry? It's killing us. If you introduce riverboat gambling to a community just to offset the social costs associated with riverboat gambling, you've got to create 13 thousand jobs in a community of a hundred thousand people. There aren't 13 thousand riverboat jobs in the State of Illinois. The average cost of pathological gambling per person, per year, is between 10 and 13 thousand dollars. Some statistics and studies show it might be as high as \$30 thousand. How is that good for our economy? Myth #3: gambling doesn't hurt people. Gambling hurts people. I don't wanna see anyone lose their jobs. provided a retraining and reeducation and entrepreneurial training aspect of this Bill to help people that are involved in this industry. But what we have forgotten over the last 15 to 20 years are all the lives and all the jobs and all the people that have been destroyed as a result of having this in our communities. The kids whose parents spent their birthday present money and their Christmas and Hanukkah money on going to riverboats. Suicide rates are higher. Divorce rates are higher. Crime rates are higher. Bankruptcy rates are higher. The personal accounts of tragedy associated with people... the pathological gamblers and gambling associated with this riverboats are too numerous to mention. Too numerous to mention. And yet, we continue to allow this to happen in the State of Illinois.

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

We have an opportunity now to right a wrong in this state. We have an opportunity to go back and fix something that we broke 20 years ago. Let's end this downward spiral. Let's eliminate this drain on society. Let's get our community and schools back on track. Let's cash in our chips. Quit gambling on the future and eliminate riverboat gambling."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beiser."

"Well, I don't... I don't pretend that I'm gonna be able Beiser: to follow that act with... with the eloquence that the Sponsor has. I have the utmost respect of the Sponsor. He's been a good friend of mine in my time here in the General Assembly and I... I expect that to continue. But I re... I respectfully and very strongly and very voicefully disagree with his proposal. It's interesting that he cited other communities like East St. Louis, which has benefited from this gambling boat Bill enacted back in February of 1990. I wish you would've visited Alton, Illinois, a home to me for all my life, a place where I was the city treasurer when this Bill was enacted in February of '90 and saw the benefits of the Bill to the community of the City of Alton. Let me remind everyone of the legislative intent as cited in the Act, 'This Act is intended to benefit the people of the State of Illinois by assisting in economic development and promoting Illinois tourism and by increasing the amount of revenue available to the state to assist and support education.' That has happened in Alton. That has happened in a very positive way. In Alton, Illinois, over 900 jobs have been created and are still in existence. These are not just jobs to fill the part-time sector without benefits. These are

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

full-time, good wage, benefit-paying jobs. These loss of 900 jobs would drastically reduce the city workforce. addition to those 900 jobs, we would lose policemen, we would lose firemen, we would lose public works employees, all because of this Bill. The original intent, like I said, was to revitalize the depressed areas like Alton. mile stretch of the City of Alton, the industrial quarter, on Broadway, in a 12-year period, over 5 thousand industrial jobs were lost. The intent was to... to take communities like this and revitalize them. We have revitalized. The City of Alton has reinvested. They have paid for two new firehouses with money that came from gambling, they have paid for one police station, they have completely revamped the heavy-duty public works machinery, all items that would not have been available in the existing indus... lack of industrial job environment. They have redeveloped the Alton Riverfront. With the help of the State of Illinois and with help from the Federal Government, that will be a majorist... major tourist attraction in the coming years. That is online, that is happening as we speak. They have established a \$5 million Operating Reserve Fund out of these gaming dollars. They have not spent that Reserve Fund money on anything other than being there in case we get into a situation like we did before with the loss of those industrial jobs. They have completely, completely overlaid... they have replaced the entire city street system. Now, the City of Alton has chosen to use this money properly. They have rewarded their citizens and the surrounding community, not just the city, with a positive effect by these dollars. And the tourism.

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Like I mentioned, the redeveloped riverfront. Over 1 million visitors come to the city a year because of this boat. And with this amphitheater and the entire redeveloped riverfront, that will only increase. Now, let me get to the... the arguments too that were made about the economics. The arguments that dollars spent on gaming will be spent elsewhere in the State of Illinois. The fact is that many visitors tour our casinos in the State of Illinois share a border with a bordering state that has casino gaming, also. These dollars will be spent elsewhere in other states. They won't stay in the State of Illinois. The dollars spent on our riverboat gaming facilities in Illinois come back to our communities, like we've already mentioned. It comes back to the State of Illinois. It goes to education. However, those discretionary dollars that are spent on places like the St. Louis Cardinals across the border, those go... those don't come back to Illinois. Those go to pay athletes, million-dollar owners, and the wage priced earners that are... the concessionaires... the low-income wage earners, they reap just a small benefit of those discretionary dollars. I say, let's don't take this away from the State of Illinois. Let's allow those discretionary dollars to stay in the State of Illinois. Another argument is socially, that this is harmful to society. Well, the fact is, whether you like it or not, this is a legitimate industry that is used responsibly by the overwhelming majority of the people that use this. If the intent is to keep abusers away or safe or to keep them from hurting themselves, well then why don't you go after the credit card

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

companies? Those companies that just let you ring up one after another credit card to the max. If we're gonna really be socially responsible, let's do that. Or do we want to go to the tobacco industry and say that tobacco is hurting us? Let's get rid of tobacco in the State of Illinois. get rid of alcohol. If you're gonna go that way, let's get rid of all these bad things. We have local group supports in the City of Alton and the surrounding communities. spoke with Pastor Sam White, a minister of the Church of Monroe Memorial Church of God in Christ. Spoke to him Monday morning before I left to come up here. wholeheartedly supports the keeping of riverboat gambling as it exists. The citing of the different sources that the Sponsor had, I respect. But I also would spim cite the National Gambling Impact Study Commission that was conducted in 1999. Lega... and I quote from that commission study, 'Legalized gambling has unquestionably had certain positive economic effects of the communities in which it has been introduced.' Hundreds of employees in several cities enthusiastically described to the commission the new and better jobs they obtained with the advent of casinos. described the homes and cars they've been able to purchase and the health and retirement benefits they had obtained by going to work for the casinos. And I would just cite, too, that they also said in these studies that it ... and this is in their quote from the report, 'Indeed, much of the previously existing research is flawed by insufficient data, poor or undeveloped mytholo... mythology, or researchers' bias. of the analy... analysis of the economic effects of gambling

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

is, in fact, poorly developed and incomplete. Almost all the studies have been conducted by interested parties.' So, although I believe that the citings that he made were in good faith, I also say there are citings on the other side of that. I also wanna suggest to you that also I have over 2 thousand signatures from the area, not just in the City of Alton, in the entire Metro East area, supporting the... the keeping of riverboat gambling. And in closing, I'd just like to say this, this Bill is bad. This Bill is bad for local investment. Penn National, which is in the process of buying the license from Argosy, in the last two days since this discussion has been happening in the State Capitol here, their stock has closed down over \$2.50. Two hundred and fifty million dollar in capital gone from that company. The in... this is the most unstable environment in this whole country for casino gaming, and it's now got worse. It's bad for the State of Illinois. We don't have a plan to replace those revenues. This is bad for education. It's bad for the teachers, it's bad for the students. It's bad for firemen, it's bad for policemen, it's bad for public work employees. It's bad for all the local vendors in Metro East that supply that gaming boat. And in closing, I, too, would like to say that if we're gonna send this message to all the employees and vendors of that casino gaming operation in the City of Alton and elsewhere in the State of Illinois... I just wanna cite one person I know very, very well and that is a good friend of mine, he's a double amputee. He works for the boat. He has a very good-paying job, health care benefits, finally, for his family. And now our message to

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

him is, hey, we'll give you job training to give you your ... to maybe, maybe, get your job back in the future. not a message I wanna send to Greg. That's not a message I wanna send to over 900 employees. That's not a message I wanna send to the citizens in the Metro East area that support that gaming operation. And finally, I speak from father his industrial experience. Mylost Owens-Illinois in 1990. This is what we try to help out and we have done that. I've had a family meder... member who has also seen problems with the gaming boat but, by her choice, she was able to get out of it. I see that she made a life choice but she also made the choice in the right way to get So, I say let's let responsible people be able to access riverboat gambling as they should have been... as they should... as they are right now and let's let that continue into the future. I respectfully asked my colleagues to vote 'no' for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. For the Members' edification, there are approximately 10 people who want to speak. I'm going to... although we didn't do it for the previous two speakers, we're going to implement the timer for each speaker. And according to the rules, you're entitled to 5 minutes. The next person to speak is the Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia. Representative LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. House Bill 1920 repeals Riverboat Gambling Act, authorizes the shutdown of all state riverboats. The legislation also requires DCEO to provide a grant to the local communities, community college

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

districts to provide job training for former employees of the riverboat gaming facilities. Proponents claim that casinos cause social burdens and are not a way to fund schools and they do not help our local economy. Proponents claim that riverboat gaming does not generate the funds it is supposed to. Proponents claim that communities that house riverboats have high unemployment rates and poor Some proponents of this legislation are not schools. against gaming but want existing boats to be closed and reopened in their districts, south suburban, City of Why is this Bill bad? Chicago. Eliminating riverboat gaming in Illinois will be economically devastating, devastating, to a state that has already finds itselves in annual deficit for our budget. Riverboat gaming facilities bring in tourism dollars and revenue to nine, economically deprived regions of this state and eliminate the funding that will cause these communities to sink even further into poverty. The riverboat gaming facilities are... let me put a face behind the locations. We have Alton, East Peoria, Casino Rock Island, Joliet Empress, Harrahs in Metropolis, Joliet Harrahs, Aurora Hollywood Casino, East St. Louis Casino Queen, and Elgin Grand Victoria. In 2004, the adjusted gross receipts totaled \$1.7 billion in... \$1.7 billion in the AGR. In 2004, total tax collection from Illinois riverboat gaming facilities totaled \$820 million with \$700.9 million going to the state and \$101.2 million going to local communities that would otherwise would get no funding. Aurora, which is located in my district, receives almost \$13 million. The loss, the loss, of that \$13 million

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

to the City of Aurora will be detrimental to myself... my city's programs, schools, and services we provide right now from local government that we otherwise would not get the This amount that the state stands to lose funding from. will even be more devastating. Where do the proponents of the legislation suggest we make up the loss of revenue? Where are we going to make up the loss of the revenue that comes from these boats? Proponents claim that communities that house riverboats have high unemployment rates and poor Removing this much money will only add to unemployment problems and already hurt our struggling schools in 131, 129. Roughly 800... 8,500 employees will lose their jobs if this legislation is passed. This Bill calls for these employees to receive job training so they can find new jobs. Where are they gonna find new jobs when we already are low on our unemployment rates? What will these employees be trained to do in their community? Illinois finds itself in the red every year and this will only add to the problem. I'm not endorsing gaming or gambling, I am a Member of the General... I wasn't a Member of the General Assembly when this... this legislation was created, but the intent was to help economically deprived areas and this is what we've been doing. Whether we want casinos to help fund school or whether we want casinos to bring in dollars needed to build our sidewalks, improve our roads, maintain our sewers, and provide clean drinking water is not The question is, do we want to eliminate a question. legitimate business and guaranteed revenue streams simply because some people in this state object to its moral

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

foundations? The fact remains that casinos do not provide a reliable sources... the fact remains that casinos do provide a reliable source of revenue and eliminating these revenue stream will be detrimental to each of these nine prospective communities and the state as a whole. But isn't gaming immoral? Let's go through that issue a little bit. personally don't endorse gaming, but I believe that the social ramifications of gambling within the community are not for the law... lawmakers outside of their communities to decide. The fact remains that patrons of all riverboat gambling facilities must be 21 when they enter the facility, and as an adult they should have the right to make up their own minds about the morality of gaming or gambling. state already requires casinos to donate funds to gaming addiction services and it requires that the industry... the industry has embraced over the years. The state also created a self-exclusion program for problems... problem gamer... gamblers in 2002 that allowed compulsive gamblers to regain control of their lives but allowed it agreed..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Chapa LaVia: "That'd be good. Residents... they could join this group voluntarily, but then in 2004 there were 2,038 people were enrolled. Although lawmakers are always looking out for the best interests of their constituents, we cannot be their conscience, their parents, their moral compass, or their clergymen or women. Residents should have the right to make up their own minds when determining if they will participate in legal activities, legal activities. And I say, enough is enough. Final note. This debate is not

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

about moral behavior. If it was then we would be eliminating racetrack, lottery, and all the other issues we get revenue into our state. It's about political... political grandstanding to win over a conservative downstate electorate. We are lawmakers and must look out for the best interests of this state, and eliminating millions of dollars of revenue is not the best interest. It's used for schools, important programs, and economic-deprived regions."

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

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Miller: "Representative, just a couple of questions first. How does this interact with Federal Law?"

Bradley, J.: "In what way?"

Miller: "There is a... out in the south suburbs there's a proposal for the Indian Ho-Chunk to come and build a casino out there. Is there any way that this would affect their ability to do that?"

Bradley, J.: "Ya know, I don't know how to answer that, Representative."

Miller: "You don't know?"

Bradley, J.: "They obviously have jurisdiction over state law."

Miller: "You don't know. On the fiscal note it lists here that..."

Bradley, J.: "I believe that would be a federal issue."

Miller: "...there would be more..."

Bradley, J.: "That would be federal issue, I believe."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Miller: "I couldn't hear you, what?"

Bradley, J.: "I believe that would be a federal issue."

Miller: "Well, that is the question."

Bradley, J.: "I believe that would be a federal issue."

Miller: "How would the state... would the State Law preempt a Federal Law..."

Bradley, J.: "This is simply riverboat gambling."

Miller: "If... if the Ho-Chunk casino people wanna build a casino on Lynnwood, would they still be allowed to do it?"

Bradley, J.: "This is riverboat gambling only."

Miller: "I can't hear you."

Bradley, J.: "This is riverboat gambling only."

Miller: "Okay. I don't think you understand the question. Your legislation is rather simple. I mean, if... it's only like a paragraph long. Under the fiscal note it lists... there's about a \$700 million in lost revenue, that's correct?"

Bradley, J.: "There would be a \$700 million, according to the fiscal note, in terms of revenue that we got from the riverboats. Now, it takes about almost \$2 billion in losses to generate that 700 million, which means that..."

Miller: "Hold... hold on. Hold on."

Bradley, J.: "Actually, it would be \$2 billion..."

Miller: "And about a thous... and about 9 thousand jobs. And also you list in the legislation... you list that there would be a grant from DECO to help supplement those who've lost jobs, is that correct?"

Bradley, J.: "We're gonna have a retraining and educational aspect in this."

Miller: "The rea... where would the retraining be?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Bradley, J.: "I think we're gonna try to utilize the junior colleges as we have in the past."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, can I... Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear him. The retraining would be where?"

Bradley, J.: "I think we're gonna attempt to use the junior colleges as we have in the past."

Miller: "So you got a 9 thousand people flux..."

Bradley, J.: "I dispute that number."

Miller: "Well, okay."

Bradley, J.: "I dispute that number. I've never..."

Miller: "Let's say 5 thousand."

Bradley, J.: "I have never seen any real hard statistics."

Miller: "What is the cost of the grant that will be applied towards people being educated?"

Bradley, J.: "I don't know... have a number on that."

Miller: "How long does it take for these individuals to become reeducated..."

Bradley, J.: "Well, I think..."

Miller: "...into a..."

Bradley, J.: "I'm trying to answer your question."

Miller: "Okay."

Bradley, J.: "I think it's realistic..."

Miller: "We're on a time limit."

Bradley, J.: "I think it's realistic that there's gonna be some people that wanna be involved in the gambling industry that would have to go elsewhere. People that are in the communities that want to stay in Illinois that don't want to be part of the gambling industry, that training would be available for. But those numbers in terms of jobs have

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

fluctuated so much since this debate started that I have real questions about what the real numbers are."

Miller: "Last question. As far as the training's concerned, you moved back the effective date, correct?"

Bradley, J.: "That's correct."

Miller: "Okay. And... I mean, are these people gonna be trained in time to be able to get a job before the effective date or..."

Bradley, J.: "That would be my hope and intent."

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

"As the Sponsor initially stated... he recited some biblical references. First off, I wanna say I'm a Christian and a member of the Salem Baptist Church and I don't think ... when I was sworn in to office I was told to uphold the Constitution and not any particular religious document. With that said though, it's easy to be against something. I mean, many of us don't use economic development... or gambling as a means of economic development, particularly in the south suburbs. Particularly, this is not our first line. But in our changing economy that we have, we're forced to do some bad... bad situations. The villages... I represent part of the five worst communities in Cook County. We have the social problems that the Sponsor has alluded to without riverboat gaming. There's no mention in this legislation any type of economic development about communities. So, what are you gonna do? You're gonna further plummet those communities that have some sense of... some kind of revenue coming in, some sense of economy, some

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

sense of something that they have and deplete it. We realize in the south suburbs what happens when you don't have any economic development. You have these social problems and so if the state... if he's saying in this legislation for us to address this, then our communities will be just further behind the eight ball. These other communities, God bless 'em, will get the attention that they need. And so, whether we have this or not, it's not a matter. A 'no' or a 'present' vote doesn't..."

Speaker Turner: "One minute."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A 'no' or a 'present' vote doesn't mean that you're for gaming. What you are means for responsible legislation. What're we gonna do? I'm for educational funding, I'm for health care, I'm for things that make our society better. In this legislation, there is no... there is nowhere in it that addresses these problems that exist. There's no way, as the Sponsor admitted... though he doesn't even know what the amount of the grants will be toward DCCO to get these people educated. And so when you have an uneducated base, something that's indeterminate... and we can all be against gaming. Fine, let's get rid of it. But in the same light, hey, let's have educational funding reform. Let's have things that it's gonna at least make the scale equal so people can succeed in the life and succeed in Illinois. I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' or 'present' and would like to remind that those votes don't mean that you're for gaming, however, for a better system in Illinois."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

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

Lang: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this misguided piece of legislation. As everyone knows, Representative Bradley and I are pretty close friends, we had dinner just a couple of nights ago. But that doesn't mean he's any less misguided on this piece of legislation. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, should I go over my 5 minutes, Representative Ryg will yield me 5 additional minutes."

Speaker Turner: "Sounds like a guarantee."

Lang: "Mr... I'm hoping not. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I heard much from the Sponsor of this legislation regarding the communities that currently have riverboat gaming. truth is that if you would go to every community today that has riverboat gaming, every one of them, and talk to the mayors of those communities, the members of the city council or boards of those communities, they would tell you their communities are far better off today than they were before we had riverboat gaming. They would tell you that their police forces are better, their fire departments are better, their public works and sewer systems are better, their schools are better, their roads are better. They are safer communities than they've ever been and they're able to build things that they've never been able to build before. are better communities because of riverboat gaming. one of them uniformly would tell you that. Then there's the notion that we're hurting Illinois citizens somehow. Ladies and Gentlemen, we made a decision in this Body in the late '80s that we would have riverboat gaming to help

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

economically-depressed communities. We've done that. When we made an effort a few years ago to raise riverboat taxes in Illinois, you see what happened then. Thousands of Illinois citizens left Illinois to spend their money in other states. It cost the State of Illinois hundreds of millions of dollars. If this Bill passes and becomes the law of Illinois, thousands of Illinois citizens will leave our state to gamble. They're going to continue to gamble, they will just go to other states, as they do today. When the Power Ball Jackpot reaches \$500 million, hundreds of thousands of Illinois citizens go to Wisconsin to buy Power Ball tickets. This Bill is economic development and jobs. The current Riverboat Gaming Act is economic development and Since we passed riverboat gaming in Illinois, education has received \$4.2 billion due to riverboat gaming. Today, we have 86 hundred people working on riverboats and over 50 thousand jobs in the State of Illinois that are indirect jobs because of riverboat gaming, florists, other service industries, uniform providers, et cetera, et cetera. Fifty thousand jobs in the State of Illinois. Each year the state gets over \$700 million from riverboat gaming and local communities in Illinois get over a \$100 million. If this Bill were to pass, \$300 million in local construction projects in Rock Island, East St. Louis, and Metropolis would disappear and the construction jobs along with it would disappear. Ladies and Gentlemen, the business climate in Illinois is at stake here. When we raised our riverboat taxes to 70 percent we hurt Illinois, the environment for business in Illinois, and hundreds of businesses that wanted

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

to locate in our state said, 'Nah, we're not going to Illinois because Illinois is bad for business.' And in the two days since this Bill got out of committee, stock prices have plunged for every riverboat interest in Illinois by 10 The business climate in Illinois is at to 20 percent. stake. We cannot afford to have financial analysts from all over the world say, 'Don't invest in any company that's in Illinois because Illinois will turn on you. Illinois will take your business and say you can't do it anymore or Illinois will raise your taxes or Illinois is a bad place to do business.' We cannot continue to do this. also say to the Sponsor, if gaming is so evil why aren't we doing away with horseracing? Why aren't we doing away with the lottery? Why aren't we doing away with bingo? aren't we doing away with Las Vegas nights? The reason we're not doing away with these things is they aren't as sexy. The reason we aren't doing away with horseracing is in downstate Illinois where the Sponsor is from there are thousands of people who work in the agriculture industry who work in the horseracing industry. He's not interested in the morality of that gaming, only in the morality of this This is... I only need one more minute, Mr. gaming. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

Lang: "Thank you. There is no basis in fact for the reason of doing this Bill. Now if you're opposed to gaming on a moral basis, do your thing. Do your thing, but then be honest. Come forward with a Constitutional Amendment to ban all forms of gaming in Illinois. If you are morally opposed to

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

gaming, come forth and do that. Don't hide behind somebody else's Bill, don't hide behind this silliness. If you're against gaming, be against all forms of gaming. Stop the bingo in the churches. Come forward and do that. But you're not opposed to all forms of gaming. You wanna take this Bill and use it as a political statement. Why don't you make a statement for the taxpayers of Illinois, for the children of Illinois, and for the communities in Illinois and vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to refute a little bit of what Representative Bradley has said right off the bat that riverboat gaming is bad for the cities. Tell that to Joliet. I live in Joliet. Joliet's the only city in the State of Illinois that has two riverboats. We have about a thousand jobs on those riverboats. There's no crime. There's nobody being mugged in the streets. All the things that they said when riverboat gaming and gambling came to town was, oh, loom, groom and doom. Tell it to Joliet. Joliet has the greatest rebirth. I think Joliet is one of the largest growing cities in this country east of the Rocky Mountains. The riverboats have been good for Joliet. They're good for the economy. As Representative Lang said, we have more policemen, we have more firemen, the city if We have better streets, better sewers. The boats voluntarily, I repeat, voluntarily give money to schools. Who else does that other than the taxpayer? riverboats in Joliet give money to the social service

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

agencies. The riverboats in Joliet give money to the schools. And I wanna repeat that, to the schools to help our children. Riverboat gaming is not a bad idea. I think when the idea came up here in the late '90s... or early '90s, everybody thought it was gonna be a good idea and I think it has turned out to please everyone. Obviously, not everyone 'cause Senator... or excuse me, Representative Bradley has a bad idea. But I just would like you to refute his idea and retain riverboat gaming in the State of Illinois. And I thank you very much."

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

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's been so long I've forgotten what Bill we're on. Oh, I see. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes, the Gentleman from Alton spoke longer than the boat in Alton has been operating. But then as soon as he got done, you put the timer on everybody else. Now is that fairness?"

Speaker Turner: "Well, there are those who would probably be a little suspicious, especially since I'm a cosponsor of the Bill."

Black: "Well, I..."

Speaker Turner: "But I tried to get leave."

Black: "As well you should be. Thank..."

Speaker Turner: "I tried to get leave."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Black: "Representative Bradley, I've heard different numbers.

How many people will be out of work if, in fact, all of the riverboats would close by a date certain?"

Bradley, J.: "I have... I've heard conflicting numbers, too, Representative, and the number that was presented from one source was 9 thousand. I've also heard that it's 4 or 5 thousand. I've also heard it's seasonal. I think it's realistic that some people that are involved in the gambling industry, managers, general managers, people that wanna be in that industry will go elsewhere with their corporations. What I'm concerned about are the people that live in the communities that wouldn't have been involved in the industry had it not been there, and that's what the retraining and entrepreneurial training is for. I'm very mindful of that and I'm very concerned about that."

Black: "Oh, and I think as well you should be. My eyebrows went up a little bit when I saw a Democrat sponsoring a Bill that would put people out of work. That's not usually what your party is about, but I understand what... I understand what you're trying to do. Mr. Speaker..."

Bradley, J.: "Well, Rep... Representative..."

Black: "Go ahead, I'm sorry."

Bradley, J.: "I'm sorry, if I could. My theory is, and what Dr. Grinols and Dr. Kindt have said, if you introduce riverboat gambling to a community of a hundred thousand, you have to create 13 thousand jobs to offset the cost of that. So, whereas we may lose some jobs within the industry itself, the communities and the state will actually gain jobs as a result of that, so it's a net win for us. Just to clarify."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Black: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Black: "There are some things that I have really enjoyed hearing in this debate and part of the Bill that I really, really like is that the Gentleman recognizes the impact community colleges. And I hope you all remember that during our budget negotiations this coming spring. colleges are indeed the crown jewel of our higher education They're the light cavalry of higher education. Every time we get into a bind... and as mentioned in the Gentleman's Bill, who will train these people if in fact the riverboat closes? It will be community colleges. Who do we turn to when we need skills up... skills to be upgraded, people to be retrained, lifelong learning possibilities? We turn to community colleges. So that part of the Bill, I'm glad that we're focusing on it. I hope you remember that come the budget negotiations next spring. The community colleges' system is operating on about the same level of appropriations that they received in 1995. Let me just share some other things I've heard from my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This has been very enlightening and very heartening. One of the speakers on your side of the aisle said, and I quote, 'Our budget is in disarray. We are in deficit spending.' Holy cow, I thought we tried to tell you that last spring and you wouldn't listen to us. Now you've said what we said last spring. Thank you for bringing that up. Another Gentleman who I thought if he changed his religion could probably be named a bishop before the day is over, 'The business climate

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

in Illinois is not good.' There's a bulletin. But coming from your side of the aisle, I'm very excited to hear that. And I hope you'll work with us in the coming Session to try and improve the business climate. And last but not least, that same Gentleman said... and let me reiterate, I have never been on a riverboat in the State of Illinois or any other state. Didn't vote for the enabling legislation. But he said, 'Let's do away with all forms of gambling.' Many of you in here would be on your way to jail because of the White Sox series if we did that. But he said something that I resent. He said, 'Well, we don't wanna do away with bingo and casino nights and that stuff because it isn't sexy.' I'll have you know that I have gone to the church and played bingo with my spouse and I can tell you I resent that remark. Real men play bingo. Thank you."

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

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

Turner: "To the Bill."

Phelps: "I'm not here speaking today to promote or endorse gambling by any means, I'm here today speaking on this Bill to save a community and to save jobs, period. I have a riverboat in my district, Harrahs Metropolis, that this riverboat has single-handedly resurrected the City of Metropolis, and here are some figures to show that. Harrahs Metropolis employs over a thousand employees and at least 80 percent of them are Illinois residents that live in my district. Harrahs Metropolis generated \$27 million in

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

benefits in the last 12 months payroll and with approximately \$16 million paid to Illinois residents that live in my district. Harrahs will generate approximately \$8 million in taxes for the City of Metropolis this year alone. Harrahs will generate approximately \$50 million in taxes for the State of Illinois this year alone. Harrahs is investing \$72 million on a new hotel and special events center that's six stories high. Believe it or not, we're getting stories down in my district now. With 250 construction jobs, with another 400 jobs that's gonna be created when this opens. The new facility will generate \$11 million of additional taxes to the state and to the city. Harrahs has contributed almost \$800 thousand over the last 5 years to charities, to education, to senior programs, and without this boat that community will die on the vine. No doubt about it. Senator Forby and myself have met with the Massac County Ministerial Alliance (sic-Association), our mayor, and our alderman, and they are all behind me on this vote and this decision that I'm gonna make today. They know if this riverboat leaves this would absolutely devastate the City of Metropolis and the counties around my district. We all know jobs are tough to come by these days and there is no way that I could sleep at night knowing that I'm getting ready to get rid of a thousand jobs to hurt a thousand families in my district. So, that's why I wish all of you would really think about this and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Lou Lang brought up a couple of good points. One of the ... one of the best points is obviously about eliminating here in Illinois, it's all the border guys always talk about, Right now, the biggest boats that are Representatives. bringing in the most money are the closest ones to our So the problem with the Bill is that if we borders. gambling, we don't eliminate people eliminate casino gambling, we don't eliminate all the evils of it, we just would eliminate the shares and the taxes coming to Illinois. So if you eliminate all the ones in northern Illinois, they're gonna go to Wisconsin or Indiana. If you eliminate it down in St. Louis, they're gonna go over there. that's the problem with the Bill. Now, if somehow we coulda amended his Bill to make it illegal in Indiana, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Iowa, then I'd be with him. But since we can't do that, that causes a problem. The other problem we have that Lou also talked about while everybody was talkin' while Lou was speakin', and sometimes that's a good idea, but one of the other problems was that today if there's someone out there and why this House vote's important that it is a 'no', if there are people out there that might wanna spend from 30 thousand to build a new restaurant in Peoria or 400 million to build a new complex somewhere near Chicago, nobody in their right mind would put one penny in infrastructure of Illinois if the Representatives vote 'no' today, even though we all know that's not gonna be called in the Senate. That doesn't matter to investors. You would make them extremely

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

skittish. Now, I've given you reasons why I'm voting 'no' on the Bill, but let me tell you why I gotta applaud John Bradley for having the guts to step up here and do this. Let me tell you why I like at least this being brought to the House, even though we must vote 'no'. In Illinois, we passed some Bill in 1989 and I think it was... all these old guys like Art Turner will be able to tell you. I think we did it at 5 to 12, or we probably pushed the clock back. Okay? They didn't even know what they were voting on. thought there were money limits, time limits. They didn't know, we just voted on it. Okay. We sunset half the things If ya wanna be an electrician, they have somebody who have licensing. We sunset everything. Our biggest mistake in '89 was not sunsetting the law, and the reason is gambling has grown to such proportions throughout the state that the way we did it was dead wrong. We did it wrong. Only in Illinois can we do a tenth license, vote on it in '99 that would bring millions of dollars to the state, help horseracing, help our communities, and only in Illinois is it 6 years later and we don't have it. Goes to show you how bad we're doing it. We can't even bring up stuff about changing taxes. We can't even talk about casino gambling, horseracing, lottery. We can't even have a Bill. So if this Bill does anything, maybe we should blow up the entire gaming Bill and start from scratch. So I would rather support a Bill that sunsets gaming, that talks about that we're gonna keep it in Illinois 'cause we can't afford to give all our tax revenues to neighboring states. So we have to vote 'no' on this Bill. But if it brings anything, I

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

hope it brings sanity that somehow we can look at the way we do gaming in Illinois and we are the laughing stock of the Only we can destroy our horseracing industry. went from #2 in the country to about #20. We did that to ourselves. Only we could do it the wrong way and do a 70 percent tax, 80 percent tax, which we had to do, but now it's time to look at exactly how we're gonna do gaming in Start from scratch, get the state. Governor, Legislative Leaders, and look at an innovative way to do gaming that takes care of a lot of the ills that John Bradley has brought forth. He's right about a lot of 'em. To encompass what everybody else has talked about who has a casino in their district... and by golly, if you have a casino in your district and you don't jump up, you better jump up, because you better protect those thousand jobs just like Representative Pritchard protect his job on my horse slaughter Bill. It's your job to do that. And you're right in protecting your jobs. But let's see if we can all get together and do gaming right. I applaud John Bradley for bringing this issue forward. It's the wrong Bill for the sake of Illinois. For sake of economic development, we have to vote 'no' today. But I hope it brings us to our senses later on this spring. Thank you."

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

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I arise in complete support of my colleague, Representative John Bradley, on this piece of legislation. He is a man of honor, he is a man of truth, and he is a man

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

of justice. And he has put evidence, evidence, Ladies and Gentlemen... may I have order, Mr. Speaker? May I have order? And he has presented evidence and facts as to the reason that he has presented this legislation. This is not funny. I also must stand, and I do not like it, but I must stand to disagree with two previous speakers who happen to be Leaders of my party. And I am sorry to disagree with you, Gentlemen, but I must. Harrahs casino is in downtown Joliet. It may give money to the community, Representative, however, Ladies and Gentlemen, right across the river from that casino is a housing project, a housing project that the city council has taken the unprecedented motion of closing because of the way that it is run down, notwithstanding some of the investors in that housing project. If the casino was so concerned about the area and the economic development, why not pitch in some funds? If the casino is concerned about giving money to the social service agencies, that's great. It has to because of the addiction problems that it causes. I also must tell you that within a two-mile radius of that casino, Ladies and Gentlemen, have been some of the biggest drug busts that the City of Joliet has ever seen. I prosecuted them myself. Within a block of that casino is a liquor store that is continuously robbed, that continuously faces the threat of retail theft. And while downtown Joliet may have received some changes in the past few years, as soon as darkness hits, Ladies and Gentlemen, that place is a And there are empty stores. Where is the ghost town. economic development that has been promised? I also stand with Leadership on the other side of this aisle who stood up

that said, 'Real men play bingo', because they do and I

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

agree with that statement. However, what I disagree with is the implication that was made that the budget is in disarray due to this side of the aisle. It's not this side, it's not that side, it is a problem that's been brewing for years. Gambling is not the solution. I will also say, though, if there was a solution that we didn't know about, this super secret solution was not given to anyone during the negotiations of that budget from last year. This super secret solution did not appear at 12:01 a.m. on June 1 because there was none. This Bill that Representative Bradley has presented to this Body in good faith asking for your support is a Bill that will help this state move forward, that will save people in cost to the State Government, and is a Bill that we should stand with Representative Bradley on because he is an honorable Legislator, because he has presented evidence and facts to this Body that we can rely on. I ask for your 'yes' vote." Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?" Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Molaro, I believe when he pulled his sock off his microphone he lost his little sponge thing here. I... that's state property, we can't take that lightly. Secondly, a lot of... a lot of people have suggested that we should apologize and we... we're not being realistic if we think we should eliminate riverboat gaming in Illinois. And I'm here to tell you... we all know we can't eliminate evil, but don't ask

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

me to apologize for having principle that you don't agree I happen to think that no matter how much money you pay there are certain things that we just can't support. I believe gaming is one of those things. Some states have made a... made a large profit by legalizing prostitution. you are telling me that you should all of a sudden, because your state's legalized prostitution... well, don't have any morals about prostitution because you know the children are benefiting from it. Well, that's ridiculous. Don't have any morals about gaming, because you know the children are benefiting from it. For every dime that's gambled, a dime is lost. For every child who benefits, there's a child who Don't ask me to apologize for continuing to suffers. support something that I find appalling. Representative, you're doing the right thing. I don't know if you're Superman or not, as the Lady suggests, but I sure support your Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Verschoore, for what reason do you rise?"

Verschoore: "In opposition of Sen... Representative Bradley's Bill. As the other speakers... I'm not gonna take 5 minutes... we... In Rock Island it would cost \$110 million project, one of the biggest projects we've ever had in my area, along with 500 construction jobs and 400 permanent jobs when it's done. It's done some great things. It's built a water park for kids, it helped schools, basically saying the same things that the rest of my colleagues said. And I just stand in opposition of this and I ask for a 'no' vote."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

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

The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington, for what reason do you rise?"

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Address the Bill. For me, I believe that you shouldn't take something unless you can replace it with something. And I can appreciate my colleague's position on trying to appeal (sic-repeal) the Gaming Act as it relates to casino gambling, but I think a lot of points have been made which are very realistic. know my community in Waukegan has put itself as one of the people... one of the entities that would love to have a boat and I would love to see it with some additional revenue, whether it's a boat or other entity. I'm going to support my colleague on this legislation for the following reasons. Number one, I think that this legislation has garnered the attention of the gaming industry in a way that I know as an individual I never could. And I think there are a lot of flaws and fallacies with it and when I look back at the historical intent of this Body to put together something that would be a tool to aid depressed communities, such as Waukegan, East St. Louis, and others in similar situation, it looks like we've strayed to the right and to the left and not in the center and have lost the true intent of what it was meant by doing it in the first place. Otherwise, we couldn't have affluent cities such as Rosemont and others at the table elbowing the little guys out of the whole process. So for those reasons, I will stand in support of my colleague's ideas in terms of the gaming industry, but not totally in agreement with him because I don't believe that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

will happen anyway and I'm a realist. But I think to get the attention of the industry, I think the distribution, the revenue sharing of it is not equitable. I think East St. Louis, based on my colleague in the chamber, East St. Louis has not gotten what it should. And so for those reason, if it means that we can go back to the original intent and look at it again and make it accessible for those communities who are really depressed and could use a economic boost, then I would support it if that would bring it about. But in the spirit of that, I know that's not going to happen but at least we got the attention of the people that we need to have the attention. So, I ask for support of this legislation."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley, to close."

Bradley, J.: "I appreciate the comments of my colleagues. Ι don't take this issue lightly. He have come to a crossroads. Are we going to be a gambling society? Are we going to allow the few to benefit at the expense of the many? Are we willing to sacrifice our values for a fistful of dollars? Is Illinois going to put its economic hopes and future on riverboat gambling? The answer to that, I think, in regards to this Bill should be a 'yes' vote. Fifteen years we've had riverboat gambling and these facilities have preyed off the very communities they were supposed to help. Taking money out of our communities and preying on the most vulnerable. Thomas Jefferson wrote, 'Gaming corrupts our dispositions and teaches us a habit of hostility against all mankind.' And one of our great American philosophers said,

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Mark Twain, 'The best throw of dice is to throw them away.'
Let's take this scourge out of our communities. Let's quit
relying on riverboat gambling as a funding source for the
State of Illinois. Let's do the right thing. Let's pass
House Bill 1920."

Speaker Turner: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1920?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz, for what reason do you rise?"

Reitz: "A point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Reitz: "Thank you. I'd like the House to join me in welcoming...
we have a group of men and women from Randolph County that
came up to watch the House today. And if they could join me
in welcoming them, I'd sure appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. They're in the rear gallery. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Second Readings-Senate Bills, page 4 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1943. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1943 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza, on Amendment #2."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is simply some cleanup language on the Patrick Leahy Bill that the Governor did sign. Thank you all for your support on that Bill. It is the Bill that would eliminate the statute of limitations on hit and runs where there is death or personal injury. All this Bill does is simply say that the Bill should take effect immediately rather than as of January 1. So it's simply cleanup language to make the Bill take effect as soon as the Governor signs it versus January 1. I would ask for your support."

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: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, was this an oversight or did we move too quickly on the Bill?"

Mendoza: "Truthfully, it was my oversight. My intention would have been for the Bill to take effect right away. And over the course of the summer I've already received multiple calls from victims whose cases are pending and might not make that..."

Black: "All right. Okay."

Mendoza: "...the cut."

Black: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Representative.

Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I have no objection to the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Amendment and intend to vote 'aye' for the Amendment and 'aye' for the Bill. Just one cautionary note, because it'll come up later in the day. When we don't pay attention to the process, when we don't let the committee structure work, when we speed up the process we end up making mistakes. This is a minor error. She's admitted that it was an oversight on her part, but some things that will come in the next few days or even today in the Veto Session... again, when we ignore the process we generally come up with a product that isn't what we want it to be and isn't what it could be. Just keep that in mind as the Veto Session goes on."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1943?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1943, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1943?' 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? Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, page 4 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 806. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. The concurrent Motion on Senate Amendment #3."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just earlier this week the Governor came in a special way and addressed this Assembly and talked to us about an issue that is very important, I think, to all of us and to the people in the State of Illinois, and that is All Kids Program. This concurrence Motion reflects the language that the Senate sent to us yesterday and was heard in the House Appropriation Committee last night and passed out with a 10 to 1 vote. And let me explain real briefly some of the mechanics of how this will work. We have a KidsCare (sic-KidCare) Program that already exists in State Law. program that have won the State of Illinois a number of accu... accolades. It's certainly something that has ... has been applauded by, I think, nearly every advocates' group and it's certainly something that has been a big step forward for the State of Illinois. It's something that the Federal Government has partnered with us on and indeed, I think that the only questions that we have had with the KidCare Program is, why did it take so long? Well, here we are today with the Governor's proposal which would say, in effect, that we'll extend KidCare to all children in the State of Illinois. That opportunity for their parents to buy insurance and buy the Kid... and buy into the KidCare Program will be available and those benefits will be

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

available. So, it's a program that we know how it works. It's been successful and we're just simply saying we need to... to basically extend it and make it available to all children. Now, how do we pay for such a program? Well, one thing we will do is simply say for those people who qualify for the program, and they're obviously above the 200 percent of the poverty limit, we're gonna ask them to pay some copayments. They're gonna participate. It's not going to be free. They're going to pay based on their family income. And for those people who barely are above that 200 percent limit, the working poor, they'll pay relatively small copayments. All the way up to people who basically will pay the full price of what it costs for health insurance for So, that's one of the major ways that we'll pay for the program. The other thing that the Governor's proposing is an item that actually was first debated, I think, a couple of years ago, and... and I think we need commend the Republicans in this chamber and in the Senate for talking to us about a way to reform our program of providing health care to Medicaid people. And the suggestion was made if we went away from a fee-for-service and went to some kind of managed care, that the State of Illinois could save significant dollars. So a couple years ago in legislation that we passed, we asked some people to study the effects and tell us if, indeed, there was any money to be had by doing this. And when they did the study they came back with a number in the neighborhood \$68 million in savings. what the Governor is suggesting that we do is that we look at taking about \$46 million of savings that we would... that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

we would save in the primary care case management program and the disease management program that he's proposing in this Bill and use that, along with the copayments, to fully fund the program that we will call All Kids here in Illinois. If, indeed, we would find that we would collect the 68 million or something close to that, this program would actually create a surplus for us and more than pay for We're not suggesting that... that, you know, we itself. should start spending money without having a way of financing it. But this is a proposal, a solid proposal, that's been thought out over a couple of years. As I said, it's been initially proposed to us by the Republican side of the aisle. And certainly, everyone who's looked at it has said that we can save money and money of this magnitude. So, we have 29 states already who use some sort of primary care case management program. It's been a... a very effective It particularly will help us with the costs that are associated with emergency room visits. It certainly can help us control the cost of prescription drugs, and it actually has some things that are of good, I think, to the State of Illinois that we really don't measure in this program in terms of dollars and cents. But we know that when we assign a physician to help people with their health care, particularly when they have certain kind of chronic diseases, like asthma and things like diabetes, it's so much better for them to have a doctor working with them on maintenance drugs than for them to suddenly appear in a very critical condition at an emergency room in a hospital. not only does that save money for the State of Illinois, but

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

I think it makes the quality of life for... for these kids so much better. And how do you measure the fact that when a child... when a child is healthy and goes to school, that they're gonna do better in school. We don't know how to measure that but I think we could all agree that that will happen. And how much better is it for the parents not to be called from work so often to take their child to the doctor or to the hospital. I think it helps cut down on... on those kind of absenteeism problems. And certainly, again, it's hard to measure that. But inherently, I think we would all agree that this is something that's good for the State of Illinois. So this is a program that helps working families, people that I think we all talk about when we run for public That middle group of people that the Governor talked about this week that get up every day, go to work, do the things they need to do, and sometimes find that finding health insurance for the kids is a tough thing. This helps to solve that problem. It takes a great step in the right direction. I think that it's something that we should enact immediately. And so I'm asking for your support today in an effort to concur in the Senate Amendment and send this Bill to the Governor."

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

Hultgren: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the press release... I mean, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill, and not the press release."

Hultgren: "I'm sorry, to the Bill. I didn't mean that.

Although, I... I think that is the point here, that this is

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

more of a press release. There's more details in the press release than are in the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I spoke a little bit earlier about the frustration of having to clean up matters that were handled ... rushed through in previous Veto Sessions. That's been a big part of our day today, is cleaning up messes we've made in previous Veto Sessions. My fear is we're about to do that again, make another mess. But unfortunately, doing something with the lives of our children here in the State of Illinois. single one of us are committed to providing health care... good access to health care for our kids. Unfortunately, it's not happening. Ladies and Gentlemen, I wanna talk to you real quickly today about what was the genesis of this Bill. I think we talk about that quite a bit here down in the State of Illinois and I always think it's kind of a stupid question a lot of times, but I think it makes a lot of sense in this one. What is the genesis of this Bill? Why is it that this Bill is coming to us in Veto Session rather than when we were down here for 5 months last year, when we were about to be down for another 5 months coming up in another 2... about 8 weeks or so? Why is it that we're doing it right now? And I think clearly it is because of sagging poll numbers and because of allegations of growing investigations that this is coming out right now and being rushed through. I think that's very unfortunate. I think our kids' health is far too important to rush through. the Sponsor of this legislation talked about that we need to act immediately. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are not acting immediately. This effective date is July 1 of 2006. Ladies

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

and Gentlemen, we will be here for an entire 'nother Session before this even becomes effective. This is not true legislation. What this is is reaction legislation to try to bump up poll numbers, to try and defer attention away from growing investigations and questioning, and I've got a real problem with that. This... I have much more respect for this process and for our jobs than to let this process be controlled and legislation be introduced by pollsters, which I feel like this legislation was introduced by pollsters. Just for example, many of you know the press conference that was held to introduce this legislation was called for October 23, last Sunday. Absolutely... if anyone from Illinois would know, that was the worst day to hold a press conference because the Bears had a big victory against the Ravens and the Chicago White Sox had a huge victory by a bottom of the ninth homerun by Scott Podsednik. And this information... again, something very important got pushed back to way back in the newspapers because it was trumped by other issues that are on people's mind. And the same thing is going to happen today. This is... there's so many other things going on this Veto Session. There's absolutely no reason for us to give up our responsibilities as Legislators to actually legislate, to work on the difficult numbers, to ask the questions: how much is this really gonna cost? What happens if someone wants to leave their... if employers want to stop providing this coverage to their employees? them a stipend to hold them over for a couple months until they can apply for this. How do we deal with that? happens with people who just move into the State of

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Illinois? What happens if someone has a preexisting condition? All these are important questions that need to be asked that we have absolutely no answers to. Ladies and Gentlemen, don't give up your right, your responsibility as Legislators to do our work. We have an opportunity to do it. This Bill fails on a number of... of situations, one is we talk about immediate effectiveness. If this really needed to be addressed immediately let's make it effective today and then let's vote on it and see if we can get the 71 votes that it needs. Unfortunately, that's not gonna happen. What this is is effective date is July 1 of 2006. clearly, by the way the Bill is written, they're admitting... the people who drafted this are admitting that this isn't an emergency approach to an issue..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Hultgren: "Sorry, I usually have the clock on. I didn't see the clock on up there. I was kinda watchin' to see if it moved. But I will bring my remarks to a close. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am absolutely committed to the health care of our children. And I think the health care of our children is too important to use it in press releases, in using it to affect polling numbers. We need to be doing our work as Legislators to dig into this, to answer real questions. We are going to be presenting a memor... memorandum of understanding. As you know, that's become a big part of how we govern here in the State of Illinois now. I'm not sure how many memorandums of understanding we had. But we are going to present a memorandum of understanding, asking the Governor and the Leaders to sign that as well, asking these

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

questions of what is the real cost? How are we gonna address people who move into the state just to get health coverage? How are we gonna do this stuff? These are important questions and all in all, I am absolutely committed to the health care of our children, and I know you are too. And let's stand up and say, 'You know what? Now is not the time to do this.' Let's commit ourselves today to work every day between now and May 31 to solve this problem. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jenisch, for what reason do you rise?"
- Jenisch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising today just to say due to a potential conflict that I have on this House Bill 806, that I will be voting 'present'. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The conflict will be so noted. The Gent… the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will.
- Bost: "Representative, is there anything in this legisla... well, first off, how many pages is the actual language for this legislation?"
- Hannig: "Representative, I have a Bill... I think it's the latest draft, and it has 20 pages."
- Bost: "Twenty pages. Okay. In... in that language is there any specifics on if this program goes forward... and first off, I wanna be very clear, too, here so... since the... the things are being out here and said. I'm... I wanna make sure that health care is provided correctly for our kids. I have no problem

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

with that. But is there any provisions in this Bill that put guidelines in place to check to see other assets besides income?"

- Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, this is... this is modeled after the KidCare. In fact, it's an extension of KidCare. And the KidCare Program is based on family income. So, this is based the same way."
- Bost: "Well… well, I understand that. But what I'm saying is… is when we move the level… if we move the level up that we're talking about here, when you start talking about… 'bout middle-income families, they more likely will have investments and those assets that are out there and other things. Will… will there be some kind of check? What… what kind of checks and balances will be made to make sure that the people that are applying for it actually do meet the criteria set… that are set forth by this?"
- Hannig: "Well, I think, Representative, we constantly talk in terms of the income tax being the fairest tax, and I would agree in my view that it is at least. And if you have investments, they're gonna make money, I would hope. And that will be reflected in your income. So there's a relationship between..."
- Bost: "Okay. Is there... is there language to that effect, that they will be checking those assets and making sure that..."
- Hannig: "Well, Rep... Representative, it's... again, it's based on income. And so, you'll file tax returns and you'll declare income. And I think that's..."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Bost: "Okay. So it... so it does actually say in the Bill... it does actually say in the Bill that those things will be checked."

Hannig: "Representative, again, it doesn't speak to assets. It terms... it tur... it talks in terms of the income ranges."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Bost: "...I have to agree with a previous speaker in the fact that, look, we... in two day's time, three day's time, a Bill of this importance is being brought forward and we're being asked to vote on it. The Bill's 20 pages long. I think the Bill is probably a little bit shorter than the Governor's speech the other day about the Bill. We are being asked to vote on this when the effective date isn't until the middle of next year and we could actually take and... and really look at this and really make sure that it's done correctly. The debate in the Senate last night, there was talk about the fact that assets were not going to be able to checked, that there weren't controls over the... on what the residency requirements are, or... or where the concern is that... of what might... we have to deal with border states. We do wanna provide these needs, but let's slow this process down. Now, if we can't slow this process down, I quess what we're doing is we're admitting to the fact that this is really just a political ploy when some Governor's numbers are down. this is nothing more than a game being played with children's lives because we aren't taking the time to do this correctly, because someone's political polling shows,

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

'Oh, I'm not doing very well right now. I've gotta have something.' We move forward with this. Folks, each one of us on this floor care about the children to make sure that they have those essential needs, which is health care. But let's do it right, not with something that is a great political pop, do a press release. Folks... hey, I've heard people say, 'Oh, well, I can't vote against this because it... it just doesn't look right.' Well, folks, I can't vote for this because of the... the way that we've speed this through the process. It's not right. Slow down. Let's go back and let's work on it together. I'll work..."

Speaker Turner: "...remarks to a close."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will work with you, but don't shove this through this fast. There's a lot of questions. Instead, slow it down. Let's wait. Take a 'present' vote if you have to, a 'no' vote. But don't pass this this quick and then in the… in the State of… the State of Illinois, when we're already this financially strapped, pass something that can really hurt us. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Molaro: "I'm a little upset. What I think may have happened is some of my colleagues on that side of the aisle must have heard the tape of 10 years of me sitting in the Senate 'cause here what I used to do. When the Senate Republicans... or the Republican Governor had a good idea that was actually a great idea, and they had some, here's what I would say...

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

'cause the Bill was good, I couldn't talk about the Bill. So I would say, 'Ya know what? It's response to poll numbers. It's political. I haven't had time to read it. Why go so fast? Let's slow down.' That's all I did for 10 years. When a Bill was good we didn't know what else to do. So I understand that there's gotta be some politics played by both sides of the aisle. I get that. But we gonna have... we're gonna be back here next week. We're gonna be back here for 4 or 5 months in the spring. It is the first time we're gonna be tryin' to reelect the Democratic Governor. We're gonna have 4 years... 4 months to play all these political games. I think this is the wrong Bill to start it Let me explain why I say that. This is not rocket science. You don't need a hundred days to look at it. is very straightforward. This is simple. We're gonna afford health care to children of the middle class. Governor is saying no child in Illinois should be without health care. I was at a meeting and Representative Lyons was there and Representative Biggins, where someone stood up about two months ago and says, 'Hey, the Governor's helping Katrina victims. How are we gonna pay for it?' And I said, 'We'll get to that. We'll pay for it, but human suffering comes first. Let's jump up in Illinois and help fellow Americans.' And we're saying right now, with the first time in 3 years... 4 years, since he's been Governor, we may actually not have a deficit. We may not have a deficit. And he comes out and he says now that we know that... the Governor comes out with his vision that he had 3 years ago. And that vision was to help our seniors, to help our

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

children, and to help the working class. Now, the reason we weren't here to do much 3 years ago is because, for those of us who forget, is when we first came down here in his first year, a \$5 billion deficit. Historic, \$5 billion deficit. And I was in meetings when the Governor said, 'We're gonna get this done. We're gonna balance this budget.' And he said we're gonna do it without raising the income tax, without raising the sales ta... tax, and we're gonna give more money to health care and to education, even though we have a \$5 billion deficit. Everybody thought that there was something wrong with this man. We couldn't see his vision. And what happened is he said, 'I'm not going back on my promises. I don't care if we have to be here 'til Hell freezes over.' Well, we weren't here that long. But if you recall, we were here 'til August of that year. And I want all of you on both sides of the aisle to check the votes and you will see that all of us came around to his vision. That all of us voted for the budget that did not increase the income tax, did not increase the sales tax, gave more money to education, and gave more money to health care. All of us came to his vision. Let's pass this Bill today. whether it's 2 months from now, 6 months from now, we will all be proud that we passed this Bill. We'll all see his vision and we all will say that we were here in the General Assembly when we made sure and joined Rod Blagojevich and made sure that every child in Illinois has health care. We will be proud of that. Let's play politics 4... for the next 4 months. Not on this Bill, not at this time. Thank you."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

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

Black: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "According to the House Rules, anyone has access to the House Floor if authorized by the Speaker. I find it unseemly, unnecessary, and precedent setting to have the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Director of Medicaid on the floor prompting the Sponsor of this Bill. That goes beyond the pale. ...that they be removed from the House Floor. If you don't wanna play politics, then get rid of the politicians."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Black, under House Rule 30, Section (c), it says that the Speaker may authorize the admission to the floor of any other person except as prohibited under Section (d). And under Section (d) it says that no person who is directly or indirectly interested in defeating or promoting, in other words, a lobbyist, any pending legislative matter or if they're required to be registered as a lobbyist shall be not... shall be allowed access to the floor at any time during this Session."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I quoted that rule to you. I said anyone can be on the floor with the authorization of the Speaker. I think it's unseemly that a director of a department that has a professed interest in this legislation and the Director of Medicaid who has a professed interest in this legislation, and both of whom signed a committee witness slip in favor of the legislation, would be on the floor

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

giving advice to the Sponsor during debate. If signing a witness slip saying that they are in favor of the Bill doesn't make them a lobbyist, then what does it make them? And if you're gonna do this to me, at least use a sanitary glove."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, they do have authorization to ser... to be on the House Floor and, with that, we're going to move on. They are not registered lobbyists but they do have authorization from the Speaker's Office to ser... to be on the floor."

Black: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I will accept your decision. I wholeheartedly disagree with it. You don't want to inject politics in the system but you have two bureaucrats with a vested interest in the Bill who work for the Governor on the floor giving information to your Sponsor. Don't your people know enough to debate this Bill without having the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Director of Medicaid on the floor? You've made this a sham. You've injected politics. So much for rules, so much for common sense, and so much for sanitation."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will.

Krause: "Representative, under the legislation, the reference is made that the department will have the same powers and authorities as CHIPA, which is the KidCare Program. And my question is... is... is the language of the KidCare legislation incorporated fully into House Bill 806?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Hannig: "It... it's referenced into the Bill, Representative."

Krause: "I understand it's referenced. But by that reference, does it thereby take that legislation and, in effect, made it part of this Bill, so that the powers under KidCare are now the powers under 806?"

Hannig: "So, I'm advised that the Public Aid Code and the KidCare laws that exist on the book are the... are the framework that the department uses as... as they go forward, Representative."

Krause: "To go forward with this. But also that you would look to that statute under this All Kids, also?"

Hannig: "I believe that's the intention, Representative."

Krause: "All right. I... I think so. Under the proposal of the Managed Care PCCM Program. Will there be an administrative fee paid to participating primary care physicians? Is there something that will then be paid to them by their taking part in the PCCM?"

Hannig: "Yes. Yes, Representative."

Krause: "Okay. And also, will this PCCM also provide for an administrative service organization? I'm interested to know as to who will run or operate the PCCM. Are you going to do it internally or are you going to use an administrative service organization?"

Hannig: "Representative, I... I just would remind you that the... that the PCCM is actually already on the books."

Krause: "I understand."

Hannig: "But the intention... the intentions are what you described, Representative."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Krause: "To... to use that. All right. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do... I rise in support of House Bill 806. We can go back over 10 years when Governor Edgar put together an extensive program on what we commonly call the KidCare Program. Coming out of his administration, he set up a committee on which I served and other Members did to go forth and formulate what I believe is a very excellent program for children's health insurance. Governor Edgar had us involved in a number of meetings, a number of committee meetings. He set it up in a bipartisanship way. And coming out of that, we established the KidCare Program that today, through that period, has been successful. This Bill extends and builds on KidCare. It will, again, work in the field of helping children with health care and it extends an existing program, which at this point has shown that it can succeed. However, as I and others... and I extend it again to the Sponsor that there is more work to be done in this area. And I do ask, Representative Hannig, if, as the Sponsor, you are open to having not only further discussion on this legislation but an actual special committee that could go along over the next number of months and bring up some of the issues that we still believe should be resolved and extended. I believe that would strengthen it. I believe that it would make this legislation better than where we are at this day. And that there are many Legislators who have worked in this area that have work and ideas that they would like to put forth. But I think it is the legislative branch, I know that we have an advisory committee under the legislation, we have to go beyond that. So, I ask you the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

question on... if you, as the Sponsor, are also amenable to having a special committee of Legislators that would hear the providers and others that still have additional ideas for this legislation?"

Speaker Turner: "On Repre..."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative Krause, I give you my pledge to work with you on that."

Krause: "But would you also join with us really on both sides of the aisles that have asked for that special committee in addition..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Krause: "I have no doubt that you will work with us."

Hannig: "Representative..."

Krause: "But there are those on both sides that would ask for an active involvement with you, with the staff, with the director."

Hannig: "Representative, I give you my pledge to work with you to try to accomplish those goals."

Krause: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, due to the potential conflict with House Bill 806, I will be voting 'present' on this legislation."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Beaubien: "Last... during last year's Session we passed what I thought was probably the worst Bill we've ever passed in the history, and certainly in my time here, which was the pension Bill that shortchanged... \$3.5 billion out of the next... this budget and the next couple, three budgets. It's gonna cost us billions and billions of dollars to repay It was a partisan vote and I think probably one of the worst votes we ever made. And incidentally, you're gonna be asked to do something similar to that this year again. I'm telling ya, it's coming. I... as I recall from my earlier days that it took God six days to create the universe. We're creating the most comprehensive child care Bill in two. I'm taking a little different tact on this, and it's my budget hat. We do not know what this is going to cost. There is a tremendous potential becoming... basically giving free health care to children under the age of 19, we will become the most comprehensive state in the State of Illinois. What is to prevent people from all over the country coming here, becoming residents, getting a job, coming from all over the world with very ill children... and I... I'm... that's a very tragic situation... from coming here and taking advantage of this? I'm... I'm telling you, they're talking 45 million. This could end up in the next few years costing hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars a year. We need to take our time, vote 'present', and deal with this issue on the cost basis during the next 4 That's not a political statement. months. That's a statement that deals with the fact that we do not know what

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

this is going to cost. And I urge everyone to vote 'present'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DeKalb... I mean, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Pritchard: "I think all of us here in this chamber are concerned about young people and the health care for all children in this state, as we are concerned that no child be left behind in our educational efforts. But it's kind of ironic that on a day when our seniors are meeting in the lobby and AARP is having a great rally, that we're going to pass a program that puts at risk our current Medicaid program that serves seniors and low-income families. I think we need to be concerned about the funding stream and the estimates that are made in this Bill. When we really look at the hard numbers and we talk to our medical providers back in the district, as I have done this past week, we find that the state is not paying its bills in a timely fashion. And as a result, we're finding fewer doctors, fewer dentists, fewer hospitals able to stay in business without making personal loans to their operations in order to provide health care that they're pledged under the Hippocratic Oath. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a program that needs more time to look at the funding stream, to make sure that the estimates that we are seeing before us are actual. We need a trial program that looks at this and we definitely need a funding stream that's going to be able to continue our current Medicaid

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

program before we look at expanding any new programs. And I think if you check with your medical community back home, you'll find that they're not anxious to do business with the state. And if they're not currently anxious to do business with the state, why will they provide care under an expanded program? I fear that we're going to be creating a myth that all children can get health care, when in fact, providers are not going to be willing to do business with the state under the state's current business practice of delaying payments and choosing to underpay a bill that's legitimate. We're cost shifting the cost of our medical providers to those that have some type of insurance and to the programs that we have in place today that are in very fragile shape. If you recall, the Governor addressed this Body this spring and said our Medicaid system is unsustainable. It's grown from about a quarter of our state budget to about two-thirds of our budget by the time children today are going to be entering the workforce. Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge you to go slow on this on this project, to ask for a trial program, and to wait until we have better legislation that is sustainable and doesn't risk the current Medicaid programs that we have in this state."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies, and Gentlemen. As most people in this chamber know, I have not been bashful about disagreeing with the Governor publicly about issues where I think it's appropriate to do so. And so, I'm not bashful about being critical when a piece of legislation is before

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

us that the Governor brings to us. And that is why I rise in support of this piece of legislation, knowing that you know that I'm objective about these kinds of things. Governor has presented to us... the Governor has presented to us a piece of legislation that will make Illinois one of the elite states in the country, maybe the elite state, for taking care of the children of our state. As you know, over the last 3 years Illinois' been the number one state in America at adding children to health care rolls. add to that great success rate and it's something we must do. For all of the folks who have spoken against this piece of legislation, I have yet to hear of one substantive reason why anyone should be opposed to this legislation. take a look at some of the reasons. I heard somebody talk about poll numbers. I heard some people talk about politics. I heard some people talk about press releases. What do any of these things have to do with the value of a piece of legislation? What do those comments mean when your parents in your district come to you and ask you, if you voted against this legislation, why you did that? Will your comments about poll numbers and press releases hold up when a parent who needs health insurance for their child comes to you and says, 'Why did you vote against the opportunity of my child to have health insurance?' Two hundred and fifty plus thousand children are awaiting a vote on this Bill for an opportunity to have health care, the opportunity to have a better life. Many of you have said, 'Well, ya know, all these rich people, they're gonna drop their health insurance so they can pick up this cheap health insurance from the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

State of Illinois.' Well, that isn't gonna happen because the Bill requires that you be off of health insurance for a Which among you is gonna drop your health full year. insurance so that you can get something a little cheaper? You're simply not going to do it. Some have talked about this as being welfare. Nobody's giving anything to anybody. People are gonna make copays, people are gonna pay a premium. People want their children insured. People have talked about this being a state-run program. It's not gonna be a state-run insurance program. The state's gonna administer it. The state's going to make sure, through this program, that 250 thousand children have a health care them out of the emergency rooms provider to keep Illinois. And let me add, as well you know, that when kids go to emergency rooms who are uninsured, they cost us astronomically more than this program could ever possibly cost us. So, the whole notion that there's something wrong with this Bill, no one's presented that to us anywhere. There is no substantive reason to be opposed to the Bill. Cost? The Governor's outlined the cost, he's outlined the savings. And even if he's wrong about the savings, even if he's wrong, is there anyone among us who doesn't think \$45 million is a reasonable sum to pay to insure all of the children of the State of Illinois? We have to be reasonable and realistic. We have to look at what this Bill does. Somebody said, 'I didn't have time to read the Bill.' Didn't have time to read the Bill. But everyone knows what's in this Bill. Everyone's known it for some time. gather that the... I would bet that the person who said that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

didn't read the prohibition of riverboat gambling Bill either, but he didn't have any trouble standing up and voting against that Bill... or voting for that Bill. He won't have any trouble sending out a press release telling people what a wonderful human being he is for supporting a Bill to abolish riverboat gaming. So let's not talk about red herrings. Let's talk about the reality of the Bill. The Governor has presented to us an idea. For the first time in the history of Illinois we have an opportunity to make sure every child in Illinois has health care. If that isn't something worth standing up and being for, I don't know why any of us ran for political office in the first place. You should be voting for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "I'd like to remind the Members that... I'd like to remind the Members that we have 15 people still waiting to speak. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I did a lot of soul-searching on this Bill. I spent a lot of time thinking about it and I've been listening to the arguments here and it's framing what I'm gonna say. A lot of you... we all know it's political. Let's admit that it's political, sure it is. But it also happens to be the right thing. Ya know, a few years ago I worked real hard with many of you to pass the Prescription Drug Discount Act. And at that time, it was rancorous debate and it's... and we didn't get that passed for a number of years because of the rancorous, political debate. Let's not do that again. Because many of the people who got up and spoke against the Bill, my Bill a few

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

years ago, when it passed unanimously and everyone was a cosponsor, it was in everybody's end of Session newsletter. 'Cause we know it's the right thing. So we know this is gonna pass and we should all vote for it because it is the right thing. But with that responsibility, because we're gonna give the Governor the responsibility, he... has an obligation. He has an obligation to do this right. what I'm concerned about is, frankly, when he's dealt with health care issues, he's done a poor job. When it comes to the flu vaccines last year, we lost \$3 million and he got a heck of a political pop. He put together the I-SaveRx program which is an abject failure. It is not ... it is not working with Medicare part D. If you're part of this I-SaveRx, you cannot use it as a... as part of your deductible for Medicare D. So we've had some real failures when it comes to those issues. That's why I'm glad to see Director Maram here with us today, because it's gonna... he's still here... because it's gonna come down to the rulemaking. That's where it's really gonna come down to the rulemaking and we have to meet with the director to make sure that we get this right. Because there's so many things that aren't in this Bill. It is open to a lot of interpretation. So we have to meet with the director and work with him. Representative Pritchard talked about the fact that many of our providers aren't getting paid now and that concerns me, because when I got the talking points from the Governor's Office, he said he was gonna put in there that the providers who help with KidsCare (sic-KidCare) would be paid within 30 days. Well, what about the providers that are taking care

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

of our seniors and our disabled that aren't getting paid for 72 and 90 days? Let's make sure everybody gets paid within 30 days. Let's change those rules while we're at it. other thing that concerns me, quite frankly, when we were having our hearings last spring, when we were doing the efficiency initiatives and we found that many of the folks that got contracts, the six of the nine vendors with the efficiency initiatives were also able to write the request for proposals were also substantial campaign contributors to the Governor. And we saw that four out of five of those folks that have contracts on the tollway are again, people who contribute to the Governor. I would ask the Governor to take this pledge today that he will not accept a penny from anyone who may do business with this state on All Kids. think we have to be beyond politics on that. We have to give 'em our faith here and I'd ask you all to vote for it. I think it's too important. We... our kids deserve world class health care. Our kids deserve All Kids. Let's give the Governor the opportunity to do the right thing, let's hold him to it, let's watch him closely, let's work with the directors. Let's do it because we should do it, but let's also hold our Governor accountable."

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

Eddy: "Thank you... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Eddy: "Is there a process or a form available at the well to amend the press release?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Speaker Turner: "Uh, I don't think so. Not yet."

Eddy: "We better get one because no matter how many times we try to talk about this not being a political issue, this is a political issue. I had the opportunity this morning to stop by the Capitol Development Board on my here and at the Capitol Development Board I had some inquiries about the School Construction Grant Program. But I was able to pick up a flyer, a flyer that promoted a program that we all care about and should be more concerned about what this does for kids than what it does for political careers. And on the back of the flyer there are directions to the location that our Governor announced his candidacy. So let's quit talking about whether or not this is political. It's absolutely political, Representative Franks is absolutely right. There's gonna be a lot of political things that come up in the next several months here, and that's correct. What we have a responsibility to do is to make sure that the components that are important to this Bill that are missing from the Bill are carried out in the rules. pointed out many times in this discussion. There are several key, key issues or components that are not there. Representative Hannig, you mentioned PCCMs and the cost savings being a very, very significant part of this. Now, is there anything specifically in this Bill that will guarantee that the PCCM model is used? Is it stated directly?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Hannig: "Yeah, I'm sorry, Representative, I wasn't listening to the… your speech. And I thought it was just a political speech…"
- Eddy: "I... I understand. I can..."
- Hannig: "...and I didn't hear your question."
- Eddy: "I can understand. I can certainly understand how the attention was diverted. The question is, PCCM. You stated, I believe, that the cost savings by using that model is an important component of this plan. Is the PCCM model specifically stated in all of the rules and regulations surrounding that in the text of the Bill?"
- Hannig: "Actually, Representative, the concept was put into law back in the 1990s. So what we're asking is that we implement something that we already have on the books. So..."
- Eddy: "Representative, my question was does this Bill specifically reference the use of that? Will it be required, as a result of the passage of this Bill?"
- Hannig: "Well, it... it references to Public Aid Code,
 Representative. And that... and that's..."
- Eddy: "The answer… the answer is that it's not specifically stated?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, it's part of the plan that was presented to us on how we would save money. The Governor presented us with the plan where we would extend, in effect, KidCare and make it All Kid (sic-Kids). And then we would fund it through two ways, one is copayments and one is that we would implement what's already on the statutes."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Eddy: "So... so, if this is the preferred methodology that is already on the statutes, why aren't we doing it now? Why is it all of the sudden a great idea?"

Hannig: "Well... Rep... we..."

Eddy: "That's okay, Representative. I..."

Hannig: "Representative, we are doing it on a voluntary basis and I think we should applaud the Governor for doing it. I mean, it's been on the books through several administrations and this is the first Governor who said we're gonna do it."

"Representative, I have a long list of issues that are unresolved related to this and I'm not gonna have time to go through them. Let me ask you this question. It has become kind of a practice of procedure in the House to, in writing, get some guarantees related to concerns that people have with legislation. I referenced the 2 to 3 hundred memos of understanding that we've already, in this chamber, asked to be entered into with the Governor's Office related to some of these concerns. I think it's absolutely incumbent upon the conscience of the people who are voting for this to have those concerns in writing and signed off on by this Governor in a memo of understanding, similar to the memos of understanding that your side of the aisle required last spring when agreements were entered into that... that were requested by your Members to make sure their... their projects and... and other items in the budget Bill were guaranteed. Would you be objectionable to that?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I would first point out that yesterday we had a public hearing. The department appeared, wit..."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Speaker Turner: "You've got one minute left, brother Eddy."

Hannig: "My only point, Representative, is we had a public hearing and I think any Member of this Body could've come and asked specific questions of the administration, of myself as the Sponsor..."

Eddy: "Representative Hannig, thank you. I gotta… just a little bit of time left so I don't wanna… And I understand that. I think everybody here knows the process, there's a public hearing. That wasn't my question. My question was whether or not it might be good for everyone here that is supportive of this type of legislation to make sure through a memo of understanding, which has become acce… accepted practice and procedure in this House very recently… and I would urge this Body to come up with those concerns they have so they can be presented. And when you go back and explain your vote on this, you will have some assurances from the Governor. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "I'd like to remind the Body that there are still 15 Members who want to speak on this Bill. We might consider if someone has said or ask the question that you wanna have asked, you may decide to release your button. The next speaker is Representative... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think a part of this debate we should consider... ya know, aside from all the... the political issues or concerns, we should really consider the link between healthy kids and their educational performance. I mean, all across this country no one really is doing a program of this caliber, at this level, and this

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

comprehensive. I think we should stand proud, whether we're a Democrat or a Republican, to be supporting such a measure. For example, in California, in a study of the California Healthy Families Program, children enrolled in public coverage experienced a 68 percent improvement in school performance and attendance. In Texas, a University of Texas study found that having healthy insur... health insurance was assu... associated with fewer missed school days or restricted activities... activity days for children. Right in Missouri, a study showed that since the MC Plus, or the Missouri Children's Health Coverage Program, began the percentage of school days missed decreased by 39 percent. In Vermont, a study found healthy students are more likely to ask... attend school regularly and perform better. Right down in Florida, a study conducted found that uninsured children were 25 percent more likely to miss school than kids who are uninsured (sic-insured). And so, when we have kids who have childhood illnesses, such as an ear infection, bronchitis, asthma, dental issues, skin infection, urinary tract infection, it has a direct impact, a negative impact on their performance in our public schools across this state And I think, again, we should be very, very happy that this administration has come up with a very forwardthinking approach in how it is that we're gonna help close the gap of health care within our state. I mean, 253 thousand young people, kids under 18 who we have invested ... are investing billions of dollars to, to be educated but, yet, so many of them... so many more of them are not adequately funded or provided access to health care.

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

is something that we should be very, very proud of to at least be thinking in the direction of how we're gonna close that gap. Oftentimes, those individuals who are working full time, who may have 2 or 3 or 4 kids, who simply cannot afford that extra premium cost or copayment just to take care of their kids for some of the... the illnesses that I mentioned before. So, I just wanna make sure that we recognize that in many of our county we have at least 5 to 16 percent of our kids in our county, on average, that are not insured adequately, that risk the opportunity to run across good, safe, affordable health care. And as it is with most legislation, all of the kinks may not be worked out. But at least this is a start in the direction where I think all of us wanna be, at least as Representatives in our respective districts. When we go back home and we're asked the question, 'What is it that you've been doing for us over this past year? What were you... what did you accomplish in Veto Session as it relates to our kids, as it relates to our schools?' And this Governor is takin' a forward approach in making sure that we close that gap to help families, to help 253 thousand kids to be healthy, only up until they're 18, so they can have an opportunity just like many of our kids, many of our grandkids. This is our opportunity right here, right now, to do the right thing to make all of our kids here under 18 healthy and to give them very similar access to health care, just like many of us. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

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

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Winters: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are probably facing one of the biggest issues that this General Assembly will face in months. And yet, what time have we devoted to this? The proposal first came out two weeks ago. The Senate looked at it yesterday and passed it. We're gonna pass it in less than 24 hours. simply an attempt to deflect attention from a failed administration. The administration has found itself bogged down in judicial... or, excuse me, investigations of corrupt practices, there are indictments out there, lousy poll numbers. And the best way to drag poll numbers back from the abyss is to talk about helping kids. What we're doing is... while it may be a laudatory goal, the manner in which administration has proposed this is irresponsible. We're spending ephemeral money, money that we don't know if it's gonna be there. If, in fact, this administration wants to be a responsible government then let's do the Medicaid reform that they think will save money. Once we have established that in fact there are saving to be made, and other states have not found that to be the case in some time... some parameters, then let's... let's at least find out that it is real savings. Then you po... can potentially expand to the All Kids Program, but let's not put the cart before the horse. The second problem that I have is that this Governor of PR, Governor of press releases, is simply using state employees all across this state to ramp up and hold political rallies on state time. Directors of agencies that have absolutely nothing to do with children, with insurance, with health care are out

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

touting this program. That's not the reason that they work for this state. They should be paying attention to their own agencies, solving the problems for which they were hired, and not simply shilling for a Governor who has lousy poll numbers. The trust that we have in this Governor can be extended to this... to this Bill. We don't trust him. else did Democratic Legislators last year insist on signing memorandum of understanding before they would agree to sign off on a budget that was totally imbalanced. This Governor has not earned the trust of the public or of us as Members of the General Assembly. And to put before us a Bill only 20 pages long, probably has 8 pages of actual language, is asking us as a Legislature to trust the Governor. We are a coequal branch of government. We should be entrusted with the details. Let's not leave it to JCAR where emergency rules can go into effect even without a majority of JCAR ruling on 'em. We are... we are leaving an incompetent administration to expand State Government enormously with no funding source after having almost tripled the state debt in the last 3 years, farther and farther behind in making payments to health care providers and we're going to expand this program. This is simply a red herring, a herr... a red herring that's designed to divert our attention from the problems, ethical and moral, of this administration, the administrative failures that they've had. It's a red herring designed to distract our attention, a sleight of hand. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of this General Assembly, this red herring is one that is going to be very hard for us to swallow. And from... years from now on we're going to be

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

coming back and saying, 'Why did I ever try to... to eat this red herring? Why did I agree to take it on?' A 'no' vote is the correct vote until we get more detail. And Mr. Speaker, if this receives the... the proper number to pass, I'd like a verification."

Speaker Turner: "Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair wants to announce there's still another 13 people that want to speak. At this point, I'm going to take the Chair's prerogative with leave of the Body and ask that we'll take two speakers for and two speakers against and we'll move forward. So, we will do two speakers for and two against. The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis, M.: "I rise to speak."

Speaker Turner: "You are for the Bill? You are one."

Davis, M.: "I am for the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Speak."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

Davis, M.: "I rise in support of this legislation because there are 253 thousand children in Illinois who live without any health care. That means they don't have access to they... to what they need in the reference to doctors, medicine, eye glasses. And these are children of parents usually who work. These are parents who work, pay taxes, but cannot afford the high cost of insurance for their children. What can we do? We can do as the White Sox did. We can hit a home run for our children in the State of Illinois. We can become leaders when it becomes to concern for the children in our state. If every child in Illinois has a right to an

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

education, every child surely should have a right to health care. Now, some people seem to think this care is free. It is not free. The parents have an obligation to a copay. The copay is based upon the parents' income. They will have a copay in reference to their medicine. They will have a copay in reference to the medical care, their eye glasses. But what it will ensure is that children don't have to miss school because they're ill and couldn't get the benefit of a doctor. Many of us think... many of us think when children go to an emergency room, that that is absolutely an emergency Frequently, an emergency room becomes the avenue of health care for children who do not have insurance. behooves all of us to realize the very small amount that's required to pass this legislation. And in a very short time it will pay for itself. For those of... those who are saying we should wait, we should wait; should we wait if children who have a cold can now get pneumonia? Should we wait if a child who now is perhaps overweight and threatening to be a diabetic? Should we wait for that parent to have access to a doctor to tell that parent how to avoid his or her child getting diabetes? This Bill will make health care for children in Illinois a lot less costly. Those of us who have children, we know how untreated illness can become a catastrophic occasion for the family's budget. Workingclass Illinoisans deserve the right to have health care for their children. When children do not receive adequate health care, a toothache can become a cavity, a cavity can become a root canal. We have the obligation to see to our children not having to suffer. All Kids... this Bill, All

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Kids, uses the state's leverage and buying power to provide health care at a far cheaper cost. This gives parents access to rates they could never receive if this were on the private market. By implementing a primary care model for All Kids, this state will save over \$100 million each year in its current Medicaid spending. And we can use that money to cover the difference between what a parent contributes in monthly premiums and the cost of providing the health care for each child. On an average, about a thousand dollars per year. In the first year, it may be costly. But later, this program will see a great benefit to the state. I urge my colleagues to be first in the nation, as the White Sox have become first in the nation, and pass this All Kids Bill."

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, you are an opponent?"
- Mulligan: "Mr. Speaker, I am a proponent but I also am the House Republican Minority spokesman for Human Service Appropriation and, in that, I have to put some things on the record that came out of committee."
- Speaker Turner: "That's no problem. So you're a proponent?"
- Mulligan: "I had someone that was going to cede me their time also 'cause there's two prongs to this. But the first part of it has to do with what actually happened in committee and the Bill. So, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "You are a proponent. This is the second proponent. Speak."
- Mulligan: "All right. Mr. Hannig, in the committee yesterday, which was called at the very last minute, we got some things on the record from the director, one of them being that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

managed care would be instituted in all counties in the state."

Hannig: "Yes, I recall that, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. And that the reforms would be implemented not only on a statewide basis, but with a time frame that was applicable to them being implemented."

Hannig: "I... I don't... could you restate that question? I'm not certain I understand it."

Mulligan: "All right. We looked at the time frame and the fact that the whole state would be required to go under the new managed care reforms for Medicaid. Not a county, every county in the state. And the director told me that this would be... I'm sorry, is he a director or a secretary now? I'm not sure."

Hannig: "He's a... he's a very well-respected director."

Mulligan: "Okay, very well-respected director. We agree on that. All right. So, we discussed that and in the committee two letters were talked about, one letter is from Representative Feigenholtz and one letter is from Representatives Bellock, Krause, Coulson, Leitch, and myself to the Speaker, asking them to implement a committee similar to fee-for-service to do oversight on this Bill. With all due respect to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I wish they'd pay attention to the following. There isn't much in this Bill, it is 20 pages long. When you're talking about low cost or what the rates are gonna be, none of that is in this Bill, correct?"

Hannig: "Representative, the rates will be set by rule and adjusted annually by rule."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Mulligan: "Right. Everything will be set by rule. For me, I'm on JCAR, so is Representative Leitch. JCAR is an evenly divided committee with three Members from every Body that looks at the rules. And it is my understanding that if this passes, rulemaking will begin by emergency rule on July 1."

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "Representative McKeon and I were just talking why emergency rule? Because emergency rule goes into effect immediately until we can formulate the real rules, is that not correct?"

Hannig: "Representative, we have a process where an agency can have emergency rules, and you know it probably better than I do, until the..."

Mulligan: "All right."

Hannig: "...until the final rules can be adopted."

Mulligan: "So every Member on this floor should know that the things they think are gonna be in this Bill or what they are talking about are not in this Bill. This is an extension of KidCare. The managed care part is already under... in the Medicaid statute, so that you could've gone ahead with managed care at any time. You could go ahead with it January 1 and have 6 months of potential cost savings to see how we would cover the cost in this, is that not correct?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think there are a lot of ways that you could've gotten to the final point. But I... I think the important point is that we have a very successful program with KidCare. I think almost everybody in this Body would agree with that, and we're trying to extend that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

program to... to another group of people, working-class children."

Mulligan: "All right. But without..."

Hannig: "So... so KidCare's the model and we're gonna use that."

Mulligan: "All right. Without the Speaker... which I would make a plea personally to Speaker Madigan to institute this oversight committee with Members from both sides of the aisle on it. Because otherwise, the only input that advocates have is through the Medicaid Advisory Board, which is totally appointed by the director of the new Department of Health and Family Services. It may not be your favorite advocate or my favorite advocate. Let's hope he would be fair, but we have no control over it. The only control we have we are now giving away as we vote for this Bill, unless we have an oversight committee. Is that not correct?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think we do in any... any number of things where... and in fact, KidCare I understand to a large degree, is done by rules. So, I don't know that... that working with agencies... and you've had a particularly effective, I think, career in working with directors on both sides of the aisle over the years in... in trying..."

Speaker Turner: "You have one minute to bring your remarks to a close."

Mulligan: "Representative Coulson said she would give me her time."

Hannig: "I don't even see her name here."

Mulligan: "Well, she had it and we turned it off. There are currently... Too bad guys. I mean, if you wanna do this, let's do it right. Is it politics or is it policy? There

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

are currently 253 thousand kids that are supposed to be eligible for that. Half of those kids are already eligible for KidCare and we haven't signed them up, is that not correct?"

Hannig: "I understand that's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "All right. So let's go to the fact that I am going to vote for this Bill because I've worked in my 13 years, along with other Members on both sides of the caucus, on for kids. health care I don't think there's Representative on this floor that is against covering kids. It started in Jim Edgar. There has been health committees here on both sides. Representative Krause, Representative Flowers, everybody has looked at this. Under Jim Edgar, we started KidCare. We did not have the money until the Federal Government came through. I won't talk about the politics of the Federal Government, but they came through with that money. Then under George Ryan, who nobody wants to talk about anymore, we expanded KidCare and FamilyCare. So, it isn't this Governor's purview. What this Governor is best at is press releases and politics. The rest of us are responsible, when we go home, for the public policy behind this. You have rushed this through. This has a potential to be good, but not if we give away all of the oversight. Now, I'm going on good faith to vote for this. I'm hoping the Speaker, who came to our aid under fee-forservice, will implement this committee. I know you find yourself in the position of introducing a Bill. Now, if you wanna do it in six days, you make us all suspicious. Why should we not be suspicious? You could do this after the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

first of the year. But quite frankly, we've all been for something like this and many of us started it before. so glad the Governor has come down here, 'cause he was here when Jim Edgar started this. I don't know if he paid attention, but I hope to hell he did. So quite frankly, I would hope that everybody on this floor that is interested in good public policy will follow up that we need an oversight committee, that we shouldn't be giving this away, and even though we're voting for better health care for kids, we're not giving it away for somebody who says 5 million times over around this Body the devil's in the I'm on JCAR, Representative Leitch is on JCAR, Representative Hassert's on JCAR. The Members on your side will get to see it. The advocates only get to write a letter in JCAR, they do not get to testify. Remember that. The advocates that you represent do not get to testify there. This will all be done by emergency rule. Ya better look for some better oversight. I understand where you are, Representative Hannig. Great politics in this. But let's get by the politics, let's take back the public policy. This is not a Democrat issue or a Republican issue. This is an issue that we've worked on us, on both sides of the aisle for many years. So who the hell cares what press release is out there? The object is let's do public policy, let's do it right. Let the people that have been doing it for the last umpteen years have some say, don't give it all away. And let Speaker Madigan come through for us and appoint this committee so that we have some decent oversight. And I hope the Members on your side will join with the Members on our

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

side who don't wanna go home and just write a mail piece, we wanna do this for the kids of Illinois. And Republicans wanna do it as much as Democrats."

Speaker Turner: "We wanna welcome the Governor to chamber.

Governor Blagojevich, welcome to the chamber. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "You're an in... you're an opponent, I'm... The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "An inquiry of the..."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Stephens: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us what time the… the Speaker filed the notice with you that he was changing the rules of debate? Rule 50… 52(c), page 31, actually, (c), notwithstanding other provisions of these rules to the contrary, debate status of… of any legislative measure may be changed only by the Speaker, as defined in item 27, that is the Speaker, Rule 102, by filing a notice with the Clerk. My question, Mr. Clerk, is what time was that noticed filed?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Stephens, according to the… Rule 52, which is the same rule that you're reading from, if you look at Section (b), it says that all…"

Stephens: "Keep reading."

Speaker Turner: "Okay. It says that all legislative matters are automatically assigned to Standard Debate status except those assigned to... except those assigned to the consent

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Calendar or the Short Debate status by a standing committee. It also says that Standard Debate... Standard Debate is limited to a 5-minute presentation by the principle Sponsor or a Member designated by the principle Sponsor, debate by each of two additional proponents of the legislative matters, and three Members in response. And I think we have heard from..."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, we are also ruled by Robert's Rule of Order precedent setting that you made on this debate, on this issue, on this day. You were giving 5 minutes for everybody that sought recognition, you gave at least 10 to 12 to maybe even 15. Just because there are 15 more and the Governor's plane's getting ready to leave for Chicago or you're worried about losing Members on a Thursday afternoon when we have called for a verification, you are afraid that you're going to lose your Members and you can't change the rule. You set the precedent on this Motion."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, the... the rule change that you're speaking of, if in fact that's a change, was made prior to Representative Winters' request for the debate."

Stephens: "What time would that have been?"

Speaker Turner: "So that was not an issue. I don't know what time it was..."

Stephens: "The... the rules... the rules say..."

Speaker Turner: "...but that was not an issue."

Stephens: "...it has to be issued to the Clerk in writing, and I asked what time. And if it was issued, then your ruling, after that time that you gave it to him in writing, after that, then you would be within the rules. But until the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- time that it's filed with the Clerk, you were not within the rules. Mr. Reis says he'll stay here for days."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Stephens, we'll get back to you.

 In the meantime... in the meantime, we'll hear from Representative Rose who was the last opponent to this Bill.

 The Gentleman from Champaign."
- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, wait. Since the rule is yet to be determ... your ruling is yet to be determined, can I assume that after you get back to me, that at that point if you're going to limit debate it'd just be after the fact... after that?"
- Speaker Turner: "Well, Representative, ya know, initially we started out... I mean, the... the rules in books call for Standard Debate. Standard Debate is two people from each side. No one requested unlimited debate and I allowed Members to speak... ya know, we went on and on and on. But Standard Debate said two on each side."
- Stephens: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, you determined that we were on unlimited debate by the nature of the method by which you ruled on who was to speak next. So that determination was made, in fact, defacto..."
- Speaker Turner: "That's not... The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "State your question."

Rose: "Representative Hannig, are there any incentives in here for current employers not to dump dependents onto this system?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- Hannig: "Well, Representative, the way the program is set up is that the agency will have the opportunity to create rules and to look at opportunities to ensure that people don't do that."
- Rose: "So there's nothing in this Bill, right now?"
- Hannig: "Well, Representative, I think one of the things you have to look at is that, ya know, what parent in their right mind is going to walk away from health insurance that exists?"
- Rose: "I'm not saying parent, I'm saying the employer just not offering the plan. I... I'll take it as a 'no'. Representative, earlier you said the Bill's 20 pages long. If you'll note on page 8½ or 9, that's really only eight and a half pages of... of amend... of actual enabling language. The rest of it is... is just amending other Acts, isn't that correct?"
- Hannig: "Representative, just to finish the first question that you raised. There's also a provision on page 6 of the Bill which allows and gives the authority to the agency to have opportunities to try to work with businesses who may be considering exactly what you said, so that we could find ways to subsidize insurance. So, I think the Bill attempts to attack that potential problem."
- Rose: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, on that note, I have a <u>Business Week</u> article from September 20 of this year regarding Medicare D, 'To persuade employers to hold onto their coverage when the new Medicare plan kicks in next January, Congress offered a hefty deincentive. Keep your retiree drug coverage,'

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

lawmakers told companies in Washington, 'we'll subsidize at least 28 percent of your cost.' That's \$660 per person, per retiree, or 80 billion over the next decade.' And I, in my district, have retirees dumped off of their current private pay plans. There's nothing in this Bill that guarantees that current employers will keep current dependents on the Therein lies the problem, Ladies and private pay plan. Gentlemen. We haven't studied this, we haven't thought about this. Less than 24 hours of actual consideration on something that amounts to only eight and a half pages of enabling language. How 'bout dentists? The Governor talked about dentists in his address to us. Nobody in my district... I don't have a dentist in my district that I know of that covers Medicaid, currently. Not one. How 'bout assets? we check assets? What if somebody's got a million dollar bank account? Can they afford it? But maybe they have zero income. Whoops, they're gonna get this. Ladies and Gentlemen, the point is, we want to work with you. We want to do this as badly as you do. We want to treat our kids right. But less than two days of consideration on a eightand-a-half page Bill is not treating our kids right. deserve the absolute best and they deserve our best. What happens tomorrow if every employer in the state dumps their kids onto the state plan? You're gonna have some awf ... awfully angry parents out there. I had some awfully angry pensioners at Equistar in Tuscola, Illinois, when they got their letter that said, 'Hey, thanks for serving us all Have a nice those years, but here's the Medicare D form. life.' We can work through these problems. I will work

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

with you. I'll stay tonight, I'll stay tomorrow night, I'll stay the weekend. I'll stay through Thanksgiving, Christmas, all spring, to do this right and answer and address these questions and put it into more than an eight-and-a-half page Bill. But that's not what's about to happen, is it? Mr. Speaker, I'll cede the balance of my time to Representative Black."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me have your... Speaker Madigan in the Chair. We want to afford everybody an opportunity to talk, but we'd also like to move to a Roll Call. I would suggest that those who, at this minute, have sought recognition would be those who would speak, and no more. So right now, and no more additions, those seeking recognition would be McKeon, Black, Giles, Feigenholtz, Hoffman, Stephens, and Mautino. And I would suggest that each of you hold it to two and a half minutes and then we can go to Roll Call. So, Mr. McKeon."

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

McKeon: "Representative Hannig, I wanna thank you for your hard work on this issue, but I do have some questions as a Member of JCAR that I'd like to clarify, particularly since much of the important detail is going to be determined in the rulemaking process. With respect to legislative intent, on page #1, lines 10 through 13, please clarify for me in terms of eligibility... Thank you. On line 10, many children of working families, including many families whose family income ranges between 400 and 800 thousand dollars, are uninsured. Are you stating in this legislative intent that

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

this policy will apply to people with incomes of four hundred... rather 40 thousand to 80 thousand dollars or could it be at even a higher rate, a hundred, a hundred and fifty, or whatever?"

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, this is... this is the legislative intent. But we don't expect to hold an agency to these exact numbers. We're trying to tell them..."

McKeon: "That's all I wanna..."

Hannig: "...that's what they should look..."

McKeon: "That's all I wanna clarify. I wanna use my time.

We're not stating that this program applies only to..."

Hannig: "That's correct."

McKeon: "...people that make between those ranges."

Hannig: "That's correct."

McKeon: "It could be a hundred..."

Hannig: "We... we would..."

McKeon: "...a hundred and ten, a hundred and twenty."

Hannig: "The idea is to give everyone, everyone."

McKeon: "Let me go on. You're using my time, let me move on here. With respect to the operation of the program as it states, it'll be operated by the Department of Health Care and Facilities, state's eligibility rules, but then you go on and state under the rulemaking process that the department, in collaboration with two other departments, will write rules with respect to eligibility. Now, which is it, for legislative intent? Are these rules of eligibility the basic framework that's going to be extended possibly by the rulemaking process or do the eligibility criteria in the

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

legislation totally overrule by the rulemaking process? Which... which is it, Representative?"

Hannig: "Well, the Department of Health and Family Services will... will write the rules but we want them to be..."

McKeon: "All right. So, whatever it says here about eligibility really is not... not the program that you're proposing. You state eligibility requirements but then you counterdict (sic-contradict) that later in the legislation saying that rules are gonna determine all of this. Is that correct or not?"

Hannig: "Ya know, Representative, I... I think we're trying to take the KidCare Program..."

McKeon: "That's not answering my question. Do the eligibility requirements stated..."

Hannig: "Why... why don't you..."

McKeon: "...in the first part of the legislation..."

Hannig: "...tell me... could you tell me..."

McKeon: "...binding or is it going to be determined totally from scratch during the rulemaking process?"

Hannig: "What... where is the line that you're referring to?"

McKeon: "All right, 'The department shall adopt eligibility rules, including but not limited to..."

Hannig: "What... what... could you tell me the page?"

McKeon: "Page 5, line 3 through 13. What I'm trying to clarify here is that the… that you establish eligibility rules, you talk about copayment, but then you counterdict (siccontradict) that by stating, particularly in lines 5 through 13, that all these rules are gonna be determined in the rulemaking process. All of these rules are gonna come to

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

JCAR during the emergency rulemaking process and what's actually written in this document is probably super... superfluous."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, first of all, existing law cannot be suspended by rule. So, whatever is in the statutes today and what we put in the statutes with this piece of legislation is the overriding cap."

McKeon: "So, those… those are binding. And then the rules can only…"

Hannig: "Those are binding. The binding... and in fact..."

McKeon: "...supplement those. That's... that's the answer to my question. You're using my time here. On page 7, line 4, 'An alternative to the benefits set forth in subsection (a) when cost effective.' What is 'cost effective' mean in that legisla... in the legislation? Or do we know?"

Hannig: "I'm sorry, where was that at on page 7?"

McKeon: "Page 7, line 4. All right, let's move on."

Hannig: "So... so..."

McKeon: "You don't have the answer."

Hannig: "We're advising the department to try to find the... the least cost method of providing insurance for children."

McKeon: "All right. Let's move on to page 8, lines 10 through 15. It states, 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates paid by the department shall not be used in any way to determine the usual and customary or reasonable charge which is the charge for health care that is consistent with the average rate for charge for similar services furnished by similar providers in certain gra... geographic areas.' What in the hell does that mean?"

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Hannig: "Representative, that..."

McKeon: "What does that mean?"

Hannig: "That's a good question. That came at the request of the Hospital Association and the... and the Medical Society."

McKeon: "I... I don't care who requested it. What does it mean?

For purposes of this legislation and what we're voting on today, what does that mean?"

Hannig: "Yeah, so... so they're... I think they're trying to say that..."

McKeon: "Will you speak up, please, so I can hear?"

Hannig: "So I... I believe that what the... I'm not an attorney, Representative. And again, this is language that the Hospital Association and the Medical Society put in because I believe that they're trying to protect situations that potentially could be out there where we would try to find ways to..."

McKeon: "All right. Is it accurate for me to say that we really don't know what that means?"

Hannig: "No, Representative. I think it's accurate to say it's
 hard for me to try to get it out."

McKeon: "All right. I'm going to assume that for… for purposes of what we're voting on today…"

Hannig: "So, I guess... I ..."

McKeon: "...we don't know what that paragraph means, do we? Yes or no?"

Hannig: "We mean... it means that it will not disadvantage the Hospital Association or the doctors in their negotiations with the state or private providers."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- McKeon: "That's very generous of us here. Emergency rulemaking, page 10, lines 5 to 12. Why are we using emergency rulemaking and not the standard rulemaking process?"
- Hannig: "I think we typically do that when we... when we pass legislation. We give the agency an opportunity... we do it oftentimes with our budget implementation..."
- McKeon: "So, it's my... as a Member of JCAR, the bulk of this legislation is going to be written by the administration during the rule ma... in the rulemaking process and the bulk of the work is gonna end up in JCAR. Is that not correct?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, I... I think that..."

McKeon: "That was a 'yes' or 'no' question."

- Hannig: "Well, the agency has shown a willingness to work with all of us in this chamber and all the providers, so I think there'll be some drafts that will become available. We'll have some input on this whole rulemaking process and then JCAR does become the check so that when rules are implemented the Members of JCAR..."
- McKeon: "Well, I just... I just wanna be sure of my workload over the next 6 to... to 8 months. That this legislation, in fact, is going to be written in the rulemaking process and will be a heavy workload for JCAR in the future to figure out what this program actually does. I see a 'yes' behind you. Is that a 'yes'..."
- Hannig: "Well, I... I don't know that it will be a heavy workload, Representative. But it certainly will be written..."
- McKeon: "Well, I'm not complaining about the workload. I just want it clear to the Members here that the actual work on writing this legislation is going to occur in the rulemaking

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

process and JCAR, which I'm a Member of, is going to play a very significant role in that process."

Hannig: "Well, Representative, JCAR plays a very significant role in almost all the Bills that we pass. And we thank you for serving on it."

McKeon: "Well, and particularly this one because of the… the lack of detail in the current Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That… that exhausts my questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. I am certainly not going to make any objection to the Governor being on the floor. He served in this Body. I remember his service well, I can pronounce his name. And as the Chief Executive Officer of the State of Illinois, he certainly has access to both the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Ladies and Gentlemen of... of the House, let me... let me come at this from a different angle. And I'm not necessarily opposed to this Bill. I... I was blessed with two children. I didn't know what love could be until I had those two children. What a remarkable journey it was to watch those two grow up, go to school, finish college, go to work, thank Heavens, that equation came in there. The love that you have for your children cannot be measured. And then, when I thought I realized what parental love was all about, I... I've been blessed with six grandchildren. Now, I truly know what unconditional love is. I would give a kidney, I would give a... my liver or a part of ther... thereof, a lung. Hell, I would give my heart, both kidneys, my entire

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Anything it takes to keep those grandchildren healthy. I'm not necessarily opposed to this Bill. And I think many of us feel conflicted. But I'd like to ask you to think along with me about some of the process. I love this process. I believe in this process. I believe that our Jefferson, Hamilton, forefathers, Madison, Adams, Washington, were brilliant people and they gave us a Constitution that said there were three coequal branches of government. The only man left in this bo... in this chamber today who was on the 70... 1970 rewrite of the Illinois Constitution was also a man, I think, of vision and I hold in high respect, and that is Speaker Michael Madigan. that State Constitution created three equal branches of government: the executive, the legislative, judicial. And I'm proud to have served in the legislative branch of this Body. Now, let me tell ya what bothers me about this Bill. The conception of this idea... I wasn't present at conception but it appears to me to have taken place about three weeks ago. And holy cow, the birth is taking place in two days. From conception to birth is less than four weeks. I've never seen such a thing in all my I'm not going to go over the ground that the Gentleman from McHenry told you about. I'm not going to go over the ground that the Gentleman from Cook just talked about. I would ask you to remember their questioning. I'm not mad at the Governor for his public relations campaign. That's part of his job. All chief executives do it. does it very well. Flying around the state, giving out free pizza, hats, t-shirts. He did an excellent job of selling

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

this program, as only he can do. Why would I criticize him for that? President Bush has been flying all around the country trying to sell his idea on Social Security. obvious... it's obvious that the Governor is having more success than the President. Oh, and by the way, since you booed, why is it that the Speaker can have hearings around the state on Social Security issues that we have nothing to do with, but we can't have hearings around the state on this verv Bill? Ladies and Gentlemen, I think... I think what should be clear to all of you, you're being asked to vote on this Bill in about as fast a track as I've ever seen. And you're being asked to do this by basically three or four people. And I think most of you will follow suit. I got a copy of this Bill this morning. I read it. The Director of the Department of Medicaid was kind enough to come in my office and go over a few things. And I appreciate the fact that she did that. The questioning that we've heard today show that there are legitimate differences on both sides of the aisle about what this Bill does. There are questions on both sides of the aisle about how will Medicaid work. What will that mean to people currently on Medicaid if they go to a managed care program, what does that do to the person on Medicaid? We don't know. Four days ago the State of Illinois borrowed \$1 billion to pay a backlog of Medicaid bills to our nursing homes and Medicaid providers. interest on that will be \$15 million. The Governor, a few months ago in this chamber in his budget address, pointed out the growing, insatiable appetite of Medicaid, consuming 10 percent of our revenue every year. And I congratulate

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

the Governor for recognizing that fact. If it continues down this road, it will consume every conceivable dollar of revenue this state generates sometime in the next 10 years. But here we are, late on the last day of a Session, asked to vote for a Bill that has had one public hearing in the House, no hearings around the state, that most of us saw a draft copy of for the first time on Tuesday. I got an actual copy of the Bill this morning, Thursday, and I'm asked to vote on it this afternoon. The Bill is very, very vague. It gives a tremendous amount of power to 12 people who sit on JCAR. I don't sit on JCAR. I cannot, in good faith, abdicate my responsibility as a Member of legislative branch to act on legislation that I have had time to read, that has had time to have public hearings in more than one location and for longer than an hour and a half, on a Bill that does not spell out just what's going to happen. The Bill, in effect, says, 'Trust me. Trust JCAR. Trust the Department of Health and Human Services. We will write the rules and the program will be a good one. You'll see.' As the Gentleman from McHenry said, I-SaveRx, for all of the publicity and all of the promotion, did not come close to reaching its goals. KidCare, for all of the promotion, some of it at taxpayer expense, did not enroll nor meet the goal that we were told we would reach. So here we are with a new program with an estimated cost of 45 million. I don't know if that's accurate. I don't know if Medicaid... or managed care will save us enough money to get that. The Governor himself said in his budget address, we need a balanced budget Amendment. And if you're gonna spend

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

money, show me the way you're going to pay for it. To his credit, he has given us a concept. But I don't know if that concept is sound. I don't know if we're gonna save enough money to meet this Bill. So when all is said and done... and I know we all wanna go home, because I'm catching a plane going to two late tonight and see of those grandchildren, and that's more important to me than even this process. I am not comfortable and I don't think it's right for any of us to abdicate our responsibilities as Legislators to pass a measure that will have long ranging and potentially expensive impact on the people of the State Illinois when it has not truly gone through legislative process. That's what your voters send you here for. You are to represent them. You are to go back and tell them everything that's in this Bill and why you voted for it and what the safequards are and what it will cost and what it will save. And the Gentleman from Cook County on your side of the aisle just raised questions that clearly showed he doesn't know the answers, and I don't know the answers. I will not abdicate my responsibility as a Legislator. I can't vote 'yes' for this Bill because to do so would abdicate that responsibility. I can't vote 'no' for the Bill because I think it opens an idea, and I congratulate the Governor on his idea, that we need to explore. But we need to explore it thoroughly in a timehonored tradition of debate, compromise, Amendments, and then come up with a plan that a majority of us are comfortable enough to vote for. I don't like 'present' votes, but I've told you why I can't vote 'yes', I told you

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

why I don't wanna vote 'no'. I will vote 'present' on this Bill. And all I will say, again, to all of you, every time we abdicate our legislative responsibility we become less and less important to this process. Don't put yourselves in that position. You are a coequal branch. We are the sp... we are the protectors of the taxpayers' money. We're supposed to look at everything that we do here and then cast the most informed vote we can. I can't vote 'yes'. There's a thousand questions that I could answer. And in all due respect of the Sponsor, who I... who I consider a friend, he can't answer the vast number of questions that I have. And it's for that reason I intend to vote 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ya know, I... first of all, I just want us to keep the thing, and that is to do the right thing and do the righteous thing. I've been in this chamber a few years and, ya know, someone mentioned about excellent press releases. Ya know, I've been around and I've seen where we have subsidized or gave welfare, whatever terminology you wanna use, to hotels, ballparks, potential airports, and even something called Sue the Dinosaur, and other projects. And... and we had legislation that had all sorts of goodies in it, and I'm sure a Legislator got... got the opportunity to put out some excellent press releases in which many of us benefited from. But you know, if we had some legislation that... that said that we're going to support and... and arm our men of the armed... men and women of the armed forces today, we would have 118 vote on that piece of legislation. We

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

will say that we will find the money. We will find it, because this is a very important thing to do, it is a noble thing to do. It is something that we must do. You know, in our country we fund... we put billions of dollars in foreign aid. Foreign aid that goes to other countries. Resources, taxpayer dollars that goes to other countries. forget about our domestic needs. We forget about taking care of home. We forget about taking care of our communities. We forget about taking care of the doorsteps of our homes and our houses. We forget about neighborhoods. We forget about what's really important to us on a day-to-day basis. We forget about those things. And we... we think globally and our tax dollars go all over the places and then we cry and we say we do not know what we with our monies. And taxes and resources are continuously increasing. We got a chance to do something at home for a change, and that's one of the reason why I'm proud to stand and to support this piece of legislation. These are our kids. These are not kids from Mars or... or some other planet. These are our kids. They are Americans. They are Illinoisans. These are our kids. They are from our communities throughout this 118 district in our state. These are our kids. This is not welfare. We're talking about working men and women. This is not welfare. I dare you call any of those working families that's tryin' to make a living and who's doing it the right way and the righteous way to give them welfare. They're too proud, they're too noble to accept the welfare. Many of you here don't know what welfare is. And of course, many of us here do not know

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

what welfare. So we must do the right thing and the righteous thing. Every man and woman and child has a basic right, has human right, and that is... one of the 'em is health care. We must have this right. And if any child or baby goes before the emergency doorstep of any hospital, we must treat that individual, we must treat that child, we must treat that baby. We must do it. So, we're already paying right now. We're paying right now as we speak. we must do it. We must do it. It is the right thing and the righteous thing to do. And if we wait... and if we wait, think of how many children and babies we can lose if we simply say, 'Let's wait until we deliberate and we debate out it, day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year.' Because it is not... the fiscal numbers do not add up. But yet, we're willing to subsidize a building, brick and mortar, any and every day in this Body. We cannot And lastly, I want each and every one of you to wait. think about your kids, your grandkids, your baby. They have those rights. They... they are getting the health care that they need to be viable and productive and healthy young individuals in our society, in our country, in our state, in our communities. They're having the right to be all that they can be. And we want every child to have that right. Those childrens, they could one day be your ... your children's friends and colleagues. We cannot deny them their right. We must support this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "There shall be one more speaker. Mr. Stephens. Stephens. Mr. Stephens, you shall be the last speaker."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Stephens: "I'm sure we're all glad about that. Thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate you coming out and... really all we wanted to do is be treated fairly. And we... we demanded that and you delivered and we appreciate it. You've been very courteous to us and fair, one more time. I don't know that we've ever created a health care program, no matter how well intended, no matter how well-funded, whether public or private, that actually delivered the promises that it made. Every health care program that my family's been associated with, we always get the brochure when they're recruiting you, and then you compare it to the bill that they deliver to you after they don't cover this or don't cover that. I'm happy that the Governor wants to make sure that all children in Illinois don't have to deal with cavities. But Governor, we have people on Medicaid right now, right here in Springfield, that can't find a dentist because the dentist can't participate in your program because we don't pay them enough, and if we did, we don't pay them in a timely manner. So Governor, the children that we say we're covering right now, we're not covering. We all know that. Only... only by the... by the grace of some wonderful dentists who go out of their way on a Saturday afternoon or a Sunday afternoon to plead with the people in the neighborhoods that can't afford medical care, they come and they get free medical care in spite of Medicaid. They go around Medicaid barriers and deliver good service. I... I wonder... someone earlier said that this is limited to Illinois's children, to Americans' children. Mr. Sponsor...

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Mr. Hannig, I wonder, is that true? Do you have to be an American to benefit from this program?"

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 79 people voting 'aye', 28 people voting 'no'. The Chair has been advised that there is a request for a verification. And Mr. Winters withdraws the request for a verification. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Burke."

Clerk Bolin: "A message from the Illinois Department of Transportation. Interstate 55 is closed at La Grange Road for 2 hours due to a chemical spill."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, there appears House Bill 1391. Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on this matter having to do with the demutualization of insurance dollars. It's shortening the time in which insurance companies would hold dollars of individuals that haven't been identified. The State of Illinois does a much better job finding people with unclaimed assets. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the Bill pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Is there any

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Motion be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and the Bill is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's recommendations for change. On page 7 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions, there appears HR 650. Representative Hamos. Hamos. Hamos.

Hamos: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

This is a Bill that will require the Auditor General to conduct an audit of the RTA, Metra, and Pace. And this is really a follow-up to a Resolution we passed the last day of the Session which requires an audit of the CTA. This will make it a full compliment of... of an audit by a very responsible, independent source of information, our own Auditor General. And I... and I'm ready... available for questions and I seek and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Wait voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Motion is adopted and the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Meyer. Mr. Jim Meyer. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Is Mr. Meyer in the chamber? Did

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

you wanna move your Motion on House Bill 3651? Mr. Meyer on House Bill 3651."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry about that, I was filling in in Rules and was in that committee. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3651 was voted on by this House earlier in the year. And just as a preference to my remarks here, I wanted to indicate that at the time I think there was some misunderstanding that this created an increase in It does not. It corrects a problem which was inadvertently created in 1979. It does not add any new tax or increase any existing tax. What happened in 1979 was that there were three different Public Acts adopted. One of them did not agree with the others and, in fact, the courts have now ruled that it negated it. Since 1979, using a valid method of taxation for certain road funds within township road districts, the tax has been levied every year. The court has now indicated that it was inappropriately. So, all this procedure does is go back and ... and allow those taxes that were properly levied in 1979 to remain on the books. And again, it does not create any new tax. Bramlett from the Taxpayers Association (sic-Federation) supports this legislation. I know he's been around to talk to several of you. Perhaps not all of you, but several of you. And I just ask that this be overridden."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the Bill shall pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Gentleman's Motion be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

all voted who wish? This Motion requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Poe voted? Has Mr. Poe voted? Clerk... the Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 71 people voting 'yes', 42 people voting 'no'. This Motion, having received the required Three-fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and the Bill is declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's Veto. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on October 27, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Senate Bill 998, referred to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Agreed Resolutions."

"On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Clerk Mahoney: Resolution 683, offered by Representative Mendoza. House Resolution 684, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 685, offered by Representative Yarbrough. House Resolution 687, offered by Representative Younge. House Resolution 690, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 691, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 692, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 693, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 694, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 695, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 697, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 698, offered by Representative Sacia.

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

- House Resolution 700, offered by Representative Rita. House Resolution 701, offered by Representative Rita. House Resolution 702, offered by Representative Joe Lyons. House Resolution 703, offered by Representative Delgado. House Resolution 704, offered by Representative Biggins. House Resolution 705, offered by Representative Bellock."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Agreed Resolutions.

 Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On page 8 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions, there appears HJR 34. The Chair recognizes Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're asking for the passage of House... I mean, Joint Senate Resolution. What it does is creates a task force for the post adoption."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of SJR 34.

 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. SJR 34. Vote 'yes' or vote 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. SJR 34 is adopted. The Chair is prepared to adjourn to next Wednesday, November 2, at 12 noon. The Clerk shall read the adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Adjournment Resolution. Senate Joint Resolution #54.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

 OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

 CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Thursday, October 27, 2005, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 02, 2005, at 12:00 noon."

"You've all heard Speaker Madigan: the Resolution. Currie moves the Representative that House... Representative Currie moves that the Adjournment Resolution be adopted. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. For what purpose does Mr. Black seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know who put the White Sox out here but I... I think that's great. congratulations to the Sox. Great... great day... great day for the Sox, great day for Chicago, State of Illinois. series was a great series for baseball. I'm a Cub fan but it was a great series. And congratulations to the White Mr. Speaker, rather than have somebody take these socks off and throw them away, if you could direct, in your ta... in your position as Speaker, to have these collected, I'll certainly be more than happy to see that they get washed and we could give them to some agency in Springfield that could use them with winter coming on. I seriously hate to think that they would just simply be thrown away. And I would hope that you could direct the custodial staff to save them. I'll make sure that they're washed, we'll put them in pairs, and we could give them to some agency where children could use them with winter coming on. I just... in all seriousness, I don't wanna see 'em just thrown away."

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, I'm advised that plans have already been put in place to do precisely what you're suggesting. Thank you. The Chair would like to advise that the Department of Transportation is estimating that I-55 will be open at La Grange road at about 6 p.m. Once again, IDOT is estimating that I-55 at La Grange road will be open at 6 p.m. And Representative Currie moves that House stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 2, at 12 noon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Miller votes 'aye'. And the House does stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 2, at 12 noon."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4162, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 4163, offered Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4164, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4165, offered by Representative Dugan, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4166, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4167, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an concerning criminal law. House Bill 4168, offered by Representative Flider, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill 4169, offered employee benefits. Representative Flider, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4170, offered

69th Legislative Day

10/27/2005

Representative Schock, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1283, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of Senate Bills to be read a second time and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 998, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 49, offered by Representative Brauer. This Resolution is referred to the House Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."