128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in our gallery to turn off their laptop computers, cell phones and pagers. We ask the guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield." Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. As we lift our hearts and minds before His most precious throne, most gracious, and most kind, gentle God. Father, we pray today according to Thy word. Psalm 23 simply tells us that You are our shepherd and that we shall not want. Father, we do no want today because You are wiser than the wisest. You are greater than the greatest. You are bigger than the biggest. You are the supplier of all of our needs. We thank You because You make us to lie down in green pastures. You lead us beside the still waters. You restore our souls. You lead us in the paths of righteousness, it is for Your namesake. You lead us through the valley of the shadows of death. Father, we fear no evil for we realize that You are with us. We thank You because Your rod and Your staff they comfort us. thank You because You prepare a table before us in presence of our enemies. We thank You for anointing our head with oil. We thank You for allowing our cup to run over. We thank You because You declare in Your word that surely goodness and mercy shall follow us all the days of our life. So, we ask this day as our shepherd Father that You would lead us in the... lie us down in green pastures, lead us beside the still waters of life. Give our souls

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- restoration and righteousness. Give us the fear no evil but to trust in You. This we pray in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Jenisch."
- Jenisch et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Black, Churchill, Coulson, Leitch, Mathias, and Sommer are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Jones and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 110 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "A quick question. I know we want to get on with the business of the House, but I noticed the end of Session party announcement has been distributed. It doesn't have a date or a time. Is there a reason for that? Or a place."
- Speaker Madigan: "The current party is underway over in the Senate."
- Bost: "I'm sure it is. I am sure it is."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 626.

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

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 626 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. 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 626, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Ryg."

- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 626 amends the State Parks Designation Act to rename the Illinois Beach State Park in Lake County as the Adeline Jay Geo-Karis Illinois Beach State Park. This is in recognition of her years of service, 6 years in the House and 27 years in the Senate. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

  The Chair recognizes Mr. Washington."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."
- Washington: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. In addition to recognizing Senator Geo-Karis for the things she's done in Lake County, I just have to say she's definitely been a role model for me. And there's some issues that we've had to face in Lake County that really were tough and this is one Lady that was consistent and very honest, and to name the park after her is really a small drop in the bucket for the number of years of service that she has given the citizens of the State of Illinois. And I hope our colleagues will agree with us and support us on this Senate Bill 626. Thank you."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

  There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has John Bradley voted? Has anybody seen John Bradley? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 830. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 830 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. 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 830, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 830 simply adds
  Bond County to the Southwestern Illinois Development
  Authority. Be glad to answer any questions. I move its
  passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1028. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1028 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. 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 1028, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1028 allows heat pumps using propylene glycol that is biodegradable to be installed in near well systems. Be glad to answer any questions. I move its passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, on page 8 of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 4676. Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that you heard about before. We've been actually working on this for 2 years and this is now fully agreed by

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

all of the senior advocates and everyone who's been involved actually. This is a Bill that will in a significant way put the definition of 'self neglect' into our statutes. Fortyone states have already done so. And the most important part of the Bill is it came out of the Senate is that we will be creating a new task force within the Department of Aging that will now spend the next year and a half developing a set of protocols, policies, and procedures on how the state can most effectively respond to seniors who are vulnerable and are not taking care of themselves. This has been carefully worked through and I seek your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' 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 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2436. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2436 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."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2436, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 2436 addresses two issues. The original Bill was an initiative of the AARP that deals with some reporting as far as long-term care beds. Also, it adds the provision to extend the sunset date for the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act from July 1, 2006, to April 1, 2007. I'll ask any questions... answer any questions, otherwise I'd like a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor working hard on this and in changing and instead of going for 5 years for an extension to 1 year. However, I stand in opposition to the Bill because I don't believe that we should be extending the Health Facilities Planning Board. There's been numerous articles indicating that this board does nothing more than increase health care costs. There was last year a report by the U.S. Department of Justice as well as the Federal Trade Commission issued a report on competition between health care providers, and it indicated that the Certificate in Need process actually increased health care costs. There's been 24 states that have gotten rid of the Certificate in Need process. We're one of the few states that still has this antiquated process. Just this last week in McHenry County our local hospital Centegra tried to get a... a cardiac treatment center there, which would have been expanding by...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

it would have spent \$1 million to be able to help people with heart problems. They were turned down. So that means McHenry County, which is one of the fastest growing counties in the state, we have over 300 thousand people, do not have a cardiac unit. The argument by the Certificate in Need by the Health Facilities Planning Board was that there was another place within 30 miles from Centegra... or 30 minutes rather, but if you are at one end of our county and need to get to a cardiac treatment center, an extra half an hour is the guestion between life and death. This is a real question that I think that this market should handle and not The Auditor General did a report in 2001 saying that there is little evidence of any positive effect on access to health care with the Certificate in Need process. All it's shown is that it increases health care costs and it restricts access. Our Attorney General has looked at the fact that many of the hospitals that are not-for-profit are not providing free health care or reduced health care. Certificate in Need process protects those hospitals so they don't have to. We ought to get rid of this antiquated Crain's Editorial indicates that the board serves no purpose and that it ought to be... it ought to be getting extinguished, and that was July 12, 2004. There's been other editorials as well in the Wall Street Journal as we say with the Department of Justice, their findings as well. I would ask for a 'no' vote to get rid of this organization that is no longer necessary, drives up health care costs, and restricts access to those who need it most."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Miller: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I just wanted to know some of the reasons why the Amendments and why the change in the… in this Act."

Dugan: "There was concerns that were brought up as far as them in reference to the sunset of the Health Facilities Planning Board. There are some questions and concerns, so we did look at those and what we determined to do is tom the ones that believe, that's certainly proponents of this Bill that believe the Certificate of Need is very important in this state as far as expansion of hospitals. But to do it for 5 years, we felt maybe there was a need to then look at the issue but to throw out the entire process that provides such a positive effect for hospitals throughout this state and the protection of consumers as far as expansion dollars that are spent, we believed it best to just extend it for the short amount of time, and that's where the April 1st."

Miller: "Yeah, similar to the previous Speaker, there was some concerns in regards to the process of getting a Certificate of Need. And so, as far as... I'm in total agreement of changing the date to 1 year. Now, also it added a requirement of a questionnaire. I'm not sure what... what the purpose of that and what... within that year's time what is being... trying to be attained from the information obtained from that questionnaire?"

Dugan: "Yes. That particular part of this legislation was an initiative of the AARP to do reporting to see as far as access to long... long-term beds. It was something that the AARP wanted and, again, it's... it's to report so that they can see if there is a need as far as long-term beds."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Miller: "Okay. So as far as the questionnaire, I assume once this Act becomes effective they'll be able to get it back, be able to analyze the data, be able to figure out whatever they're gonna do within that year. Is that... is that correct? And make recommendations?"
- Dugan: "Yes. The intent is to look at all of the… the access for seniors and home and community and institutions and that type of thing for seniors."
- Miller: "All right. And last question. Does this change any of the… any of the… of the timeline between somebody applying for a Certificate of Need and being able to receive that?"
- Dugan: "No, it does not. Right now... and I also wanted to mention, Representative, also at this time the Health Facilities Planning Board, the rules are being rewritten. So... but no, it will not affect as far as your question is..."
- Miller: "And... and during that time, is the... is where the process of... the length of time of obtaining a Certificate of Need will be determined or it will be examined or be able to help to be streamlined?"
- Dugan: "They are reevaluating the whole process and streamlining the process itself so that if there are concerns or problems as far as the amount time it takes..."
- Miller: "And that's when we can have input at that process, which is right now."

Dugan: "Correct. Correct."

Miller: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Speak."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Bellock: "There was a lot of discussion on this in the Human Service Committee meeting and it was decided that at this time that there definitely needs to be some type of mechanism in place to dispense with the current applications that are before the CON Board. And so, I stand in support of this Bill with the extension 'til April of next year. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
  Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Jenisch. The Clerk shall take the record.
  On this question, there are 105 people voting 'yes', 4 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1892. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1892. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Colvin, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Amendment will be presented by Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson on the Amendment."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Amendment #2 (sic-#1) simply adds the City of Rockford to the River Edge Redevelopment Zone pilot program. It's authorized by Senate Bill 17. This Bill would become law only if Senate Bill 17 becomes law. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Amendment #1 shall be withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Jefferson."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jefferson on Amendment #2."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Senate Amendment...

  I'm sorry, House Amendment #2, Senate Bill 1892, adds the
  City of Rockford to the River Edge Redevelopment Zone pilot
  program as authorized by Senate Bill 17. This Bill would
  only become law only if Senate Bill 17 becomes law. And I
  would ask for passage... adoption of Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendments. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1892, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Bill's now on the Order of Third Reading.

  Mr. Jefferson on the Bill."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Bill adds the City of Rockford to the River Edge Redevelopment Zone pilot program and this Bill will only

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

become law if in fact Senate Bill 17 becomes law... signed into law by the Governor. I would ask for a favorable vote... a favorable vote from the committee... I mean, from..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Durkin. Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the parliamentarian." Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, the underlying Bill is an Amendment to the Consumer Fraud Act and the Amendment deals with the River Edge Development Zone Act. I would ask whether or not... how is this germane to the Consumer Fraud Act?"

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, Senate Bill 1892, Amendment #2 is an Amendment that relates to business economic development. The title of the underlying Bill is 'an Act in relation to business'. Therefore, the ruling of the Chair is that the Amendment is germane."

Durkin: "All right."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jefferson has moved 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. Tryon voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 100 people voting 'yes', 9 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 622. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "Six Bill... 622 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. 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 622, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kelly."

- Kellv: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 622 is the cleanup to the medical background check Act that was passed last year. The main issue is that private medical schools are unable to use the background check system of the FBI. So this Bill would allow the medical schools conduct an inquiry into the State Police's statewide sex offender database for each matriculant as part of the admissions process and the State Police must make the information available to the schools through the database. Secondly, the State Police shall conduct a fingerprint base, Illinois Uniform Conviction Information Act, check of the criminal history records database from violent felony convictions for the private medical schools. I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

  There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Wait voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 789. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 789, has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has Amendment #1 been adopted to the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 789, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 deals primarily with the Illinois Medical District Commission, which is located in my district. They want to be able to put their employees into the IMRF Retirement System and I move for the adoption of that Amendment... I mean, for the adoption of that Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Parke: "One quick question. Is this related to the Illinois Medical District?"

Turner: "That's correct."

Parke: "And it is exclusively in the city limits of Chicago?"

Turner: "That's correct. This particular medical district is located in the City of Chicago. That's correct."

Parke: "And that you are going to add them to IMRF?"

Turner: "That's correct."

Parke: "That's... thank you very much."

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? Has Mr. Tryon voted?
The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence, on page 8 of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 4977. Mr. Scully."

Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. It was an attempt to relieve the ICC of an annual reporting requirement, a rulemaking requirement, and free it up to take certain steps in connection with the electric supply planning. I'm anticipating that the Senator... the Senate Sponsor is going to recede from his Amendment and the Bill will be approved as originally voted upon by this House. I ask for your support for my Motion to Nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor signify say 'aye';

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4977. Mr. Molaro. Good morning. Did you wish to call House Bill 4572? It's on page 3 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4572 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Amendments have been approved for consideration. 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 4572, a Bill for an Act concerning ethics. Third reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you all. This is a good Bill. I'll be brief. This has to do with the Inspector General and basically what it is, when they go out and make a report, by law they're supposed to give it to the Governor's Office. They keep a copy of the report and give it to the director. It also is supposed to remain confidential. So, those three people or three groups that get it have to keep it confidential. Well, it turns out that once in a while, and we don't know who, either employees, whatever, release that information. As you well know, that's a very dangerous thing to do 'cause in the reports it has certain people who actually said things about other people and we gotta keep it confidential. What we found out is that there is no penalty. So all this does is say, if you break this law, which is the law of the State of Illinois, it'll be a Class A misdemeanor."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Molaro, I have one question. There's some confusion over here as to which Amendment is now part of the Bill."

Molaro: "Yeah."

Durkin: "What Amendment are we dealing with that is now part of 4572?"

Molaro: "Yeah, it's just... well, it just was Amendment #1. There was an Amendment out there about giving them badges, but I think Leader Cross and the Speaker wanted to think about that more, so that's not part of this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I have a question on how this works. I know you're talking about who the Inspector General can share the information with."

Molaro: "Right."

Franks: "Right now let's assume, for the sake of argument, that there is an investigation of a state agency, okay, by the Inspector General, whatever agency might be."

Molaro: "Right."

Franks: "And..."

Molaro: "Say DOC for fun."

Franks: "Let's say DOC. And let's say at the same time someone...
the Auditor General is requesting information. Let's assume
that the information is turned over to the Inspector General
by the Department of Corrections. Then if the Auditor
General was to do his job, would he be able to obtain the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

documents that the Inspector General has or would the Auditor General be prohibited from seeing the documents that were turned over by DOC?"

Molaro: "Well, the only way I would answer that... in my Bill it doesn't speak to that. So whatever he could get today he would be able to get after this Bill passed. And also if he couldn't get it, he wouldn't be able to get it. So this Bill doesn't change what he's able to get."

Durkin: "Okay. And... and I'm not sure what the law is on that, I was really asking a question. Because if he can't get it, I think he should because otherwise he would be unable to do his job as Auditor General."

Molaro: "Well... to be quite honest with you, I think he can get it, but then he would be bound by the same confidentially remarks. So I would say that this Bill is more to keep what he's given to the agencies and keep it confidential. So, just like it was DOC and three jail guards said, 'Yeah, my supervisor was doing this or taking money.' If they thought that would be released exactly who their names are, where they work, no one would ever talk to either the Auditor General or the Inspector General."

Durkin: "Because as..."

Molaro: "So I'm agreeing with you."

Durkin: "Because sometimes we have concurrent investigations..."

Molaro: "Right, I agree."

Durkin: "...in different agencies and that's..."

Molaro: "We certainly don't want them to stop sharing. I... I'd check with staff, but I don't wanna to get yelled at that I checked with staff, so. But I think the idea would be

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

that, yes, they would be able to share. Least that's my... my opinion and that's my intent."

Durkin: "Okay, thank you."

Molaro: "You're welcome."

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 109 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2185. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2185 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hassert."

Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2. I want to thank Representative Currie for allowing me put this on this Bill. This simply allows that Water Recommendation... Water Reclam... Metropolitan Reclamation District has some property in Will County that they lease some property to the forest preserve. Right now, they are taxable. This would exempt the forest preserve from paying the tax on the property, which they have done before, and this would maintain their tax-exempt status for the real estate property tax. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2185, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Hassert on the Bill."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Other than the Amendment, the underlying Bill provides for property tax payments. The supportive living facilities are not included when determining their fair cash value of their facility. And my... my Amendment that I just explained is also on the Bill. I'll hopefully be able to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Franks: "Representative, why does the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Cook County own land in Will County?"
- Hassert: "Representative, they have a... approximately 600 acres in Will County. Their one facility is a power plant on the river that they generate power and sell it back to Commonwealth Edison, and then they have a bunch of wetland along the river that is managed by the forest preserve. And this is just taking the wetlands and areas that's part of

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

this preserve that they lease to the forest preserve and making it tax-exempt. I don't know why they own land and they've owned two for quite a few years."

Franks: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear. Who are they leasing this to?"

Hassert: "The Will County Forest Preserve."

Franks: "And right now they're being taxed approximately \$48 thousand a year?"

Hassert: "Yes. Forty-nine."

Franks: "Well, it see... this does not... I understand Will is... is leasing this from another governmental entity, but it seems to me the governmental entity is in a profit-making mode here when they're leasing land, which is surplus, so they probably couldn't use for anything else. And since they're not acting as a governmental agency but actually as a profit maker, why should they be exempt from paying property taxes on land they're making... they're making a income on?"

Hassert: "No, let me explain this a little bit better. The Will... the Water Reclamation District is paying property taxes with their lease for \$1 a year to the forest preserve, they're passing those taxes onto the forest preserve. The forest preserve is using them for public use for forest preserve preservation type land. They have actually a very delicate forest preserve with a lot of endangered species in this one particular area. So they are... the Water Reclamation District is paying property taxes to the tune of about \$350 thousand to the local government entity, so they are paying it for this for-profit on their power plant.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

This is the park that they're leasing back to the forest preserve that's being used for public purposes."

Franks: "So, it's all part of one parcel?"

Hassert: "Two parcels."

Franks: "But this parcel's a separate pin number..."

Hassert: "Yes."

Franks: "...and it's been assessed at approximately \$48 thousand a year in property taxes."

Hassert: "It's about a half a dozen parcels within two pieces of properties... two separate parks along the Des Plaines River.

And yes, this is what's being assessed at right now that the forest preserve is liable for paying under their lease with the Water Reclamation District unless we pass this legislation."

Franks: "If we pass this legislation what would the effect be on the local school districts?"

Hassert: "They... they really wouldn't... they've been tax-exempt. This has been a long convoluted story. We, a couple of years ago, passed a Bill that would allow all of the water reclamation property in Cook County and we didn't realize that they had this power plant in Will County to be tax-exempt. Well, this did affect a lot of local taxing bodies. We passed legislation... 2 years ago I sponsored legislation to put them back on the tax roll. This was the consequences that we didn't realize that their lease with the local forest preserve, we're fixing this untended consequences by putting them back on the tax roll."

Franks: "But right now they are getting that tax money, am I correct? Is it..."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Hassert: "They just started this year."

Franks: "Okay."

Hassert: "They actually have not been getting it for 5 years."

Franks: "Okay, but right now they are receiv... the local municipalities, the schools, the fire, everyone's receiving a portion of this \$48,884."

Hassert: "They would start it back this year. Yes."

Franks: "Okay. So, if we pass this Bill we would be taking money that otherwise would go to local school districts away?"

Hassert: "Well, it's the taxpayers paying the taxes. The forest preserve taxpayers paying the taxes to the school. We're just... it's one public entity to another."

Franks: "Well, I understand. But the net result would be less money for the school district."

Hassert: "There'll be some less dollars to the school district, but they understand that. They... they knew... this wasn't being taxed to begin with so they got this money back into their budget. They were taxed like 10... you know, 5 years ago they were being taxed, we passed this law that exempted the land from being taxed. For the last 5 years we went back and corrected that because this power plant is forprofit and now the school districts are getting this money back, so they're very happy with the situation."

Franks: "Have they... have they weighed in on this?"

Hassert: "Yes, they're fine."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Hassert: "Thanks."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- 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? Has Mr. Smith voted?
  The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there
  are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill,
  having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
  declared passed. Mr. Brosnahan, did you wish to call Senate
  Bill 858? 858. Mr. Clerk, on page 5 of the Calendar, on
  the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears
  Senate Bill 858. What is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 858 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brosnahan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan on the Amendment."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would simply move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 858."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 858, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is intended to apply the current public school background check provisions in the School Code to private schools for their employees. This legislation is intended to apply only to those private schools that seek recognition through the Illinois State Board of Education. The confidentiality restrictions with the respect to the resulting information are also intended to mirror those that are the same as the public school background checks. What we're simply doing here is standardizing a practice that already exists in many private schools. I know of no opposition to this legislation and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, let me understand this. Are we establishing standards for nonpublic schools that are greater than public schools with this legislation?"

Brosnahan: "No, we're simply mirroring the public school background checks and applying them to the... to the private schools."

Parke: "And were the private schools in agreement with this?"

Brosnahan: "Uh, yes, they are. There was no opposition to this legislation."

Parke: "Now, why is the Illinois State Police in opposition to this legislation?"

Brosnahan: "Uh, I was not aware of that. They... as far as I know they didn't put a slip in opposition. No one testified against this Bill. No one from the Illinois State Police

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

contacted me to voice their opposition, so I am not aware of that."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Boland voted? Has Representative Mulligan voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 931. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a third time?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 931, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 931 is the Bill that will help us deal with the nursing shortage in Illinois. I explained this thoroughly the other day and then it was taken out of the record. I would move passage of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 931. 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 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2664. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2664, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scully."

Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like your support for Senate Bill 2664 which makes some changes to the rules before the ICC on the burden of proof for the condemnation of a sewer system by a public body. This... Am... this Amendment to the law will streamline the ability to take a sewer system by eminent domain while preserving the rights of the owners of that system to fair compensation."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, can you tell me what Amendments are on your Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scully."

Scully: "Amendment #3 was passed to the Bill."

Parke: "Is that... become the Bill?"

Scully: "Yes, it does."

Parke: "What happened to Amendment 4 and 5?"

Scully: "I believe Amendments 4 and 5 were withdrawn."

Parke: "I'm sorry?"

Scully: "Amendments 4 and 5 were to the… 5 is… 5 was enacted, 4 was withdrawn."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Parke: "Excuse me. Could the Clerk please tell us what Amendments are on this Bill?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. There is an inquiry from Mr. Parke. Which Amendments have been adopted to the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5 has been adopted to this Bill. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 were tabled. Floor Amendment #3 was withdrawn and Floor Amendment #4 was referred to the Rules Committee. Only Floor Amendment #5 was adopted."

Parke: "And Representative, does that become the Bill?"

Scully: "Yes, it does."

- Parke: "All right. Now, can you explain to us what this Bill does now that it's been amended by #5?"
- Scully: "As amended by #... Amendment #5 adds a provision for a sanitary district in Southern Illinois to also be eligible for these provisions. The substance of the Bill being to streamline the process by which a sanitary district can acquire by condemnation a private sanitary system. There is still a process before... the original Bill was to eliminate review by the Illinois Commerce Commission entirely and strictly rely upon the civil court system. As amended, the Bill will retain the ICC review and supervision. It will streamline the process at that level but also retain the obligation that it has to go through a civil eminent domain action."
- Parke: "Are you... is this applying to all sanitary districts or just the one down in Southern Illinois?"
- Scully: "It applies to the one in Southern Illinois in Representative Flider's district. It does not apply to all sanitary districts. The original Bill was a proposal for a...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

brought forward by the Thorn Creek Sanitary District which is in my legislative district and to do an eminent domain action of a private sewer system at the far south end of my district and between those two parties it is an agreed Bill."

- Parke: "Oh, it's an agreed Bill. Is there any opposition to this?"
- Scully: "I am aware of no opposition. The only opposition that I was aware of was the private sewer system that was go... that may be acquired by eminent domain. They did initially oppose it. They have dropped their opposition."
- Parke: "But again, I want to clarify this. This only applies to the sanitary district in your area. It does not apply to the Illinois... to the northwest area?"
- Scully: "That's correct."
- Parke: "It gives them more power over my municipal governments or... is... does this just apply to water systems?"
- Scully: "We are only... we are only aware of two sewer systems in the State of Illinois that this would apply to. One is the sewer system in my district and the other one's a sewer system in Representative Flider's district."
- Parke: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, this is amexpands the authority of one body over another using the power of eminent domain. I think you need to be paying attention how you're going to vote on this legislation because of... of the controversial nature that we see this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

by voting 'no'. Has Representative Dugan voted? Has Mr. Sullivan voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 66 people voting 'yes', 41 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd just like to ask for a point of personal privilege, if I may."

Madigan: "State your point."

Jefferson: "I'd like to recognize the mayor from the second largest city in the State of Illinois, Larry Morrissey is in the gallery. If he would stand up and take a bow. Let's welcome him to Springfield. Thank you. We're still number two. Thank you, Mayor, and welcome to Springfield. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, on a Committee Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Joint Resolution 134, offered by Representative Soto, and House Joint Resolution 91, offered by Representative Colvin. Committee 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 May 4, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 613."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 627.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Mr. Mautino, 627. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 627 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mautino: 627 is the Veterans' Care Program Act and what this will do is for veterans between the ages of 19 and 64 who've been uninsured for the past six months and are ineligible for VA health care or other health care programs, they will be able to sign up for this. The Amendments have taken the Senate version that came over and have narrowed the Bill to hit the targets of a category eight veteran. And this is a veteran with a lower income level that doesn't qualify, they can't go to their VA. They can't go to the VA hospitals and they're uninsured. The target that we're looking at on here is about 9 thousand eligible veterans. If you have a takeup rate of about a third, we're looking at 3 thousand veterans that have no access to health care because they are in jobs and positions where those aren't offered. will allow them to access health care through their own doctors, their own hospitals. They'll have dental, vision care. And I think it's a benefit that we should afford to all of our veterans. And I'm proud to have any and all of

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

you cosponsor this. The money's in the budget for it. We've got a cost structure of about \$6 million and I think this is the least we can do for those who've done so much for us."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

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

Mautino: "Yep, Mike."

Bost: "Representative, I... and I'm in support of the Bill, obviously. But what I'm needing to know is... is they do not qualify under other programs that we have available at the state, and if so, why not?"

Mautino: "Well, that's one of the things that we put in...

Amendments 1 and 2 took care of the income guidelines.

We're using the HUD Geographic Means Test. So, let me paint you a picture of the veteran who would qualify for this. If he's got a... if he's working for about 14 bucks an hour, he's single, he's returned from service, they don't offer any health care where he's at, he will be able to buy into this program. If he tried to do it on his own, it'd be about \$3 thousand. Using the state benefit package there, we're looking at between 40 and 80 dollars. This is the guy who... who... and the lady who we're trying to reach with it."

Bost: "Right. So, there's... there's a formula based on need?"

Mautino: "Yes. And we put in there to take some of the rulemaking capabilities and list it right in the language of the Bill itself that you have to go to the veteran service officer, you gotta check to see whether you qualify for KidCare, Medicaid, FamilyCare, or any VA benefit. Now, the people who fall out of this are the category eights. If you

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

look on your VA website, it'll show you that these are vets who are above 185 percent of the poverty level. That's why we use the Geographic Mean Test. So, we're looking at about 25 percent income more than that. So, if you're making 30 grand, your disposable income after taxes is gonna be about 24."

Bost: "So... so, they're truly the veterans that falling through the cracks?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill.

I think the Bill's a wonderful Bill and I plan to support

it."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I just wanted to go over the cost a little bit and is it now gonna up to 225 percent of poverty?"

Mautino: "Yes. It'll be 225 percent and that's based at... we needed go over the federal level of 185 percent of the Geographic Mean, and I can give you the chart to show you exactly who that is."

Mulligan: "And will there be only certain points of intake or will it be available across the state depending on wherever that they can get health care and have the service provided?"

Mautino: "That's an excellent question. We have... and I also wanna thank Martin Rue of the LaSalle County VAC. When this Bill came from the Senate we had to restructure it and make

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

sure that our veteran... that our VAC officers in our counties would be one of the points and we would... they would have to go through them for evaluation, as well as our Department of Veterans' Affairs service... service officers. So, they'll have those access, they'll be able to get 'em on the website. And so, in every county your veteran service officer, the guy who you go to when you find a veteran who has fallen through the cracks, will have access to this program."

Mulligan: "Representative Parke is pointing out that the drafting of the Amendment says, 'An amount equal to 25 percent of the poverty level plus an equal... an amount equal to the Veterans' Administration Means Test.'"

Mautino: "Okay. Would you mind repeating that just a little bit louder or a little closer to the mic?"

Mulligan: "I'm sorry. Representative Parke was pointing out..."

Mautino: "Right."

Mulligan: "...the Amendment to me and it reads..."

Mautino: "Right."

Mulligan: "...differently than what I asked you. It says, 25 percent. So, either..."

Mautino: "No. It's... it's..."

Mulligan: "I'm not putting the combination right or the Amendment means something..."

Mautino: "Well, it's... if you'll look... if you read into that line, it is 25 percent on top of the Geographic Means Test that which is the guideline that your local veterans' service center uses. That's the HUD Means Test. It's 25 percent on top of that."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Mulligan: "But you're estimating that would be 225 percent of poverty?"

Mautino: "It could be higher than that and I've got actually a chart by county. Geographic Means Test used by the Federal Government, what that does... it says, if my cost-of-living is cheaper in Spring Valley than yours may be in Cook County."

Mulligan: "Right."

Mautino: "And so, that 125 percent..." or 185 percent..."

Mulligan: "Is based after an income test."

Mautino: "...is different in different areas. Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Mautino: "Income threshold test, not income and assets, income threshold."

Mulligan: "All right. And then, is there any... we had talked in committee about Department of Health and Family Services trying to seek a waiver to get some additional monies or match because Medicaid does not cover them and the veterans' program. I think it would interesting idea for them to go out and seek some kind of a federal waiver to help cover, 'cause I think it's going to be an issue around the country."

Mautino: "I am working... working on that as well. And one of the things in the Amendment that we put in with the assistance of Mr. Rue, Mr. DeWeese, was to make sure that we also have an income component to this. It came over with none, so we're looking at a premium side that I'm hoping can be set in a Medicaid or Medicare eligible line. So, we're looking into that for the premium side."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Mulligan: "All right. So, this is actually going to be an insurance program where they actually in some instances, depending on income and geographic area based on income, they pay in to the program?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay. And that would make them eligible to be insured and get medical services. But my... I still wanna go back to the question. Is this available... will this be available anywhere in the state where a doctor or a hospital is willing to take them or do we have to negotiate this or only in certain areas?"

Mautino: "It'd be under Medic... yeah. It's built and designed under the Medicaid structure so if a hospital is within our... or a doctor..."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Mautino: "...or provider is within our Medicaid program, they would fall into that."

Mulligan: "All right. And so, is this considered a pilot program or a program that would be for this particular income level and if it works well, are we to get a waiver then we could expand it but it's going to be a permanent program as you view the Bill?"

Mautino: "I put language in the Bill specifically to not create an entitlement because I wanna know the cost structure first. In there we have an evaluation period at the end of 1 year..."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Mautino: "...to see whether we have high utilization and what that utilization is going to cost. And I think that's a very...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

this is a program that I hope someday the Federal Government will bump their's 25 percent and cover the people that they should."

Mulligan: "Well, I think our circuit..."

Mautino: "But I wanna make sure that..."

Mulligan: "...breaker program in the past..."

Mautino: "Yeah, not creating an entitlement."

Mulligan: "...has allowed... Because Illinois did a good circuit breaker program, it allowed us to get a pilot program before we went to Medicare Part D. So, I'm not opposed to doing something that might encourage the Federal Government to do something similar. But are you saying there's a sunset date or you're just looking at evaluating it?"

Mautino: "At the end of '07, there's a sunset which I requested on it. It wasn't in the Senate Bill."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Mautino: "But I think that we need to know what it cost and what our exposure is."

Mulligan: "And how it's working."

Mautino: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you very much." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Representative Mautino spent some time with me and explained this Bill to us. I think this is a great opportunity for servicemen that don't have insurance to get insured at a reasonable rate. It's not an entitlement, as he said, it's simply a leg up for these men and women that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

have served our country. I think it's a fine idea and I rise in strong support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Turner: "Representative, I was reading in here about eligibility. Does it make any difference what war you may have fought in or as a veteran..."

Mautino: "An honorably discharge..."

Turner: "...an honorably discharged?"

Mautino: "If it's a great... it's a great question, though, because the veterans will... from ages 19 to 64 will fall into the category of there. But once you turn 65 you are Medicare eligible, so you have your health care coverage."

Turner: "Okav."

Mautino: "So, if you're within that age range... and our younger ones returning from Iraq or Afghanistan, under the Millennium Act from Congress, will receive 2 years care."

Turner: "Okay."

Mautino: "So, I mean, there's... that's your age range and that's the population so any honorably discharged veteran."

Turner: "Okay. If he's an ex-felon, would that disqualify him from any of these benefits?"

Mautino: "No. No."

Turner: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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? The Clerk shall take

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 613. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 613 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Molaro, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment #2. Are there further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 613 has two portions. The first being one that addresses an issue that's very important in my district which has to do with the Village of Hopkins Park and the land that was originally going to be the Hopkins Park Correctional Center which we all know has been... that project has been stopped. My Amendment will allow the Department of Corrections in the State of Illinois to enter into a longterm lease for 99 years with the Village of Hopkins Park, so therefore, my community and the leaders of that community can be part of economic development in their own community. So, that is the one part of the Bill. The other part addresses a tract of land owned in North Chicago and a study to be done. And certainly, if there are any questions on

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

the Hopkins Park part of the Amendment I could answer and Representative Currie on the North Chicago land. So, I will be happy to answer any questions and would like a favorable vote to help the Village of Hopkins Park."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We know... we've clarified our question. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, this prison was never built at Hopkins...

Hopkins Park, you said?"

Dugan: "That is correct."

Reis: "Was there anything done to it at all? Any improvements, foundation work, infrastructure put in place before that..."

Dugan: "There was a..."

Reis: "...project was halted?"

Dugan: "There was a short amount of foundation work done but nothing of any major significance."

Reis: "Now, is the state going to take care of demolition of that or is the City of Hopkins Park going to do that?"

Dugan: "I believe, as this goes forward, we will look... and depending on future development it may or may not come into... to where maybe it even can possibly be used. That part of it we... we haven't looked at yet. This is to at least get the Village of Hopkins Park into a role of true leadership and partnership with the state."

Reis: "How many acres is included in this site?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Dugan: "I'm not sure of the exact amount. I mean it... it was...

I'm sorry, Representative, I'm not sure on the total acreage. I'm sorry."

Reis: "But the whole site is gonna be leased to the city?"

Dugan: "Correct."

Reis: "And you said it's a 99-year lease. How much are they leasing it for?"

Dugan: "One dollar a year."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Mr..."

Dugan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Representative, you mentioned North Chicago. Is that in Lake County, Illinois?"

Dugan: "Yes, it is."

Osmond: "Would you tell me a little bit more about this?"

Dugan: "As I... when I originally introduced the Bill, Representative Currie, who is a cosponsor of this Bill, can explain and answer any questions on that particular part of this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, this is a proposal from North Chicago. There is land that is owned by the Department of Transportation, I think between U.S. 41 and 43. Originally, the department thought they might do a cloverleaf intersection on that site, apparently that plan has been shelved. The hundred sixty acres includes approximately a hundred acres of wetlands and 60 that are

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

not required for conservation purposes. This measure would propose a study by IDOT of the area to establish which lands need... which acres need to be protected. At the end of that study, the City of North Chicago would have an option to buy the remaining acres at a price negotiated with IDOT. And then North Chicago would have to use that land for a public purpose and should they ever decide to sell the land, the land would revert to the Department of Transportation."

Osmond: "So, just so I understand it, who owns it today?"

Currie: "The Department of Transportation."

Osmond: "Oh, I see. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, Floor Amendment 2... or Amendment 2 to this Bill had to do with the Recorder of Deeds Office, is that Amendment on the Bill? Has Amendment 2, that came through the Judiciary Committee dealing with the Recorder of Deeds filing electronically, is that on this?"

Currie: "It's not in the Bill."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say '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 Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 613, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."
- Dugan: "Yes. Again, I think I had my explanation before. I would just like to ask for a favorable vote from my fellow Representatives to... to help us in helping a community that is very poor economically but very prideful in the people that live there. I would like and appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
  Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 106 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 2796. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2796 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Giles, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2796. The Amendment is technical in nature and if this Amendment is adopted, then I can proceed with explaining the various integral parts of the actual Bill."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2796, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 2796 is a very important piece of It is the Special Education Due Process Bill. legislation. What this Bill does is seeks to bring Illinois procedures in line with the Federal Law under the Individuals With Disability Education Acts, with regards to resolving disputes in special education programs. Senate Bill 2796 outlines two general area and I'll briefly go over both of The first one is the update of the general the area. procedures to conform with changes made in the December 2004 reauthorization of the Individual With Disability Education Some of the changes was language regarding the Act. components of the due process requests prior to IDEA 2004. Currently, there was not specific requirement regarding the components of due process requests. This particular legislation make changes and modifications to allow for there to be a due process request. And the request is made among the description and the nature of problems and proposed resolution of the problems. In addition to the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

language regarding the requirements, in a response to a due process request, there were no written response to the due process request and so this legislation will do so. there's a requirement for holding resolution meetings. 2004 required that... that the LEA initiative to a resolution session dealing with the outside presence of a hearing officer to resolve complaints no later than 15 days from the receipt of the complaint, so there are some modifications The other category in which modifications are made is the administration of the due process system that we have here in Illinois. Some of those changes dealing with the training and evaluation entity. We also dealt with the CPS residency issue in which there are a large number of cases in the City of Chicago. This particular legislation would not make cities... a residency issue in the City of Chicago barring from hearing Chicago cases, but it would retain other conflict of interest language so that the best ensure impartiality. This piece of legislation also... this piece of legislation also made certain changes to various section, first one concerning identification evaluation and placement of children with disability. It makes changes in relations the definition the eligible... eligibility to when This... we determination must be made. have worked extensively on this piece of legislation. All parties have been involved. There has been no parties left out in this piece of legislation. And at this time, I ask for the passage of this legislation and stand ready to answer any questions."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

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

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, you... you well know that any time we start looking at any kind of... of changes in administrative rules or decisions concerning special education children we've got a huge constituency that... that gets nervous and one of those is the Learning Disabilities Association of Illinois. They're quite concerned that the state board is making an attempt to leave out or no longer seek the advice of the State Advisory Council on Education of Children with Disabilities. I know that's not the purpose of the legislation. I've talked to the state board. That is not their intent whatsoever, but with your indulgence, I would like to read into the record the legislative intent for Senate Bill 2796."

Giles: "That... that's correct."

Mitchell, J.: "Section 14-3.01 of the School Code establishes the Illinois State Advisory Council on Education of Children with Disabilities, known as ISAC and lays out the constituency duties and responsibilities of ISAC. Moreover, the current version of Section 14-8.02a of the School Code specifically addresses certain ISAC responsibilities with respect to the special education due process system in Illinois. Senate Bill 2796, which among other things, amends Section 14-8.02a, does not in any way change the fact that in those instances where the Illinois State Board of Education determines it necessary to promulgate rules

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

related to the qualifications of hearing officers or the rules and procedures for due process hearings, such rules must be promulgated with the advice and approval of ISAC. Is this the intent of your legislation, Sir?"

Giles: "Representative, that's correct. The intent is not to take ISAC out of the process."

Mitchell, J.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with... with that intent and that point cleared up, I believe we can all vote on a piece of legislation the State Board of Education needs in order to comply with fed... federal regulations. And Mr. Speaker, if I might just steal a minute or two to say that is has been an extreme pleasure as Minority spokesman in Elementary Sec... and Secondary Education to work with Representative Calvin Giles. This Gentleman has been the most fair individual, allowing all parties to have their say, sometimes using... having to wear a striped shirt and be a referee. He has never cutoff the debate during that time. And I've been very, very proud to serve with him and I... I'm going to greatly miss him. So, Calvin, thanks so much for all you've done for education."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Giles has... has done an outstanding job with a very difficult topic here. Anytime you begin dealing with the interests of special education children, there are competing... competing sides. There... there's a very legitimate group that works very hard to make sure that the advocacy for special education children is taken care of. On the other side, there's the issue that Illinois sometimes supersedes or goes

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

beyond what federal rules require, costing school districts a lot of resources. We... we... we've heard this in this chamber before that we need to... to come to a point where we're more aligned with federal IDEA rules and regulations, but we need to do it in a way that's balanced, in a way that takes care of the interests of children. There's no more important area than the due process whenever there's that... that classroom level concern by parents as to where children are going. Representative Giles has worked hard on this to make sure that groups have been represented in a way that takes care of both interests and that's not always easy. And I applaud him for that. This is an outstanding piece of legislation brought to us by a person who has... has really, I guess, refereed or led in a very, very inclusive way the... the Education Committee through a myriad of issues this year where... where there's been a lot of consensus at the end of the day. Whether it's reorganization, less red tape or special education, Representative Giles has found a way to bring people together and bring this Body pieces legislation where there's very, very little contention by the time it gets to the floor. I congratulate him for that, and I want to add to what Representative Mitchell said. Never in Education Committee have we felt like we haven't had our opportunity to have a say and I think because of that we've come up with good legislation. In... in the 4 years that I've been here I found that when we worked together we do good things and... and Representative Giles you've been a big part of that. And I thank you and applaud

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

your style of leadership, you got the job done. This is a good Bill. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Sacia voted? Has Mr. Bost voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2399.

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2399 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."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 embodies two separate issues both dealing with employees, our constituents. The first portion of this deals with apprenticeship programs in labor unions. As we know, there's been a lot of talk around this building regarding this issue for some time. There have been some heavy-handed attempts to tell labor unions how to do their work. There have been a lot of allegations that labor unions are not reaching out to minorities. And this Amendment... in this part of the Amendment will deal with this by simply gathering information. You'll recall that when we dealt with racial profiling, instead of being heavy-handed and

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

going in there and making life difficult for all these people with decisions that we would make without all the simply passed a Bill information, we requiring that information be gathered. That's all this portion of the It requires labor unions to report to the Bill does. General Assembly, to DCEO about who's applying for apprenticeship positions, who's being accepted apprenticeship positions, who is doing the work. also says that no one will be required to seek out this information. So, there's nothing here that requires labor unions to report anything that they aren't already getting. They don't have to ask race; they don't have to ask any of these questions. All they need to do is report the information they have. That's all that portion of the Bill does. The other portion of what the Amendment deals with, classification of employees. I think we all know on this floor intuitively that there are businesses in our state who put people on and call them independent contractors simply so they don't have to pay benefits. They don't have to pay Social Security, they don't have to pay insurance, they don't have to do many things that they do for their employees. The stat portion of the Amendment simply deals with that issue in a straightforward way and makes sure, in the end, that businesses that are actually employing people treat them as employees so that the hardworking people of Illinois get the benefits they're entitled to. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Amendment, the Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, now tell us again what does this Amendment do? You're... you're... you wanna set up some kind of an apprentice program?"

Lang: "No, Sir. This... the... the Amendment... the portion of the Amendment dealing with apprentice programs takes existing apprentice programs that labor unions have and simply requires them to report to the state as to who's applying for these positions. The... the notion is and has been discussed around the building for some time that some of these programs are not reaching out to different minority groups. In fact, the allegation has been that some of them are actually shutting out minority groups. These labor unions must now report to the Federal Government this same information and we're asking that they report it to the state as well."

Parke: "Are you doing this because there's some sense that the unions are not meeting the federal guidelines that have been established to... for minority employees in the... in the apprentice programs?"

Lang: "Some have alleged that, I don't allege that. I just simply say that the best way to find out is to gather information, just as we did with racial profiling. So, we decided rather than us mandating a solution to a problem that we weren't sure existed, that we would just require law enforcement around the state to gather information for our review. That's all this does."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Parke: "Well, isn't there federal guidelines that are established already that the labor unions must comply with?"

Lang: "There are many federal guidelines, that is correct."

Parke: "And aren't they exceeding..."

Lang: "But we... but... but we don't have any jurisdiction over the Federal Government..."

Parke: "No, but our unions..."

Lang: "...or over those federal..."

Parke: "...must comply."

Lang: "Well, they must comply, but we don't have the information here in Illinois for us to determine on our own if there are any... if any state remedy is appropriate or what that remedy would be. Perhaps we will find out there's no problem. Perhaps we will find out there is no remedy. And so, I... this Bill simply requires that basically the same information reported to the Federal Government simply be compiled and reported to us."

Parke: "Well... I mean, is there... is the catalyst for this that...

that there's a sense that they're not reaching the federal
standards that have been established by the Federal
Government for labor unions?"

Lang: "Well, there are certainly allegations that that is the case. We... but..."

Parke: "Then why don't they just... why isn't their claims that...
against the Federal Laws to say that we think that there's...
they're not complying when, in fact, they are complying and
exceeding them. I don't know why this is necessary."

Lang: "Well, Representative, when so many people have argued that there are abuses, when so many people have argued that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

there is a failure of these apprenticeship programs to be all inclusive... these are not arguments I have made, these are arguments others have made... it cries out for at least us getting the information. And that's all this does. This is no remedy, this is no solution, this is no creation of a new problem for us to deal with. This is simply fact gathering."

- Parke: "All right. I'd like to know, with this Amendment on the Bill does this Amendment become the Bill?"
- Lang: "If Amendment 1 is adopted, Amendment 1 will become... no, wait a minute. So, Amendment 1 will become the Bill."
- Parke: "And then are you planning on putting any of the other Amendments that are out there on it to... and will that change it then?"
- Lang: "Amendments 2 and 3 are there in case Amendment 1 fails. So..."
- Parke: "So, you're not planning... if Amendment 1 goes on..."
- Lang: "...Amendments 2 and 3 will be withdrawn if Amendment 1 is adopted."
- Parke: "Okay. All right. Let me... let... does that affect the underlying Bill? Does... is this Amendment 1 affect the underlying... the original underlying Bill in any way other than adding this into it?"
- Lang: "The original underlying Bill is included in Amendment 1.

  And the underlying Bill is one that's pretty much in... was agreed among a lot of different parties and that deals with the prevailing wage changes we made last year requiring contractors on public works jobs to report data regarding their employees, how many hours they're working to make sure

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

they're paying prevailing wage. And it's simply cleanup language that... that the contractors requested. That part of it is agreed, that is in Amendment 1."

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. I believe that the mechanism is in place already that if there is any abuse of the quality apprentice programs that are... trades operate under, that they should file a comp... some kind of a objection through the federal mechanism that's established. But in fact, the trades have either exceeded... I mean, met or exceeded all the federal guidelines or they would be in court. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment. And... thank you, I would like a Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Yes, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Representative, could you tell me the… this fact-finding information that you're looking for… for the… that we say we need for the state, it… is it not so that this information is already reported by the… the union apprenticeship programs and the unions throughout this state to the Federal Government?"

Lang: "As I stated, Representative, it is reported to the Federal Government."

Dugan: "And, so why do we believe that we need legislation to gather information that's already been gathered?"

Lang: "Well, as you know, the State of Illinois has no jurisdiction over the Federal Government or over federal guidelines or over Federal Laws. There are many in this

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

chamber who believe that particular communities of interest, minority groups and women, have not been treated properly by trade unions. Let me point out that I have not drawn that conclusion, but many have drawn that conclusion. And there was some discussion, Senator Jones last year discussed some very strong, and in my opinion, heavy-handed approaches to dealing with this problem, but instead of that, I chose this route. A route which is slow, a route which is let's get the information and then decide if there's a problem and if there's no problem, there won't be a solution needed."

Dugan: "And... and... and so, as you stated earlier, that I heard you state to the previous speaker that the... the intent here is then to gather the information and I think you stated yourself, Representative, to then determine if the state needs to put in a remedy as far as defining... which is what the concern is to define the apprenticeship programs of the unions in the State of Illinois."

Lang: "Well, that is not my intent. My intent is to gather the information so that we, as a General Assembly, can determine if there is a problem. If there is no problem, then we won't have anything to worry about. Most of the trade unions say there's no problem. Fine. But then gathering the information that they already send off to Washington should not be a problem."

Dugan: "To the Bill, Speaker. In all due respect to the Sponsor of this particular Bill, the intent and... and because of the concerns that have been stated and some of the reasons that it has been stated there certainly is reason to believe that this particular piece of legislation is the stepping stone

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

of believing that possibly some in this... in this House believe or some in this state believe that the State Government getting involved in defining the standards of a union apprenticeship program is unfortunately the concern many do have with this particular piece of legislation. is a legitimate concern because of the fact that the information that we're asking for in this legislation is already available to the state, so the state can already get this information and look and then determine if there is a problem. But to put into legislation something requiring a specific career to report, I don't believe that the State of Illinois requires this same type of information in other careers that people may decide they wanna go through to. I'm certainly not speaking on behalf of all the labor unions, but I am an IBEW member. I am a woman that did go through the apprenticeship training program of the IBEW. I went through that training program with minorities and other I understand that some believe there is a concern, women. but to say that it is in the best interests of any union apprenticeship program that has very high standards for the people that they put out into this state to do electrical work and to say that the solution to this is to say that possibly the State of Illinois needs to step in and make remedies to our private union apprenticeship programs would be detrimental not only to the people of the state but the service people the that we provide professionals throughout the state. I.. with all due respect to the Sponsor, I completely oppose this Amendment."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Madigan: "The question is on the Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'aye'; those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 10 people voting 'yes', 84 people voting 'no'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 deals with the other portion of the first Amendment that we had previously discussed with the reclassification of employees. I think we all know, as I said, that many businesses in our state to avoid paying benefits to people who are really employees classify them as independent contractors. That's wrong. These people are entitled to their benefits. I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment 2 is strongly opposed by the business community. They feel that this is not necessary. That it, in fact, makes... puts undue burden on the business community of Illinois. And I rise in opposition to Amendment 2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to this. I've had numerous letters from businesses in my district and around the state that have been operating under the business model of independent contractors. Federal

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Express is probably one of the premier ones that bought an over-the-road trucking company that was set up under this model. And if we adopt the Amendment, what we will be... we will be doing is destroying much of the value that those independent truckers have built up over time. specific runs that they're allowed to market, to hire additional employees for them as contractors. They are not employees of Federal Express. They have built up equity and you will virtually destroy their families' equity if we adopt this Amendment. You'll find that in many other industries around the state. And I think the ... the expansive language of this will absolutely devastate some of the industries in our state. Another message that we're sending to the business community, that you're not welcome in Illinois, you might as well set up across the state borders. You can still provide services to Illinois, but you better be based out of state. This is another bad business Bill. And I urge the defeat of this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We would request a rec...
recorded vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, turn on the... the voting switch for Mr. Flider. Has Representative Hamos voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 12 people voting 'yes', 82 people voting 'no'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor
  Amendment #3 is the... is the apprenticeship portion of
  Amendment 1. I'll leave it at that and move passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, we'd like a Roll Call on this Amendment, and second of all, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, does this become the Bill?"

Lang: "Amendment 3 would become the Bill."

Parke: "And rather than just belabor the point, is there anything additional in this that Amendment 1 did not have?"

Lang: "No, it's exactly the same language for the apprenticeship part of Amendment 1."

Parke: "Then I also arise again that our unions have either met or exceeded the requirements set up by the Federal Government, and that if, in fact, there is any discrepancy on this that they, in fact, should use the recourse that's available through the federal labor laws. I rise in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise in support of Amendment #3 and unlike some of the discussion earlier from one of the questions that were asked in Amendment #1, the intent of this Amendment is just to only find out or to measure the magnitude of the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

problem, that's the best way I can describe it, and that is minority participation lack of in the apprenticeship programs. We've had this discussion for the 20-plus years that I've been down here, and there has been There also has been a substantial some progress made. decrease in the numbers of African Americans that are participating in their trades. The federal requirements at this point does not give us enough of the 'whos' and the 'whys' and so we develop... we support this Amendment because this Amendment tells us who's applied, how many people were admitted to the program, and how many people complete the In no way does this lay out a format where the state intends to take over the apprenticeship programs. We're trying to just get accurate numbers as to assess what the problems are and they vary in different parts of the state. It's quite obvious to those of us from Cook County because we can just look or walk out of our door or drive on any of the interstates and we can see who's working and who's not working but because we're a State Government we do want to try to measure those numbers statewide and we feel that this Amendment will give us the ability to at least determine where we are, what the numbers look like, and from there we can try to assess what the remedy should be. so we ask ... we feel that giving us this data, reporting the data as the programs currently exist, we're not changing the programs, we don't think we're asking much, and we move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanna point out that this is a situation where... absolutely where the state... State Representative Turner points out that it's very important for ... certainly in some of the communities that we represent where there is a dismal number of Africanparticular, American participation in in participation on some of these major public works projects or private projects where the union simply... you know, I find it very... well, the community finds it very difficult to look at it. You walk out of your door, if you live in a certain town or a certain part of our town in Chicago, and the work force does not look like the community by even a small percentage. What this Amendment... the third Amendment does simply is outline that... break it out in terms of how it is that you're gonna be assessing and looking at the number of people of a diverse background reflects on certain jobs, certain unions. I think it's... yes, it's very similar as one Representatives pointed out to the Federal the Government's standards, but it gives us a better and stronger sense and up-close look more intimately here in our state to see how things are moving along with these unions. It's no secret that a lot of the Members of the Black Caucus and Latino Caucus, especially the Black Caucus, has pointed out or have with some of these unions not being fair and including a number of our state's citizens. And so, again, this is a very mild attempt to assist in helping to put everyone a part of the process or a part of a work trade that they can build on their careers and feed their

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

families, as well. So, I would ask and rise here for all of my colleagues to have us support Amendment #3. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

"Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Certainly in respect Dugan: to... to my fellow Legislators in this particular issue and I understand that there are concerns or questions that are being asked, but again, I want to state, this information that we're looking to obtain, we could obtain by making a phone call right now. We could call and get the information... well, and I'm not... and I certainly will work with, and certainly with the caucuses that have an issue with this they believe that possibly they cannot get this information. This information is available. It is already reported. I want to state that I know the concerns and I quess my question would be is, if you wanted to do something, then what you wanna do is you wanna ask the question, not how many minority and women completed the program, what you wanna ask so that we can solve an issue that may exist in certain areas of this state is, why it is that certain ones did not complete or why is it? It has to do with getting into a union apprenticeship program. are very strict requirements and regulations. There are programs that we need to do to make sure that the people, whether you be from a minority, whether you're a woman, whether you're white, it doesn't make any difference, if you wanna be in the union trades, there are requirements to meet and those requirements are there because of the importance. When someone is an electrician, it's a lot more that you need to know besides just tying two wires together. So

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

there are... there's education that needs to be there prior to starting, and that's why the requirements are there. certainly support the Black Caucus and those that have concerns about what we need to do and I have been in the apprenticeship program... I have been in the trades for 27 I have done training programs in my district understanding that the problem is, is we need to get our young adults and we need to get our people ready to meet the requirements of a union apprenticeship program. particular information, as I said, is already available. The concern is very strong. The Sponsor himself said that we get this information and then look at what the state remedy might be for private union apprenticeship programs. That is the fear of this particular piece of legislation. There are other ways to address this. I would certainly be happy to work with the local... the Black Caucus and the others that have concerns as we have done in my district, but again, this is not beneficial to the people of this state and certainly to the union apprenticeship programs that put out very well trained people. So, in all respect, I stand in opposition to this Bill and ask for... this Amendment and ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Washington: "You know, with this particular Bill, 2399, the previous speaker... I appreciate her sentiments and I know her to be very sincere, and I thank her for that. But I guess I wanted to point out that they are two different reality and

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

realities can be always be measured by results. And if you look at the results and you look at the reality and you go by that old cliché 'that beauty is in the eye of the beholder', we're not lookin' at the same thing in the same way. And the results are not there. I would beg to differ that the equal opportunity and equal access is not there. And the reality is not there. And if the previous speaker wishes to really, really, really help and put her vote where her mouth is then we would expect support and give us some credit that we hear the pains and the cries of the constituents we represent and we have really done our homework to know what is the best prescription to lessen the pain and give the patient a chance, either life over death. I urge support for this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

Miller: "To the Amendment. There are two reasons just to contradict some of the previous comments in regards to federal legislation. This helps standardize the federal requirements so we can have some sense of a comparison. Data without a comparison is just simply data given. That's all this does is help provide some sense of a relationship between those who are in the program and those that are not. The other piece is nobody here is suggesting any less of a requirement for any individual. All of us want qualified, highly qualified individuals, to ultimately be in the apprenticeship program and to be eventually on these labor... labor jobs. And so I just wanted to at least stay that... say that and urge support for this legislation."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' 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 46 people voting 'yes', 59 people voting 'no'. The Amendment fails. Mr. Lang. Are there any further Amendments? Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2399, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2399 is now simply the underlying Bill which is agreed language to cleanup the Prevailing Wage Act. I know of no opponents and move passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the Gentleman's Motion and will be voting for the Gentleman's Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
  Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by
  voting 'no'. Mr. Froehlich, has he voted? How about Mr.
  Dunkin? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question,
  there are 106 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This
  Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
  declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 3904. What is the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

status of that Bill? 3904? Make it a House Bill. House Bill 3904, it's on page 3 of the Calendar."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3904 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative... House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan, 3904."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill Dugan: 3904 addresses an issue that we have talked about on this floor during this Session and that is the 24 schools back from FY '02 as far as the school construction grant. We've talked about it many times and ... and we do have these schools. These 24 schools will lose the opportunity that These particular schools are already eligible they have. They did their part of what they were for the grant. supposed to do, which is to pass a referendum. And the constituents in those districts passed the referendum because they needed the school construction and they wanted Unfortunately, the State of Illinois in the school construction grant didn't follow through with their portion of the funding. And so, therefore, what House Amendment #1 does to this Bill is to authorize for bonds to be issued in the amount of 500 in the amount of 500 million to be able to give the grants to the school districts from FY '02. They are going to lose their opportunity if we do not do And I believe most people are aware of this particular situation. So, I'll answer any questions."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig is in the Chair. The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 3904. And on that question, the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Cross: "Representative, can you tell us the funding source in this Bill that will be used to pay off the debt service on the bonds?"

Dugan: "Yes, Representative, the... the funding source for this particular will be the same as it has been in this state for the school construction grants that were before. It looks as though from the impact study I received the ... it would cost... the annual debt range for this particular program for the 500 million would run between 45 and 21 million a year. The way that it's done now, as far as the debt service of school construction bonds, they're paid for by transfers from the School Infrastructure Fund. The fund receives that pays this debt comes from the General Revenue Fund in the amount of 60 million a year. Approximately 75 percent is from the additional liquor tax increase from Illinois FIRST. Five million from the cigarette tax, so there's different funding sources that this comes out of with, of course, the General Revenue Fund having to make up any deficit from these other funding sources. In FY '04, 11.8 million came out of the General Revenue Fund. And 2 million will occur in FY 2006. So, there... there are quite a few funding sources that this program is set up to take funds from."

Cross: "All right. Well... let's... let's make sure,

Representative. Let's all... it's a kind of again like

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

yesterday, this is a political debate, it's a political discussion, it's a political Bill. There's a... it's impossible for this Bill to pass in the Senate. There's a six-day posting requirement. So, we're gonna have a political discussion right now about school construction so we can do a Roll Call. This is a Bill that's going absolutely nowhere. So, let's make sure we all understand that, Representative. But let's talk a little bit about the funding stream. You talked about telecommunication tax. You've talked about the liquor tax. You talked about... Representative?"

Dugan: "Yes."

Cross: "You talked about the cigarette tax, the liquor tax, the telecommunication tax. Those were all taxes that were implemented when we first did school construction. That actually has been a very good program, we would all agree and those taxes are being used to pay off the bonds that we sold several years ago under the original school construction plan, isn't that correct?"

Dugan: "That's correct."

Cross: "That's correct. I mean that... there's no dispute about that. When we... all the other times we've done school construction we've had a designated funding stream... a designated revenue source to pay off the bonds. You would agree with that?"

Dugan: "I wasn't here then, Representative, but I'm assuming..."

Cross: "Okay. Well, you've got..."

Dugan: "...what you're saying is true."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "...you've got a bunch of staff people around you. They can tell you that we had a revenue stream... a designated revenue stream, like telecommunication tax. We would take that money and then pay off the bonds. We did that. You're not gonna dispute that? Is that correct?"

Dugan: "Oh, you're asking me a ques... I... I won't dispute that, Sir."

Cross: "Okay. All right. Let's get this right. The point is when we've done school construction bond programs in the past we had a way to pay off the bonds. That's... that's the truth. Now, along comes House Bill 3904 that has absolutely no chance of passing, and it has no designated revenue stream to pay off the new bonds that would be sold. Isn't that correct? It does not have a telecommunication tax, does not have any type of revenue stream?"

Dugan: "I'm sorry, Representative?"

Cross: "There's no mention in this Bill... God, déjá vu. It's wild. Thanks, Gary. I think now I can ask you questions from yesterday 'cause there's a little order in the House. Well, and this is amazing. All right. Representative..."

Dugan: "Yes."

Cross: "...let's... let's try to clear this up and then we can move on to another topic. There's nothing in House Bill 3904 where money's collected from a telecommunication tax, keno, liquor tax to pay off these bonds. Isn't that correct?"

Dugan: "There's nothing specifically stated as far as the funds for payback of this..."

Cross: "Okay."

Dugan: "...but there are funds available."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "Now, what... what... you have... I think you just cleared it up for us. Go ahead and get an answer, so we can get the political answer so we all hear it. What is it?"

Dugan: "I don't need to get an answer. Go ahead, Representative."

Cross: "There's no new revenue stream in this Bill that would be needed to pay off the bonds that you want to issue in the amount of \$500 million to... under this Bill? That is correct, yes or no?"

Dugan: "No."

Cross: "Okay."

Dugan: "Is there... is there a particular fund you would like to use, Representative, other than the ones that have been..."

Cross: "No."

Dugan: "...used in the past?"

Cross: "My only point is, you've introduced a Bill to... that sounds really good on paper, it's gonna sound really good in the press release, it's gonna sound really good in the political campaigns to let's do school construction, but you don't have a way to pay for it, Representative. That's what's somewhat deceptive, not somewhat, very deceptive about this Bill and disingenuous. 'Cause we have some real needs of school construction, I would agree with that, everybody in this chamber would, it's been a great program. But every time we've done a school construction bond program... every time we've done a school construction bond program, we have had a designated revenue stream to pay off those bonds and this Bill does not. So, that's one problem with this Bill. And... and you've... obviously, you have not

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

disagreed with that. The second part of the problem with this Bill, Representative, is that it will now go over to the Senate if assuming it passed. And it has a six-day posting requirement. We're gonna leave here today assuming that the caucus over in the Senate gets enough new pork to satisfy their desires like what happened over here and then we can move on and... and pass your budget. So, there's absolutely no chance of passing this Bill in the Senate. What is your plan to actually get this to the Governor's desk in the net 24 hours, given the fact that there's a six-day posting requirement in the Senate?"

Dugan: "Posting requirements can always be waived, Representative, which I'm sure you're aware of. And... and I hope that the Senate looks at this particular piece of legislation as I do. There are 24 schools sitting out there that their referendums are going to not do them any good. Some of them have already sold the bonds, some of them have already built the schools."

Cross: "Okay."

Dugan: "And they went with the understanding that the State of Illinois is gonna live up to their end of the obligation."

Cross: "All right."

Dugan: "And we need to live up to that obligation."

Cross: "All right. So, posting requirements can always be waived, you're right. The Constitution, Representative..."

Dugan: "Yes."

Cross: "...the Constitution of the State of Illinois requires that every Bill has to be read three days. Now again, assuming the caucus that's causing all the problems over in the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Senate gets their demands met with more pork and we get out of here tonight or in the morning, how do you propose that the constitutional requirements of a Bill being read three times be met in the next 24 hours?"

Dugan: "I... and... and certainly, Representative, you are correct.

I can assume that possibly maybe the Senate will still be here for three days. And two, if not, we always have the Veto Session that we can have the Senate address it during the Veto Session. We need to get it out of the House. And then if the Senate is able to address it while we're still here this week that will be great."

Cross: "All right. So..."

Dugan: "Otherwise, we have the Veto Session."

Cross: "So, we now have a Bill up here on the board that has no revenue stream to pay off the bonds. We have a Bill on the board that requires a six-day post... has a six-day posting requirement in the Senate, that's not gonna happen. We have a Bill before us that requires a three-day reading over in the Senate and that's not gonna happen. Why are you doing this if it can't pass? Why don't you wait until Veto Session?"

Dugan: "Representative, it... it... One, it's my intent to have this piece of legislation passed. So, I'm not here to not have this legislation passed, it's my intent to. I also have two schools on this list that I know have taken on from a community aspect the obligation that they were required to take on to meet the requirements of this state..."

Cross: "All right."

Dugan: "...to put in the school construction."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "Right."

Dugan: "And they've done that."

Cross: "You know what, Representative, our caucus 110 percent supports the need to pay off those 24 school districts that as a state we promised was... they were due money. We have an obligation as a state. We have a piece of legislation, House Bill 5782, that would take money out of the General Revenue Fund, the growth that we had this past cycle, about \$900 million and that's a revenue growth. That would just take GRF and pay that off. You wouldn't have to... you wouldn't have to borrow money and pay interest to actually pay off those schools. Why wouldn't you support something that would allow just the utilization of GRF money to pay those schools?"

Dugan: "Because these schools, Representative, need to have the money now. They cannot be told again that they need to wait to see as far as the General Revenue Fund going up and then we can pay them their money. I want to... again, and I'm sure you know, Representative, these are General Obligation Bonds paid for out of the General Revenue Fund. So..."

Cross: "So, I..."

Dugan: "...we are talking..."

Cross: "...so, I... All right. All right. Good."

Dugan: "...about the General Revenue Fund."

Cross: "So, you just acknowledged that we're gonna pay off these bonds out of GRF not a new tax. Thank you. Now, what we're saying is... what we're saying is... Representative, what we're saying is you have \$900 million in new revenue growth this year. You could take a hundred and forty million of that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

and pay these schools immediately without borrowing any money at all and not incurring additional interest. Why would you not support that concept, Representative, pay as you go versus borrowing \$500 million and paying interest on the debt? We have a hundred and forty million which is sitting out there versus borrowing the money. Why wouldn't you just pay it, right now?"

Dugan: "Because the funds for these particular schools and the school construction grant program has been in place in this state long before I came. We are following through on the state construction program and we... the money... the bonds that will be sold, again, are General Obligation Bonds that are paid out of the General Revenue Fund of this state. And it is my intent..."

Cross: "All right."

Dugan: "...to proceed in the way that... that you have done on this House Floor ever since you started the school construction program."

Cross: "Okay. The... a couple of distinctions: when we've had a school construction bond program we've had a revenue stream, you haven't done that. Now, let me ask you something. Again, I want to talk a little bit about the utilization of outright GRF money versus going out and selling bonds, borrowing money and having to pay off the debt. You realize don't you, Representative? Representative..."

Dugan: "Yes."

Cross: "Since Governor Blagojevich came into office he has tripled... he has tripled the General Obligation Bonds that we've issued as a state from 7 to 20 billion dollars. So,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

what you wanna do is just add to that by doing this versus the opportunity of just paying off these schools, like we should, out of ... out of GRF. Now, let me... let me... let me make a suggestion. Yesterday in the budget that we passed or you passed with a billion four of new spending, didn't pay our Medicaid bills, didn't put any money into pensions. There was in that budget \$577 million of un... unaccounted pork... unaccounted for earmarks. And then another \$200 million of accounted for pork, meaning \$777 million in yesterday's budget unaccounted for straight money, right in the budget. Why couldn't you take a hundred and forty million of that money instead of creating new pork, hip hop festivals, whatever you wanna call and just pay those schools off instead of having to go borrow money. Why wouldn't you do that, Representative?"

Dugan: "Again, Representative, as I stated earlier, the school construction program... grant program in this state has been in this state and I am proceeding in the same way that it has been done on this House Floor ever since the school construction plan was put into place. And that is way... my legislation addresses it as the grant program as we have always done it."

Cross: "All right. So, you would rather borrow money as a Legislator... you'd rather go sell bonds, pay interest on those bonds as opposed to taking straight money out of GRF that we have as a state and paying schools that we owe money? It's more... it's a better financial approach to borrow money without a revenue stream, pay back that plus interest as opposed to just taking money you have and paying

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

off an obligation that we owe? That's your approach to government?"

Dugan: "My approach is a budget has passed, Representative, and the money for these..."

Cross: "Whoa... whoa..."

Dugan: "...24 schools..."

Cross: "...whoa... whoa... whoa..."

Dugan: "...is not in it."

Cross: "Representative, the budget's not passed. The budget's sitting over in the Senate because there are people over there that want more pork and more money for their districts and they're ignoring that fact that we haven't paid our Medicaid bills, they're ignoring the fact that we haven't paid these schools, they're ignoring the fact that we're not paying the pension. And they have the audacity today over there to actually ask for more pork so they can get their vote. And what we're doing is saying no to those schools that you say are a priority and we agree are a priority because we all want to get more pork to take home to our districts. That's more important than those 24 schools, isn't it, Representative?"

Dugan: "Representative, this House Bill addresses the 24 schools in the..."

Cross: "All right."

Dugan: "...school construction grant, which includes two schools of mine. And I am here to address this Bill and my proposal as to how we go forward with the school construction grant."

Cross: "All right. Representative..."

Dugan: "And that's all."

128th Legislative Day

- Cross: "...let me ask you a couple other questions.

  Representative Currie in... in Revenue said we're not gonna do a school construction Bill this year, there's no revenue stream. Now, she's your Majority Leader. Why do we have a distinction now of introducing and pushing a Bill that, of course, isn't going anywhere without a revenue stream, that's contrary to what Majority Leader Currie said? Why are you doing that?"
- Dugan: "Again, Representative, I have a district that I represent. Two of my schools are on the 24... the list of 24.

  My job is to represent my district and that's what I'm doing."
- Cross: "All right. Let's... as long as we're on this, let me ask you a couple things. I gotta tell you, the 577 million in unaccounted for pork kind of caught our attention... kind of caught, I think, the public's attention. On top of that you add the 200 million. Apparently, there's some MOUs, Representative, memorandums of understanding between you and the Governor's Office delineating and specifying how we're gonna spend that pork. Since we didn't want to put it in the budget, we kind of hid it. Can you tell us when we'll see those MOUs?"
- Dugan: "I don't know, Representative, 'cause I have no MOUs with the Governor or anyone else in this state."
- Cross: "Well, you're gonna about being the only one on your side of the aisle to get an MOU. That's... you better talk to somebody. That's a shame."
- Dugan: "You asked me whether or not you would see the memorandum of understanding and I don't have one, Representative..."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "All right."

Dugan: "...with the Governor or anyone else."

Cross: "Well, let me ask you this. There's no… there's no dispute that your side of the aisle entered into MOUs. And you've got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 staff people over there, can you ask… 10… is that Art over there? Art knows. Come on, Art. Arthur knows. Can you just at least let us know so we can tell the people of the State of Illinois when we're gonna see these MOUs? I mean, this is… we've got a budget, we want open government. Here's an opportunity to tell the…"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross..."

Cross: "...No, I'm almost done."

Speaker Hannig: "...Representative Cross, could you re..."

Cross: "I'm almost done."

Speaker Hannig: "Could you respond... could you debate the Bill, please?"

Cross: "I'm debating pork, I'm debating paying off schools. I'm debating..."

Speaker Hannig: "Could... could you..."

Cross: "I'm debating the state's money. And I'm asking questions about where the money of the people of the State of Illinois is and how we're gonna find out as a state where that money is hidden. 'Cause in the budget it's hidden, Mr..."

Speaker Hannig: "It's... and it's..."

Cross: "...Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Hannig: "...it's not in this Bill, Representative."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "...\$577 million. Five hundred seventy-seven million dollars is unaccounted for in that budget. And as long as we're talking about budgets then we all have a right to know where that money is. And I'm asking her 'cause she said schools are a priority and she wants to pass this budget. And I'm saying, there's \$800 million in pork, let's take that pork to pay off these schools."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative..."

Cross: "Now, what's wrong with that?"

Speaker Hannig: "All I'm asking is that you confine your debate to the Bill on the board, okay?"

Cross: "Well, I'd like to know and you... actually,

Representative, you did the budget yesterday, can you tell

us when we can expect to see those MOUs?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the... as the temporary Speaker, my job is to oversee the debate. I'm, you know... I don't think..."

Cross: "That is really good, Gary. That's a good answer. But as someone..."

Speaker Hannig: "I... I..."

Cross: "...that's overseeing this debate you can assist us in this debate and let us know when as a state we can expect to see those MOUs be released to the public since that 577 is unaccounted for. Assist us, 'cause Representative Dugan can't tell us, 'cause she won't tell us what's going on with her Bill. So, why don't you help us?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, I'm sure that all MOUs will be posted on the Internet at the appropriate time. So, would you like to debate the Bill?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "All right. I'm gonna… I'm gonna… I'm about done. When would be the appropriate time? And then I'll… then I'll finish up with the other one."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative..."

Cross: "Tell me what's the appropriate time?"

Speaker Hannig: "...Representative, that is not an item that I do."

Cross: "All right. Let's make sure... and I... and I, thank you for the time, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We all know what this is. This is political legislation at its best. It's a Bill that has absolutely no chance of passing. It's a Bill... because of purely constitutional and rule requirements. It's a Bill that does not have a revenue stream. It's a Bill that Representative Dugan and other people on your side of the aisle are gonna use for press purposes only, so they can go around their districts and say I was for school construction. We have never in the history of this state done a School Construction Bond Bill without a revenue stream. This Bill does not have a revenue stream. the school... I'll tell you what's really sad about this Bill. We have an obligation to pay those 24 schools. As a state we have an obligation. Just when those schools ought to have a little hope, a little opportunity for thinking that they're gonna get their money along comes Representative Dugan's Bill that is nothing but a... a deception, a Bill that has absolutely no chance of passing. Let's just make sure that everybody understands this is a political scam. It's a Bill that's going nowhere, doesn't have a revenue stream. We had an opportunity yesterday when we passed a budget, you

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

passed a budget on the other side of the aisle, to take some of that \$800 million in pork that nobody knows what's in that pork and actually use that money to pay off those schools. That is a travesty. So, Representative, you did a nice job introducing a Bill that has no chance. You had an opp... nice job of passing or introducing a Bill that... that is unresponsible. You passed a budget yesterday that could have taken care of all this. I... our side of the aisle, I doubt very seriously, is gonna support this. They shouldn't support this. We are not gonna be part of a scam on those 24 school districts or any of the other school districts in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Acevedo."

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I hate to interrupt the debate. But I'd like to introduce Ms. Aurora Venegas, she's a board member for our Latino Caucus Foundation. She's here tonight with her mom... today, her mom Valentina Venegas and her son Michael. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks. Okay. Representative Dugan, would you take this Bill out of the record for a moment?"

Dugan: "Certainly."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, this Bill will be out of the record.

Representative Burke, for what reason do you rise?"

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

128th Legislative Day

- Burke: "I am delighted this morning to introduce to the chamber, again, the Emerald Society of the State of Illinois. The Pipe and Drum Corps of the State of Illinois, the Emerald Society. Ladies and Gentlemen, they'll be joining us momentarily."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Acevedo, for what reason do you rise?"
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Acevedo: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just so you know, the Emerald Society was here today... visiting today because in honor of the police memorial today. You know, sometimes we come down here and we forget that we... we have the toughest jobs in the world and we forget about the brave men and women who are out there 24 hours a day protecting us, making sure our neighborhoods and our communities are safe. You know, a very good friend of mine 4 years ago, we worked together in the same unit along with myself and Senator Munoz, was killed in the line of duty. His name was Donnie Marquez. So, we're here today to honor him and all the other fallen brothers and sisters in the Chicago Police Department, throughout the State of Illinois and throughout the United States of America. So, in honor of their memory and in... in respect to their memory please let's have a moment of silence."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Acevedo.

  Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

128th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 18(g), I move for the discharge of House Bill 5782 from the House Rules Committee.

  Under House Rule 54(b) all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 any vote shall be by record vote whenever five Representatives shall so request. There are at least five Represent... or Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge the Amendment from the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, the Gentleman has moved to discharge... is it the committee? This requires a unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I object to the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, the Gentleman objects and so the Motion is lost, Representative."
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 5782 from the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Could you restate the Motion? I'm sorry, I didn't hear it."
- Eddy: "Yeah, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 5782 from the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, then Mr. Clerk then the Gentleman's Motion is to overrule the Chair. And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor of sustaining the Chair should vote 'aye'; those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

128th Legislative Day

- Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 43 voting 'no'. And the Chair is sustained. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 835. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 835 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. However, a land conveyance appraisal note request has been requested by Representative Bost and not yet filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley, J.: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 41, I move that the note, the land conveyance note, rule be suspended as it is inapplicable to this piece of legislation."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion, this requires 60 votes. Representative Durkin."
- Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a Roll Call vote. And..."

  Speaker Hannig: "Yes."
- Durkin: "...I just wanna make it perfectly clear that what we're voting for is to waive the note which is a... on a land conveyance, waive the land conveyance note on a Bill which is a land conveyance, correct?"
- Speaker Hannig: "So, the question is, 'Shall... So, the question is, 'Shall the rule be suspended and the note be ruled inapplicable?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 43 voting 'no'. And

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

the… and the Motion prevails and the rule is suspended. So, Mr. Clerk, move this to Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 835, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "This is a Bill that makes a simple technical change to the annexation statute. Currently, a municipality can annex across a forest preserve, but it technically doesn't say that you can annex across a wildlife refuge. Maybe you can, maybe you can't, but this would clarify and allow a group of people that want to be annexed into the City of Carterville. They came to the City of Carterville. This is their request, this is what they want. It's simply a voluntary annexation at their discretion. They don't have to do it, but it will allow them when they want to to do this. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "So, the Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 835. The Calendar indicates this is on Short Debate. I would suggest Standard Debate? Let's start at Standard Debate. Representative Winters is recognized."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Winters: "In this Bill, is there any kind of restriction on distance from a municipality? The way I understand it, if a municipality borders a national wildlife refuge and they annex the refuge they could then go on to..."

Bradley, J.: "Well, no you can't… you can't annex…"
Winters: "You… you don't even have to annex the refuge?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Bradley, J.: "So, current... currently as the law stands, Representative, is that a city, and in most of the time it occurs in Chicago and the suburbs, the city can go across the forest preserve. That way you don't actually disturb the forest preserve, but you can get contiguous land on the other side of the forest preserve. Now, in Southern Illinois we don't have forest preserves, we have like wildlife refuges. And so it's simply... it's really just a technical change. And the... the statute itself remains the same except for adding the words 'wildlife refuge'."

Winters: "Well, it may be a question of scale. How big are some of these wildlife refuges?"

Bradley, J.: "Well, you know, wildlife refuges are like forest preserves, they can vary in size. The area that we're talking about is not really a... a big jump."

Winters: "What?"

Bradley, J.: "It's not really a big jump, the area we're talking about."

Winters: "Well..."

Bradley, J.: "And it's what the people of this area want. It's within Williamson County, it's serviced by the Carterville School District, it's serviced by the… by the Williamson County Fire Protection, it's serviced by Williamson County Police Protection. The kids go to the City of Carterville School District. It's completely voluntary. They wanna be part of the City of Carterville, they got the services already."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Winters: "Well, it looks to me on the map that I have in front of me that one of the… one of the boundaries here is a county line, I believe?"

Bradley, J.: "Well, there's a county line on the other side going the other way further, yeah."

Winters: "Okay. But what... what you got... and it looks to me like... and I don't have a scale here on this map to really tell me, but it looks like at least the portion of Crab Orchard Lake Wildlife Refuge that I can see is quite extensive."

Bradley, J.: "Well, it... but..."

Winters: "Could you give me a range? It is 10 thousand acres?"

Bradley, J.: "Well, the wildlife... the majority of the wildlife refuge, and this came up in committee and I don't have the exacts, but the majority of the wildlife refuge is south of the area that we're talking about."

Winters: "Okay. But the lang..."

Bradley, J.: "What we're talking about..."

Winters: "...the language is that..."

Bradley, J.: "...we're talking about a finger here."

Winters: "Okay. But the language is that any contiguous land to this wildlife refuge can be annexed..."

Bradley, J.: "Well, it... it changes..."

Winters: "...by the municipality."

Bradley, J.: "...the annexation statute to allow in addition of forest preserves, wildlife refuges. Practically speaking, the only area that I anticipate or anyone would anticipate being impacted would be this one particular..."

Winters: "But we... we don't ... "

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Bradley, J.: "...area."

Winters: "...we don't pass state legislation that looks at a current situation. Or we... we can do that and restrict it to a township, we can restrict it to a particular parcel. But when you draw the general language, which this Bill has, it not only deals with Crab Orchard Wildlife Refuge..."

Bradley, J.: "Well..."

Winters: "...but it deals with the other seven ... "

Bradley, J.: "...this..."

Winters: "...wildlife refuges. It makes any wildlife refuge applicable to this law."

Bradley, J.: "I..."

Winters: "Let me... let me complete the thought. And it also doesn't restrict it..."

Bradley, J.: "Well..."

Winters: "...to any contiguous land next to the wildlife refuge becomes eligible..."

Bradley, J.: "Forest..."

Winters: "...for annexation."

Bradley, J.: "...forest preserves aren't restricted."

Winters: "Well, how big..."

Bradley, J.: "Do we have restrictions on..."

Winters: "...are most forest preserves?"

Bradley, J.: "...on forest preserves?"

Winters: "Are you aware of most of the forest preserves in this..."

Bradley, J.: "Are you telling me that there's not a forest preserve somewhere in this state that would be the size of a wildlife refuge?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Winters: "You haven't yet told me how big the wildlife refuge

is. But if I know..."

Bradley, J.: "Well, I don't know the..."

Winters: "...the scale..."

Bradley, J.: "Are you telling me there's not a forest preserve

in this state that's the size of a wildlife refuge?"

Winters: "I don't believe there is."

Bradley, J.: "Okay. I don't know."

Winters: "There is not. I... I was on a forest preserve commission in Winnebago County. Our average forest preserve was probably a hundred and sixty acres, a quarter square mile. This looks to me, if I'm looking at it... and I don't know exactly what the scale. It looks like a five, six, seven miles across and it goes off the edge of my map, it goes off the edge of these two maps. You've got seven others scattered all across Southern Illinois. So, that the potential annexation for any municipality that touches or gets to touch one of the wildlife refuges is virtually unlimited."

Bradley, J.: "No, I... I..."

Winters: "It is virtually unlimited."

Bradley, J.: "...I..."

Winters: "Why didn't you draw the legislation..."

Bradley, J.: "We can..."

Winters: "...for a specific case?"

Bradley, J.: "...we can... we can disagree over that."

Winters: "Well... and... and we do. I think you're..."

Bradley, J.: "We can... we can disagree... I don't wanna argue with you all day. We've been here all Session. We disagree on..."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Winters: "Are you getting worn out?"

Bradley, J.: "We disagree on that point."

Winters: Well, the easy way is to pull the Bill from the record."

Bradley, J.: "That's not gonna happen. All right?"

Winters: "I made an offer. I mean if you wanna end the debate, we can just pull it from the record."

Bradley, J.: "I'm trying to be polite because I don't wanna stand here and argue the same question with you all day.

But I'm not gonna pull it out of the record."

Winters: Okay. But what we've established is you have a very broad, drawn language."

Bradley, J.: "No, what we've established is I've made a technical change to a statute that affects a very small group of people that this is what they want..."

Winters: "It's... it's... it... it's..."

Bradley, J.: "...and this is..."

Winters: "...it's not a technical change."

Bradley, J.: "...and unfortunately, this has become a local fight, which is silly. This is what these people want in this particular area. We oughta be able to give it to 'em. And I can't believe there'd be opposition to trying to help local people make local choices."

Winters: "Well, I believe there are local people that wanted to go the different direction. There are other people on the other..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters, I've been running the 5-minute clock and maybe you weren't paying attention. So, could I give you another minute?"

128th Legislative Day

- Winters: "To the Bill. Members of this chamber, realize this is not a technical change. This is a huge expansion. What we're dealing with thousands upon thousands of acres across Southern Illinois that now are available for annexation to any municipality that can get access to a... to a boundary of the wildlife refuge. They may be able to go 10, 15, 20 miles away and annex a little resort. It might be an industrial site, they don't... they aren't... in this case they may be offering the... the municipal powers and municipal services, but in every other case they may just wanna grab a particular parcel to block another community, to grab some high value real estate. It's a lousy, absolutely lousy example of what we can do as a state. We have a lot of power, but we can hurt local people. In this case it's not the locals wanting this. It's some locals wanting it and some vehemently opposed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Could... could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"
- Winters: "Thank you. Again, it's a bad idea. I urge you, look beyond your own neighborhood and help defeat what is a... is an incredible expansion of state powers. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, we'll move this from the Order of Standard Debate to unlimited debate. Okay? Representative Pritchard, you're next on the list. Okay. Rep... you yield your time to Representative Winters, is that correct? Okay. Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to watch the time this time and use every last second of it. Again, this is as if you had two neighborhoods and they can't agree on a...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

an open parcel. One of 'em gains an advantage through this State Legislature. The idea that you can come up here if you've got a small community that... that can see a way to screw their neighbor, which is what is happening here, the neighbors don't want it to happen. The neighbors are vehemently opposed. You're crossing county lines. You're ... draft the Bill a little bit more realistic. Draft it so we have a... a distance limit. Maybe it could be a half a mile, maybe it could be a mile. That's something that we can discuss, we can agree to a compromise. But the broad nature of this Bill, that's what sticks in my craw is the idea of the broad nature. Again, we think that some of these wildlife refuges, I haven't had a chance to look at atlas, but some of these are 20 or 30 thousand acres. How... how much power do we want to give municipalities? It's not a little forest preserve. All of us in the northern part of the state are familiar with forest preserves. You can walk across it in, you know, 20 minutes, 30 minutes you get to the other side. Okay, that makes some sense. But what we have here is a huge, huge expansion. I'll be back. Bill has been on the Calendar for weeks, it has never been called until the Representative... Representative Bost, who represents a neighboring contiguous district, is not here. Now, why can't you call the Bill when there's a chance on the floor to have a debate between the proponents and the opponents with the local knowledge, with the mayors that have talked to them, the neighborhood associations, the aldermen who are very much concerned with this? Why do you wait until the major opponent has no opportunity to speak on

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

We would, by the way, in the event that it might reach Constitutional Majority, would request verification. But again, this shouldn't even reach that majority because of the increme... extreme expansion of the powers of municipalities. A wildlife refuge, federally controlled... the state doesn't even control how big federal refuges are. We do control if a county forest preserve decides that they want to go crazy and start annexing across county lines, they want to start expanding their size, as long as they can get bonding authority, they... they can be reigned in by this State Legislature. The federal wildlife refuges, however, cannot be reigned in by us. So, why are we now giving municipalities the opportunity to use that as a... as a stepping stone, as a leaping stone, as a gigantic power grab... a land grab when we don't even control the size of the federal wildlife refuges? The idea that you can give a municipality in the face of opposition... in the face of another municipality saying we don't want this, and then turn around and give them, the first municipality, the opportunity to jump across thousands of acres of open land and serve... serve a neighboring parcel. And there's no recommended... there's no requirement in this that they actually offer any municipal services. They can just see it as a... as a tax grab that they see a high valued parcel, they don't give them any services. Now, this... in this specific case if they do, then write a leg... piece of legislation, write a Bill that deals with a specific problem. Don't make it statewide as this one has and reach, overstep, grab... it's a huge land rush. This is almost like the Oklahoma land

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

rush. When we pass this Bill any municipality at all close to a federal wildlife refuge... and there's ones within 30 miles of Springfield, to the west of us along the Illinois River. If there's a municipality next to 'em, it's like line up the wagons, fire off the gun and you can go after as much land as you can swallow, get that... get that tax revenue into your case against the opponents of the neighbors. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Bradley, are you indicating you want this out of the record? Okay. Out of the record. On page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, is House Bill 4173, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. The underlying Bill had to do with an election reform measure that would prevent name changes leading up to an election. There was some Amendments put up... on the Bill in the Senate, which we believe would preclude ultimate passage of this Bill. We're gonna move to nonconcur. I have an understanding that the Senate will move to recede from their Amendments so we can get this Bill to the Governor's desk. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4173. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs. On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 2762. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2762 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2,

128th Legislative Day

- offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll just take it out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 2049. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2049 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Dugan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, there... I understand there's 3, 4 and 5 on... on this... So, Mr. Clerk, we're gonna withdraw Amendment #3.

  Any further Amendment?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Mr. Clerk, withdraw Floor Amendment #4.

  Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Osterman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osterman."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #5 becomes the Bill. And this legislation allows the Public Building Commission in Illinois to... the ability to use design-build method and construction of public buildings in Illinois. Amendment #5 includes language similar to Senate Bill 766, which passed last year dealing with the cap... Capital Development Board state projects. The language outlines an open process for advertisement of projects and the selection of contractors.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Groups that had been opposed to this legislation in the Local Government Committee are now in support. This legislation gives the ability for the Illinois Public Building Commission the option of using design-build and construction of schools, police stations and other public buildings. I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Rep..." Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Parke: "Representative... Okay. Representative, is the... I can...

because of the light behind you I have trouble seeing you.

Is the underlying... have the Amendments changed the underlying Bill much?"

Osterman: "It does, I think, in a significant way, Representative Parke. When this Bill was first heard in Local Government, a number of groups came out in opposition. Groups that had been working last year to pass Senate Bill 766, which outlines a number of criteria involved in the advertisement of procurement. We have since adopted all that language, Representative, and all of those groups are now in support. So, the Members of the Local Government Committee heard the opposition. This Bill was heard in Executive, but everyone that was in opposition is now in support and they have a comfort level with this legislation."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Repres... Representative Osterman."

- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Simply would ask for an 'aye' vote. This will give the Public Building Commissions in Illinois the option of using design and build, which will hopefully help them in the construction of public buildings throughout the State of Illinois. And I ask for any 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2049. And on the question, Representative Verschoore is recognized."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

- Verschoore: "Representative, I voted for this to come out of committee, but I had a question on labor. Is labor supporting this Bill?"
- Osterman: "Labor had reached out to me, the AFL-CIO, and I explained to them what the underlying Bill did. They since have not gotten back to me and I don't expect that they are in opposition to this. So, they have not called me back and said they're in opposition. They didn't ask for any specific Amendment changes. So, I would think that they are

128th Legislative Day

- neutral or in support. But they've not voiced an opinion, one way or the other."
- Verschoore: "Well, it's my understanding that labor is against this."
- Osterman: "I... can you repeat that, Representative?"
- Verschoore: "I said, it's my understanding that labor is against this Bill."
- Osterman: "That's absolute news to me. And... and not one person from any organized labor organization came to me. AFL-CIO called, I explained to them what the intent was. We put the subsequent Amendment on and they... no one has come to me and said otherwise. So..."
- Verschoore: "Well, like I said, I think labor is against it.

  And I'm asking people a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then, Representative Osterman to close."
- Osterman: "I'd appreciate everyone's support of this legislation and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes' and 59 voting 'no'. And Representative, that's not enough for Postponed Consideration, you need 47. So, the Bill fails. On the top of page 6, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 1684. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1684 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brady, do you wish to do the Amendment? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, which becomes the Bill, Senate Bill 1684. Which simply has been a long process, but is the Missing Persons DNA legislation, which this chamber voted for, but for a variety of reasons, some changes occurred to it. Basically, those changes center around making the particular piece of legislation subject to appropriations and some technical changes with the wording regarding a time frame with the State Police and the entering in of the data of the missing person's DNA file. I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding the legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I ask for a 'yes' vote regarding Senate Bill 1684, which has now become the Missing Persons DNA legislation of which we have been working on this entire year. It's an initiative of the U.S. Justice Department.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

It is supported by the State Police at this point in time. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 2295. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2295, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mathias, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Hultgren I think there's a number of Amendments. Do you wish to… what is your pleasure on #3?"

Hultgren: "I'd like to..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay..."

Hultgren: "Okay, we want to move..."

Speaker Hannig: "...excuse me."

Hultgren: "...to adopt Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Hultgren: "We had... on three... we want to adopt #3."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2295, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "This is a clarification in regards to disclosure of records of patients by physicians or dentists when there's a subpoena that's been issued. This is agreed discussion by the Medical Society, by the Dental Association, so I'd ask for the support of the Members."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2295. Is there any discussion? Then... okay. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Franks: "I'm looking at our analysis and maybe you can clarify.

Was House Amendment #2 ever adopted?"

Hultgren: "No, it was not. We can check with the Clerk to make sure, but my understanding is it was not."

Franks: "What Amendments have been adopted on this?"

Hultgren: "If I could ask the Clerk to clarify that."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Mr. Clerk, would you clarify which Amendments have been adopted?"

Clerk Bolin: "Two Amendments have been adopted to the Bill.

Committee Amendment #1 was adopted and Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted."

Franks: "Thank you. Could you please describe Floor Amendment #3?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Hultgren: "I can do my best. Again, this is Representative Mathias who had introduced this Bill and was more directly involved in it. Actually, if I could have just one moment, 'cause... I wanna make sure that I get it correct."

Franks: "Thank you."

Hultgren: "Thanks for your patience. This was... Floor Amendment #3 is in addition to the Bill. It was requested by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations to be able to clarify really what their responsibility is as far as disclosure of records when there is a subpoena that would affect... affect them. So really, my understanding is it's a clarification by the department of responsibilities that they would have when a subpoena is issued in a case. Again, the rest of the Bill has been agreed to by the parties that would be involved in this: Medical Society, the dentists, that... But this was the request of the department as far as clarification of what their responsibilities would be."

Franks: "Thank you very much. I appreciate your indulgence."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Joe Lyons, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Osterman, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're going to return to Senate Bill 2762. Representative Rita is the Sponsor and Mr.

128th Legislative Day

- Clerk, read that on Second Reading. This is on page 7 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 2762."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2762, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2, which, well, will become the Bill, has language that clarifies a Bill that was passed last year that would allow students in 9th grade through 12th grade be eligible… excused from physical education class. And what House Amendment #2 would do is just change 9 through 12 to grades 3 through 12. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you. House Amendment #3 which would... it would just clarify that it would have to be part of their IEP plan to be pulled out of the physical education class for tutoring. It just clarifies it and makes it that it has to be part of it even though it states it in House Amendment #2."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2762, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2762, as amended, as I stated when we were doing the Amendments that it would allow children's grade 3 through 12 to be pulled out of physical education class to get special tutoring as long as it's part of their IEP program."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 2762. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Molaro: "Never mind. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Verschoore, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Winters: "A question of the Chair, if I could. It's a little chilly in the chamber. I wondered if you could ask the Emergency Management Agency if they have any supplies of blankets that they could send over to the House chamber. There is a winter storm warning issued for central Springfield, I believe, also."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia, for what reason do you rise?"

Sacia: "A point of personal privilege, Mr..."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last week, Monday, many of you participated in a benefit for Fritz Kanady. Fritz is Patty Lindner's secretary and she's really a wonderful lady. You really raised a tremendous amount of money for her and she wanted me to express her sincere appreciation for that. You really turned out, staff and Representatives alike and really helped her along the way. And I know she is so very, very grateful for all of this, not only financial support but just support with hugs and expressing your concern to her. And I just wanted to share that with you and I believe Representative Lindner wants to say something as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Lindner: "I want to thank Representative Sacia. I hear he was a fantastic auctioneer and really hung in there for the three or four hours it took to auction off all the gifts that everybody gave. And Fritz did say this, 'I can't just seem

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

to be able to find the words to express how grateful I am to all those who attended and purchased items from the auction. You are all so wonderful. Thanks again, and may God bless all of you.' And thank you all for helping Fritz. She is a wonderful person and a great secretary to have."

- Speaker Hannig: "On page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, Representative Stephens, you have House Joint Resolution 15."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HJR 15 started out in the House as naming Route 162 in Troy the Paul Simon Parkway. This... the Senate decided to add the local interstates to the tune of about two miles in every direction. I'd move its adoption."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in the Senate Amendment to House Joint Resolution #15. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment and the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative Stephens. Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the Body's attention. This will be the first parkway in Illinois that is designated with a symbol that is recognizable throughout the United States. Paul Simon and his bowtie are legendary and we thought we would be appropriate to put the symbol of the bowtie on the signage. Thank you."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "On page 9 of the Calendar, we're gonna go down the Order of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 119, Representative Ryg. I understand there's an Amendment on this, Representative."
- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 1 expands the proposed task force to include representatives from statewide child advocacy and parent/teacher organizations and clarifies that meetings of the task force will be open to the public allowing nonmembers of the task force to provide input."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor

  Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Representative

  Miller on the Amendment."

Miller: "Yeah, one question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady will yield."

- Miller: "Representative, we talked about making sure that advocates on educational funding was included in this. Does this Amendment address that issue?"
- Ryg: "That was actually addressed in the original language.

  There will be three at large members appointed by a national or regional association with expertise in school fiscal and/or accountability issues."

Miller: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. And now on the Resolution, as adopted, Representative Ryg."
- Ryg: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Joint Resolution creates an accountable school

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

task force charged with making recommendations to improve and stabilize the fiscal and performance accountability of the state's school districts and individual schools. report to the Governor and General Assembly will be required later than January 8, 2007. The task responsibilities are to evaluate existing fiscal performance accountability systems, identify costs mandates, recommend a fiscal assessment process including criteria for evaluation of current fiscal practices and determination of adequacy and efficiency of controls and to recommend methods which provide transparency and are understandable to parents and taxpayers. Members of the Education Committee request a consideration of a variety of issues and were assured by the representatives from the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus who initiated this Resolution that their concerns would be reviewed. Education funding and accountability are measures that should be considered hand in hand, and leaders of our communities are asking for that process to begin. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 119. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Miller: "Representative, you talked about accountability in school funding. What tangible evidence of accountability will come out of this Resolution, if any?"

Ryg: "The task force is charged with reviewing current practices and making recommendations that would provide increased

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

accountability both in fiscal and performance measures. The proponents of this are the local, I'm sorry, the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus. We have the support of the Illinois Municipal League. These local community leaders believe that we... the state has to do a better job with education, but they also believe that as we look at funding reforms we have to consider accountability measures to be fair to the taxpayers."

- Miller: "Well, I'm sure accountability in Chicago schools versus possibly northern schools versus downstate schools may all be different. We talked about consolidation of school districts, has been one of the recommendations, I believe, from EFAB and other... other studies have been out there. How is that gonna all kind of relate into this accountability study, the differences between regions?"
- Ryg: "The task force will be comprised of representatives from across the state. And so those differences from various regions will be the subject of the discussion and the recommendations will reflect that we rec... and the group recognizes that there are inequities in our current system."
- Miller: "At the end of the day is there gonna be any sense of a standardization of what accountability is from this study?"
- Ryg: "That's the charge of the task force to make that recommendation."
- Miller: "So... so we don't know... so we don't know... so they're trying to find out a standardization model of accountability? Is that a... is that a yes?"
- Ryg: "You know I'm unable to speak to the end result because what we're asking for is the establishment of the task force

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

to do the study, look at the accountability measures in relation to the criteria and make a recommendation back to us."

I stand in support of the "To the Resolution. Miller: Resolution from the perspective as a proponent and Chief Sponsor to House Bill 750. Many of the critics of the legislation will talk about we need greater accountability in our school districts. I would agree and hopefully that this study signs... or finds methods of accountability so that we can finally get to the solution of funding our education system that is broken here in the State of Illinois. There's been study after study after study after study that addresses this problem. So if this is just gonna get one excuse out of the way for those who can hopefully try to support a meaningful comprehensive legislation piece of reform... a reform piece of legislation, I'm all for it. But I think that at the end of the day those critics are still gonna have a reason why not to support and do the right thing to equitably fund our schools. So I would urge all votes on this to support this and as long as the dialogue goes on, on accountability, let's make sure that we funding mechanism that continue the is broken here... discussion on the funding mechanism that is broken here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative... okay. Representative Ryg to close."

Ryg: "Thank you. That is the purpose of this task force is to ensure that the studies that have been undertaken are now reviewed in a comprehensive way. And, again, there was a

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

commitment made with great feedback from the Education Committee to look at this hand in hand going forward to look at how we're funding education in the State of Illinois. So I believe this is a comprehensive approach. It brings in community leaders who recognize the importance of education in their roles as municipal leaders. So thank you for the opportunity to get your input so that we can get this information to the task force, they can do their work. We have a short time frame but I think that speaks to the urgency of the issue and I ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Durkin, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no' and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Dunkin: "It is... I'm not sure... I'm not sure if it's just this section here or this row or this area, it is quite frigid on this end here and some of us don't have a lot of hair, Mr. Speaker. So any assistance or adjustment you can work out, people like myself, Mark O'Brien, Joe Lyons, let's see here. We would appreciate it. Oh, Will Davis. Who else? Tim Mapes? No. Thank you, Sir. I used your name in debate, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, is House Resolution 1063, Representative Sullivan. I understand there's an Amendment, Representative, on the Resolution. So the Gentleman moves for the adoption of House... of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And that... is there any other... any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, on the Resolution, Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you. House Resolution 1063 simply asks the department to track previous residency history for people that have applied for the All Kids... All Kids Program. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Acevedo, you have House Resolution 1146. Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1146 directs the Auditor General to conduct an audit of the Pilsen Village Community Mental Health Center. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1146. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Mulligan: "Representative, isn't it unusual for the Auditor General to conduct an audit of a nonstate entity?"

Acevedo: "Representative, this entity is... does receive state dollars."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Acevedo: "A quite... quite... quite a bit."

Mulligan: "Usually, when you receive state dollars you have to provide some kind of an audit of the money that you have received and how you've used it. Are they not doing that?"

Acevedo: "Right. Representative, actually, this Resolution calls for a reaudit because it was approximately 8 years ago the Auditor General did an audit on this mental health center and it was found that maybe, possibly \$2 million was misappropriated. And all we're doing, I've been receiving letters in my office and phone calls stating that there might be some other activities occurring with state dollars. And that's exactly what I'm trying to do, to protect the state funding."

Mulligan: "All right. So what you're saying is, they've received state funds, the audit they provided to the state is not adequate. There seems to be something wrong there and you'd like the Auditor General to do another audit just to see what's happening with the funding."

Acevedo: "Yes. I'm sorry."

Mulligan: "Thank you. That's okay. It's a long week."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- McAuliffe: "Representative, do you know if there's still… you were saying before that there was some activities that were under question. Is that still going on, do you know?"
- Acevedo: "I don't know for sure, Representative, but there's been letters delivered to my office, faxes sent over to my office from, actually, some employees who work there telling me that there is some activities that needs to be looked into."
- McAuliffe: "Okay. I received a letter from Reverend Mulcrone who is also a pastor with a... or fire chaplain and he thinks that they're doing a good job. I believe he's with a... he does some work with them with the hard of hearing, so he asked me to oppose this Bill so... or oppose this Resolution, so that's why I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There's no question that there were problems with this particular mental health center some years ago. The audit did uncover... the audit of several years ago uncovered significant financial problems. But the leadership of that mental health center has undergone enormous change and I have heard from many of the people who are now part of the operation they very much resist the idea of this audit from our Auditor General on the grounds that it will take enormous staff time, enormous energies that would better be put to serving the people who need help from this mental health center. It is essentially a very different group and I don't know that we need to take the full-bore shotgun that is the State Auditor General to see if there are problems

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

when there is, as far as I know, no evidence that the problems that used to plague the place have been any way, shape or form recurred. So, on that ground I would oppose the audit at this time."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Acevedo to close."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to my colleague, no, the leadership has not changed. The gentleman who is in charge was part of the old regime. Now these people have to be held accountable for the state dollars that they receive and the state dollars that are spent. And by all means, if there's nothing wrong... no wrongdoings that are occurring there, I'll be the first to admit that I was wrong. But if there is, state dollars that are being misappropriated, I think that's something that we need to look into and make sure it's put right once again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1146 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Parke, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes' and 14 voting 'no', and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Brauer, for what reason do you rise?"

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Brauer: "I am overwhelmed by the generosity of this Body and I'm talking about the contest I was in for the biggest loser contest for... to raise money for our guard that was slain here, Bill Wozniak. The love that was shown by this Body; I had over \$650... \$655 per pound pledged and was able to raise a little over \$9 thousand. So I thank everyone for that."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Brauer. Okay. On page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Resolutions, is House Resolution 1026. Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1026 is another dog Resolution and I'm really, really sorry about that but it... it... the genesis of the Resolution is I had a contest in my district for seventh and eighth graders and this was the best submission we got. So I would love to pass this Resolution on behalf of the students in the 39th District. What it does is it urges municipalities to not to enact breed-specific dog bans and instead it encourages the same municipalities to establish programs to educate the residents and pass laws that target irresponsible dog owners. We all know it's usually the owner that trains the dog to be as bad as it really is, so we're trying to urge them not to enact breed-specific legislation. I'd like an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Mitchell, J.: "Representative, you do realize that this is already the law that you cannot ban any breed specifically in any municipality in any county or statewide?"
- Berrios: "I do know that but this was the only thing that actually would work as a Resolution for the students in the district, and I urge it to remain that way. Thank you."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, just for your information, we had a 14-year-old girl killed and I did have a Bill that allowed the county to ban certain breeds of dogs, those that were responsible. So, for that reason, I will be voting 'no' on your Resolution. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Did you wish a Roll Call, Representative? Okay. The Resolution is adopted."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. On the Order of Resolutions we have House Resolution 1151, Representative Reis. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk. Representative Reis moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1151. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those... Representative Reis on the Resolution."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 115 (sic-1151), as amended, urges the Governor and the Department of Public Health to provide full disclosure on how the current appropriations to the Illinois Regenerative Medicine Institute are being spent. I ask for your favorable vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1151?' And all those in

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson on the Motion on page 10 of the Calendar. Representative Jakobsson moves, pursuant to House Rule 60(b), to table Resolution... House Resolution 1194. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is tabled. Representative Washington on House Resolution 1223. Representative Washington on House Resolution 1223."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1223 is an extension of an effort collectively with myself and my colleague, Representative Froehlich and others who were concerned that the General Assembly had passed out of this Body a encouragement, the law that must be complied with, data collection of the number of stops across the state, and the ultimate purpose was to show balance and fairness to everybody that's a citizen of the State of Illinois. And we wanted to root out any bad behavior of any law enforcement personnel that would be stopping people just because they didn't particularly like the way they had a beard or straggly hair or black or Latino; and as a result, this particular Joint... House Joint Resolution, it will urge that all the municipalities who have the means who engage in any type of stop, to give us that information as a Body for us to evaluate it. though in committee it was stated that some municipalities are small and don't do a lot of traffic stops, we felt that if the shoe didn't fit, don't try to put it on but pass it

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

on. And so being that a lot of municipalities did not say anything at all, they totally didn't say what was the reason why they didn't comply. So this is merely a effort to encourage and urge the municipalities to comply with what we thought needs to be addressed, what we thought needs to be looked at and what we thought in the best interests of everybody that makes up the citizens of the State of Illinois."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Lindner: "Is the Illinois Sheriffs' Association still opposed to this Resolution?"

Washington: "Representative, I'm sorry. Did you ask a question?"

Lindner: "Is the Illinois Sheriffs' Association still opposed to this Resolution?"

Washington: "No, Ma'am. To my knowledge there is no opposition to this Bill. The unclarity at that time was that we were asking the law enforcement people to be the ultimate people responsible when we know they come up under the jurisdiction of municipalities. So we were able to move over that."

Lindner: "Wasn't there testimony in committee though that they felt that they were complying with the law?"

Washington: "I'm sorry, Representative."

Lindner: "Wasn't there testimony in committee? Am I not thinking of the right Resolution that you introduced that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

the testimony was that they felt that they were in compliance with the law?"

- Washington: "The way... the way my memory serves me, in the committee there was some who clearly, strongly expressed that if the shoe didn't fit they didn't want to have to wear it. And I, too, don't want them to have to wear it if the shoe didn't fit. But the fact that they said nothing, that was... that brought the problem about that certain municipalities, if they felt that they had a legitimate reason that they couldn't comply, they never stated what that was."
- Lindner: "Okay. I was thinking that the sheriff, the person from the Sheriffs' Association did testify in committee, and I thought..."
- Washington: "Representative, could you hold it for it for one minute? Mr. Speaker, can we get a little order? I'm finding it very hard to hear the Representative."
- Lindner: "Yes, I think that they testified that the Sheriffs' Association was against this Resolution because they felt that they were in compliance and that, you know, sometimes the data is compiled in a county by one person and not by all the departments. The data was compiled by one... by the Department of Transportation. Oh, I know what it was. The Department of Transportation had lost some of the data that had been transmitted. And sometimes, also, different sheriff departments, when there was a small department, they compiled the data altogether instead of in the separate departments. So, maybe that's where you are thinking that the data is not getting compiled."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Washington: "Well, Pat, I don't know now about them losing information. That's the first I've heard of that, if I heard you correctly. And I really..."
- Lindner: "Well, I do think they testified in committee."
- Washington: "Yeah, but I don't recall that. That's all I'm saying. I don't recall them. But shame on them if they're losing information and as much money as you and I are givin' them. That's the first I've heard of that."
- Lindner: "Yeah, well that... they testified that the Department of Transportation was the one who lost the information, not the sheriff's department. But I will just say as far as the Resolution goes, I do think, I have been told that the Sheriffs' Association is still against it."
- Washington: "Yes, Ma'am. With no opposition and we hope that they won't keep losing information, but we find it hard to believe that they lost the information of over 55 cities. You know, that's a lot of municipalities that didn't comply and that's no disrespect for the ones that did. Because the majority, the vast majority of them obeyed the law and did the right thing which we expected them to do, being that we passed it out of the House."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Washington, if I recall, the purpose of this Resolution was to try to make some determination about why it is that we did not hear from all of the municipalities that had been asked to supply the information. Is that correct?"

Washington: "That's correct."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Howard: "And so, isn't it correct that the Attorney General's Office and also the Racial Profiling Prevention and Data Oversight Board is to make that determination?"

Washington: "Yes, Ma'am."

Howard: "So all you expect then is that they do an investigation and let us know why it is that it appears that there might have been some disrespect for the law. Is that correct?"

Washington: "That is totally correct."

Howard: "And I think that's a good idea. We need to know whether or not there is a problem with the mechanism or there are people who have made a decision to not do what the law says. And I commend you for this Bill and I certainly hope that my colleagues are agreeable to support it."

Washington: "Thank you, Representative."

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

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I rise in strong support of the Gentleman's Resolution, and I stand here probably not for the reasons that most people would think that I would support such a Resolution. We know that there are inherent problems in police departments and the way that... and the manner in which they stop individuals who are driving in what are perceived to be the wrong communities because of the color of their skin, because they may be of a different gender or whatever the case may be. But it's amazing that here in the Legislature, when we're asking for information to be provided, there appears to be opposition when information is asked for. Earlier we debated a Bill in which we were asking that information be

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

provided on behalf of apprenticeship programs to show the number of minorities and women that were being... that were admitted into these programs. But yet there was opposition to information being provided because we expect, simply because you ask for it, that they're going to give it to you. Well, unfortunately, Ladies and Gentlemen, that's not the case here in the State of Illinois. So on... so what's left to us are the mechanisms that we have here in this Legislature and this Body on this floor to demand and to... and to require individuals and agencies to give us the information that we have asked for but unfortunately have not been given. So I do stand in support of the Gentleman's Resolution, and let this be a message to any entity in the State of Illinois that when information is asked, you should simply give it and not resist because you will be required to give it eventually. Thank you."

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To this issue. What staff pointed out to us and I think what Representative Lindner was trying to point out, that when the Sheriffs' Association testified, what they said, it wasn't necessarily all their fault, that it was also IDOT and that they felt the Resolution should include state entities that don't process the information and get the information correct, that it wasn't just local municipalities or law enforcement entities, it was sometimes the failure of the state to actually get the information and process it for people to have. So I think they felt that they would have liked to seen that included so that they didn't take the full brunt

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

of it. I certainly understand where the Gentleman is coming from. I, too, often ask for information and have a hard time getting it and would like to get it in other areas, so I can understand that. I think they just wanted to make the point that they felt that IDOT was also at fault here."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, many of you know that I'm probably one of the most pro law enforcement Legislators here, and I've tussled on a number of times with Representative Washington. But this makes sense. You have to adhere to the rule of law and it's all the Representative is asking these departments to do. The fact of the matter is these departments may not have liked it. There are a lot of things we don't like, but it's there and they should comply and I'm proud to join Representative Washington as a supporter of this legislation."

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

Molaro: "Thank you. Well, it was nice to hear what Representative Rose said. So, Representative Washington, I think that everybody understands it. I don't think we're gonna have a problem with this Resolution whatsoever. The rule of law is there. And I remember we even said in the committee to Mr. Sullivan from the Sheriffs' Association... picking on the sheriffs, we're not singling anybody out. The law calls for law enforcement agencies to compile it. And all we're saying in your Bill is to figure out why it's not the... I mean the Resolution, why it's not being done.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

You at no time said it was their problem, you said it was a little failure on reporting. If it's IDOT, we'll find out. If it's the wrong type of paperwork, we'll find out. We passed the law, we should find out. No finger-pointing, let's find out what's going on. And that's why it's a good Resolution and we urge your full support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1223?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Resolution's adopted. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures and/or legislative actions and Motions were referred, action taken on May 04, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1497, and Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2225. 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 May 4, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 15. The following recommend 'be adopted': House Joint Resolution 128, House Joint Resolution 129, House Joint Resolution 130, House Joint Resolution 132. Recommends 'be adopted' the following Resolutions: House Resolution 1259, House Resolution 1265,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- House Resolution 1266, House Resolution 1275, House Resolution 1288, and House Resolution 1291."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Order of Second Readings, page 8 of the Calendar, we have House Bill... Senate Bill 3088. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3088 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3088, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Repre... the Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think most of us know that a Public Act 88-669 was ruled unconstitutional because of a violation of the sub... single subject clause in the Illinois Constitution. The Illinois Department of Revenue has asked me to handle this Bill, which reinstates and validates those... those parts of the Act that have to do with the Department of Revenue's operation. So it doesn't do anything new. Everything that this Bill would ask us to do is already on the books but we need to... to validate it through new legislation that's germane to the Revenue Act. So I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Mulligan: "Representative, you're stating that this Bill only reenacts portions of a 1994 statute so we can continue to collect revenue as it was originally passed and no changes to that revenue?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "So it would be what we've been doing, but it would verify what we're doing, so we go back to single subject?"

Hannig: "That's correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 3088?' 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? Hey, what's... Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos. Representative Lyons. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences, we have Representative Colvin on House Bill 5342. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Now, Representative Colvin on Amendment... Senate Amendment #1."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move..."

Speaker Turner: "And 2."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. This is a Bill that we passed out of the House earlier in the year. There were two additional Amendments made in the Senate. It deals with reimbursing counties that house prisoners in county jails and moving

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

them in a timely fashion, if they violate their paroles, back to state prisons. And the state would be required to pay one half of their expenses while they are incarcerated in a county jail when they should be in a state prison. What this language does is clarify who indeed is a state parole violator and make certain that we're only assessing this fee to those individuals who are there and being held only on a state violation of their... as a condition of their parole. There's no opposition to this Bill. This is a good Bill that helps the counties. It helps... the counties are now required in a number of ways to make sure they report that information back to the state parole agents who are working in concert with the county sheriff's office, the county sheriffs' offices. The county sheriffs have indicated enthusiastic support for this Bill. It will help us deal with the vexing problem of having so many state parole violators sit in county jails when they should be moved back in a timely fashion. The penalty doesn't... is not even enacted if they move them back within a 72-hour period. And the Illinois Department of Corrections feels very good about this piece of legislation. We worked very hard to clean it up from its original standard. We know of no opposition and we ask for concurrence of Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5342?' This is final action. And all those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 105 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Consti... and on this question, the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5342. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Readings, we have House Bill 2225... Senate Bill 2225, Representative McCarthy. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2225 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The... Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2225 is the exact Amendment that we added on in Higher Education Committee the other day to House Bill 1945. So, we did have a full hearing on this in the Higher Education Committee. The... this language helps create the MAP Plus Program that was funded at \$34.4 million yesterday in the Senate Bill 1520. This is, after much negotiation and discussion, on a way to help the families of our state. The Governor's Office and many of us in the Legislature agreed to push this initiative forward. It basically allows a grant to Illinois residents who attend Illinois universities and community colleges of \$500 per year for their sophomore, junior, and senior year as they move toward their baccalaureate

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

completion. There is a stipulation in the Bill that says, if you get a MAP grant, you are not eligible then for this MAP Plus grant. Also, as part of the negotiation, we also... and if you look in the budget you'll see that there's a \$26.8 million appropriation going to MAP in addition to the 7.4 million that we put in GRF, so that MAP will also be fully funded, which was part of these earlier negotiations. And I think that's a positive step forward, as well. is a one-time thing, it's... sunset after a year. The grants can only be given out for the fall semester of 2006 and the spring semester of 2007. I think it will be significant help to the families of our state. And we do think that the money will be available only if there is a sale or a refinancing of the loan portfolio that ISAC holds. commissioners at ISAC say they don't wanna do that or if they sell such a small part of it that they don't generate at least a hundred million dollars, then this program will not go forward. Also, the extra money to MAP won't go forward, so we are hoping that they do make the decision that they may wanna go forward with this. We had a hearing on that sale with the new commissioners of ISAC, and we felt very strongly that they haven't made the decision yet but they will go forward and make the decision on their own. they make it, that money will go into the trust fund, the Student Loan Operating Fund and this is the enabling legislation that we can move it there in order to fund the addition to MAP and the MAP Plus Program. I think it's great for the middle-income families of our state and the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

lower income families of our state. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

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

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we on this side of the aisle have a number of questions that we would like to address to you. We do intend to let..."

McCarthy: "Please."

Myers: "...the Amendment be adopted on voice vote and we will reserve our questions for Third Reading."

McCarthy: "Thank you very much for that consideration."

Speaker Turner: "With that, the House... Representative McCarthy moves that the House does adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill... Senate Bill 2225. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No Further Amendments. All Motions have been filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2225, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McCarthy. Representative Rose."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Rose: "Good afternoon, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "He's busy picking up support, give him a minute."

Rose: "I'm sorry, I didn't... I couldn't hear, Mr. Speaker."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

McCarthy: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Turner: "He's picking up a lot of support for this Bill, give him a minute."

Rose: "Oh, thank you. Good afternoon, Representative."

McCarthy: "I'm sorry, Representative. Please proceed."

Rose: "The... couple quick questions for ya. Do we know how much we're gonna get from the ISAC sale yet?"

McCarthy: "We have... we have no idea at this point. There are estimates out there, as you know, but this is contingent on, first of all, the transaction going forward and realizing at least a hundred million dollars for it."

Rose: "And if I recall from the testimony of the head of ISAC the other day, they have not decided internally on what their breakpoint is, that is the point at which they would either sell the assets or not sell the assets based on the rate of return. In fact, at this point in time, he indicated they haven't even determined how they're gonna sell the assets, if to be sold at all. He indicated you could refinance, you could refund, you could just sell it outright, but that none of those decisions have been made. Yet, as I understand it, as part of this budget deal, this MAP Plus is going to be created contingent upon the selling of an asset. And the people who control that asset, ISAC, haven't even determined internally whether they're gonna sell it or not. Am I..."

McCarthy: "That's absolutely true."

Rose: "Well..."

McCarthy: "But I... I think they're doing their due diligence.

They're going through the program. They're trying to

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

determine, they have financial experts that are helping them, and they're gonna make a decision as a commission whether it makes sense. They may do it, they may not do it. This enables us to spend the money on MAP Plus if they decide to go ahead and do it."

Rose: "And... let's get to that question, because MAP Plus is what, \$32 million? Is that what I remember? The MAP Plus is about \$32 million?"

McCarthy: "34.4."

Rose: "34.4. And so, let's say they do sell the asset and they get 34.4, then all that money would go to MAP Plus, correct?"

McCarthy: "Incorrect."

Rose: "Incorrect, where..."

McCarthy: "They have to at least make the hundred million dollars so that they can, first of all, fund the additional money to MAP so that we fully fund MAP."

Rose: "Okay."

McCarthy: "You know, it'll increase about \$400 every award in MAP or the maximum award."

Rose: "And that's... what is that..."

McCarthy: "Now..."

Rose: "...about 20..."

McCarthy: "That's 28.7..."

Rose: "2... 28 million?"

McCarthy: "No, it's 26.84..."

Rose: "Okay. So, 26 plus 30..."

McCarthy: "Added on to what we already did GRF, both of them turn in to being a 34.4 million dollar increase."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Rose: "Okay. So, if MAP sells... my question is this, if MAP sells and there's more money that comes in than what's allotted for the program, what happens to that? Conversely, if MAP sells and less money comes in, what happens?"

McCarthy: "If less money comes in, less than the hundred million dollars, neither of these programs go forward. Okay?"

Rose: "But... hold on. You keep saying..."

McCarthy: "And..."

Rose: "...a hundred million dollars, but the MAP and the MAP Plus is only about \$62 million total."

McCarthy: "And there is also a \$38 million transfer to higher ed for... for GRF to higher ed purposes."

Rose: "Okay. So, that gets you to your hundred million."

McCarthy: "That gets me to a hundred million, correct."

Rose: "Last year in the Higher Ed-Appropriations Committee, John Filan indicated he thought ISAC could sell for as much as 300 to 500 million dollars. Where does the other money go if it does sell for that much money?"

McCarthy: "He... they could sell... if they happen to sell the whole thing and if we were fortunate enough to get near the estimate that Director Filan gave you, that money... the only money we would transfer, ya know, through the budget implementation and through this legislation, is that hundred million. The rest would have to sit in the Student Loan Operating Fund and it would take legislation by us in order to move it."

Rose: "Okay. In your... in your Bill..."

McCarthy: "Correct."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Rose: "Is there any guarantee... Representative Jakobsson had a Bill in here that went to the Senate and went nowhere that would've guaranteed that the terms of any deal that's already been agreed to by a student or a student... or a former student who's in repayment status doesn't change. Now, I agree that contractually that... the underlying terms, the interest rate, the repayment period, the principle, obviously, that can't change contractually, but there are certain incentives that ISAC offers, like for example, interest rate reductions for electronic debiting, on time payments, so forth, that that could change. Is there anything in this Bill that would guarantee that those terms wouldn't change from what ISAC's offering?"

McCarthy: "Well, you were nice enough to join us for our hearing with Chairman McNeil and he indicated at that time that the RFP... if they decide to move forward with the RFP, would include guarantees such as that. And he thought that... he said that actually the ISAC guarantees today and the improvements are kind of in the middle. There are ones out there already that do better than them and some that do a little bit worse than them. But he said, it could be included in the RFP, and we certainly would encourage them to do that, to make sure that those benefits go on into the future."

Rose: "But that's an RFP, that's not a guarantee. And I guess, my point is, we had legislation here earlier, Representative Jakobsson's Bill, excellent piece of legislation that would've guaranteed that. And if there... if there is truly

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

no harm in the guarantee, then why don't we just do it as part of this legislation?"

McCarthy: "Well, I have confidence in the commission that they're gonna move forward and make sure these benefits will continue to the students who hold these loans."

Rose: "Then... what happens here if it... you don't get the target price of a hundred million dollars and let's say you only get \$60 million?"

McCarthy: "Well, that money would sit in the SLOP (sic-SLOF), the Student Loan Operating Fund until..."

Rose: "No, no, no..."

McCarthy: "...we as a Body..."

Rose: "What happens if you come up short? And..."

McCarthy: "What I'm saying, nothing'll happen. It'll just sit there until we as a Body, if we decided to create further legislation in order to spend the amount that we've put in there. Or we could just leave it in there until maybe they sell another part next year and then get over the hundred million, but we'd still need new legislation to spend it."

Rose: "So if you came up with \$60 million instead of a hundred million, then MAP Plus doesn't happen?"

McCarthy: "MAP Plus doesn't happen, the transfer to GRF for higher ed purposes doesn't happen, and the increase to MAP exclusive of the approximately 8 million that we have in GRF going to MAP next year."

Rose: "How does MAP Plus get paid for next year?"

McCarthy: "Well, that's why we made it a 1-year thing. It's contingent on this funding being there. We wanna see if this is something, we think or I think, personally, that the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

people of our state will greatly appreciate this and then we can come back next year and say let's extend it again. But we also have to find a funding source. If they sell the total thing and say we get 300 million, well, we'd still have money in that Student Loan Operating Fund that we could transfer over next year at budget time, okay, if we wanted to extend for the next two semesters after that. Or we may decide we don't wanna do that or there may not be enough money in there or if they refinance a small part and only get say a hundred and twenty million, we take out all but 20 maybe next year, we'll say is there an opportunity to do it again."

Rose: "But in your... in your answer, there's a lot of maybes and ifs and possiblys. We don't know is the real answer."

McCarthy: "There's a lot... there's a lot of contingencies, you're correct."

Rose: "The... I guess that's sorta what troubles me. Again, ya know, first of all, Representative, I know you've been very fair to our side of the aisle on this issue and I know you've invited me to come to your committee and for that, I'm truly grateful. And part of... because of that, all year I've left my door open on this because I understand that the dynamics of the student loan marketplace have changed. There isn't necessarily the need for a secondary marketplace for the State of Illinois since the U.S. Direct Loans went in place, because now U.S. Direct Loans guarantees all students no matter where they live. And they become the market trendsetters so, you know, no one's gonna be out of step with student loans... U.S. Direct Loan. But I guess, my

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

question is, the first thing we have to do is guarantee that the terms of the deal don't change on anybody who's currently a student. There's no guarantee here. The second thing is do we have to know what are we getting? Are the taxpayers getting a fair deal for their... for their assets? Are we selling this asset and getting a fair price? From... and what you've said... from what the director of ISAC said, we don't know what we're gonna get yet. They haven't made that determination and they may not make that determination for another month."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Rose: "And then the RFP would get issued, and so we are all making a decision to sell the student loan portfolio without any information about how much money we're gonna get for that asset. Why would we do that?"

McCarthy: "Well, I... I think their own expertise, the commissioners, are all people that certainly have better financial credentials than I have and I would say they have better financial credentials than most Members of the General Assembly. They're gonna determine and they're not gonna sell it if they don't think they're getting a fair price for it. I mean, they don't wanna end up looking like they didn't know what they were doing or something or that they were just, ya know, making a decision that was predetermined or something. They're gonna have to make sure that they're gonna get a sizeable return on this asset before they move forward with the sale. I have confidence in them that they're not gonna do anything unless they're

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

gonna make sure they get a good return on it. They're also..."

Rose: "But if they don't have a... if they don't ..."

McCarthy: "...they got the flexibility to sell a part of it; maybe the servicing, maybe the loan guaranteeing, maybe just refinance part of it. We gave them a lot of flexibility. They're gonna look at all the options and say, yes, this makes sense to do it, and if it does, we get to help a lot of families. If they say it doesn't, then we don't help 'em."

Rose: "But if they don't sell it, then you got no MAP Plus?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Rose: "And frankly, you've got no MAP, either, there's a big chunk of that money that was gonna go to the... increase the MAP Award. There'll still be the GRF MAP..."

McCarthy: "But... but the Governor..."

Rose: "...but not the additional MAP."

McCarthy: "...and many Members of our caucuses... within our caucus were very forceful in making sure that we did put the new money into MAP so that we'd be guaranteed to get the federal match. And we did put that 8 million into MAP out of GRF.

Only the extra 26-something comes out of the sale."

Rose: "But it..."

McCarthy: "So we are increasing MAP with or without this."

Rose: "Right. Right, but not by as much."

McCarthy: "Definitely."

Rose: "Now, but this is part and parcel of my point is we don't have any certainty as to whether the sale proceeds, under what terms it proceeds, or how much we get from the sale.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

My... then we don't know if there's any finality to this program if it's this year, next year, or whatever. Like, for example, Representative, the University of Illinois just instituted a \$250 per semester deferred maintenance fee. Okay. I believe the MAP Plus is \$500 a year. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Rose: "Okay. So, that just took care of their deferred maintenance fee if you're lucky enough to qualify for MAP Plus. But it doesn't go anywhere towards the tuition increase, which President White three weeks ago announced will go up 60 percent over the next couple years in response to declining support from the state of his institution."

McCarthy: "Well..."

Rose: "Now... let me just finish my statement. My point is this, I've left my door open all year on this topic and outside of you, Chairman McCarthy, no one has contacted me from the Governor's Office on this issue, because it could be done in a way that makes sense. Potentially, you protect the students, the current payers; you make sure you're getting a fair bargain for the taxpayers; and three, you figure out a way to maximize the return on the asset sale with the most benefit to a higher education community. Certainly, certainly, MAP Plus is part of that. Certainly MAP is part of that, but what about deferred maintenance and what about faculty and staff salary retention? What about tuition assistance? You know, if John Filan thinks that there's 300 to 500 million dollars here to be had and in fact, the Direct Loan Program now has sort of removed us from the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

marketplace equation anyway, that money could go a long way to offsetting the deferred maintenance at every institution in the state. And I guess that's my real objection here, Representative, is we have no information on what we're getting with this, there's no protection for the student. And finally, it's not part of some forward thinking, thoughtful plan to really give that shot in the arm and the boost to higher education that it needs. And I'm not discounting MAP Plus, I'm really not. And I'm also not discounting you and the efforts you put into this, because I do appreciate that."

McCarthy: "Um hmm."

Rose: "But at the end of the day I am gonna have to close my door now on this concept because we have no idea how to pay for it next year or the year after that. There's no deferred maintenance, there's no faculty salary component. We don't even know if the asset's gonna be sold. And if this had been an open process from the Governor's Office, we probably could've got there. And with that I'll conclude my remarks with a simple thank you to you for letting me ask these questions."

McCarthy: "I appreciate your sincerity."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Scully: "I rise in very strong support of this Bill. And I also wanna thank some of the Representatives who were in the House Higher Education-Appropriations Committee yesterday

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

asking very tough questions about the issue of the sale of the loan portfolio. And no, we do not have assurances yet that the property... that that valuable asset is gonna be sold on a proper basis. But what we did through our questioning in the House Appropriations Committee for Higher Education and what we have done through this debate on the floor of this House, as we've assured ourselves that this commission knows that the sale of that asset is going to be sharply scrutinized and that we are paying very close attention to We understand as was stated in committee yesterday that they cannot disclose to us what their breakpoint is. That would severely damage their ability to properly negotiate the best deal possible for the State of Illinois. But they know that their conduct will be watched carefully. With that assurance, I... stand in support of this I stand in the support of giving the commission the authority to review the option of selling that loan portfolio if it can be done on financial terms that are expedient and beneficial to the State of Illinois. you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Myers: "Thank you. Representative McCarthy, I have a couple of questions. First of all, I need to ask some questions on the record on behalf of another Representative; then I have some other questions in addition to that. But upon the sale

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- of the assets of the student loan portfolio, do you agree that the money should go into the Monetary Award Program?"
- McCarthy: "I'm very happy with the way we decided to split it up. I'm happy that a good chunk is going to the MAP Program, as is. I'm very happy that there's a good chunk going to MAP Plus and I'm happy that we'll also have the \$38 million going in there. Hopefully, that could be used for good higher ed purposes like deferred maintenance."
- Myers: "Okay, but it's all going in the Monetary Award Program whether it's the MAP, the original MAP, or the MAP Plus, right?"
- McCarthy: "Well, 62 million out... 62 million and change out of the hundred million, yes."
- Myers: "Okay. And if the sale of the loan portfolio does not generate enough money, let's just say it generates substantially less than anticipated, so what gets the priority then? Is it the original MAP or is it the MAP Plus?"
- McCarthy: "The way... the way it's drawn up and our intent in doing it, if we don't get the hundred million dollars, none of 'em get it. You know. We don't... we don't..."
- Myers: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."
- McCarthy: "If we don't get the hundred million dollars, we'd have to come back here and have further legislation to say, if we wanted to spend say it's 60 or say it's 30, we'd have to have different legislation to agree to do that and we'd have to work together in our committees and figure out what we wanted to do with that money."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Myers: "Okay. When the sale occurs, will the revenue be deposited in ISAC Student Operating Loan Fund? The proceeds from the sale will be deposited in the Operating Loan Fund. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "Correct, Student Loan Operating Fund."

Myers: "Okay. And is that fund planned to be swept by the Governor?"

McCarthy: "I don't ... I don't know that."

Myers: "You don't know that?"

McCarthy: "I know they have that folder here right now, I could look up..."

Myers: "According to our information, in Senate Bill 1977 House Amendment #2, the Governor does plan to sweep this fund."

McCarthy: "As a chargeback or as a sweep?"

Myers: "No, it's a sweep. So, you don't have any comments with regard to that?"

McCarthy: "I really don't. I'm sure that we looked at that fund and they thought there was available funding. So, it was one of the funds chosen to take some money out of. But it's not an easy decision to do that as you know, but it does enable us to fund things like K-12 education, ya know, Medicaid, many other things that we wouldn't be able to do if we didn't sweep those funds. So, sweeping funds is not something I enjoy, but it does enable us to do a lot of good things for people around the state. So, we chose that this would not affect the operation of this fund. This is a large fund, this hundred million dollars is a small part of it. This is used to buy and sell loans across the state in their operating thing and they're gonna have money in that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

fund next year, you know, one way or the other even without this sale."

Myers: "Okay. So, for the… for legislative intent and on the record here for this Body, we intend that the proceeds are going to go for the MAP Plus and the MAP Program. And even if the funds are swept, we intend for these programs to be administered in the proper way as we understand them here. Correct?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Myers: "Okay, thank you. And is the administration being completely funded... the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, is that being completely funded now by the student loan portfolio proceeds?"

McCarthy: "Yes, it is."

Myers: "Okay. Also in committee the other day, when we were discussing the proposed sale of the ISAC proceeds, it was my understanding that the executive director of the Student Assistance Commission indicated they're looking not only at the sale of assets but possibly refinancing or refunding. Is that true?"

McCarthy: "They are in... in this legislation we do allow them the... look at the opportunity to refinance."

Myers: "So, the possibility of no sale at all is still a possibility and we will still go forward with the program assuming that the board of directors or the board of trustees of the ISAC can come up with the expected hundred million dollars. Correct?"

McCarthy: "If the refinancing did generate a hundred million dollars, we could go forward with the program, yes."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Myers: "Okay. Now, even with that statement being said, that there's a possibility of either refinancing or refunding instead of the sales of the proceeds, if this piece of legislation passes and as we understand it, the MAP Plus Program and some additional funding for the regular Monetary Award Program are accepted by the Legislature, what we're in effect may be saying is we also approve the sale for these programs. The Republicans on this side of the aisle have had a request in for the Attorney General's Office for some time now as to the legality of whether ISAC assets could be sold without legislative approval. And some of us now question whether or not, if we pass this legislation, in effect the Legislature is getting somewhat tacit approval to the sale of... or to the sale of assets and the question of the legality will become a moot point in the eyes of the general... Attorney General. Do you read it that way or do you still think that there's some legal question that the Attorney General will need to rule on?"

McCarthy: "You know, if the Attorney General decides to offer an opinion on that, I would like to see it. The legal counsel that we have on our side and plus the legal counsel at the Student Assistance Commission has determined that they have the right to do it as a commission. They also determined they don't have a right to spend it, that is ours alone, and that's why we have this Bill. But I don't think us passing this Bill... I want them to do their due diligence. I think that's what they're doing. I think that's why they came back to us later and said we also would like to look at the opportunity to refinance. Okay. So, as they go forward in

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

this process, I want them to have all the options available to them, but I don't think we're encouraging one way or the other by the passage of this legislation. We're just saying that of families of the state… if we're able to do this, if it makes sense to do it, if we generate a hundred million dollars, we're gonna try and help all the families of our state."

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Myers: "Last spring when this whole subject matter was brought to... before the General Assembly, just before we were ready to adjourn, the possible sale of ISAC assets, it was soundly rejected by most Members of the Higher Education Committee and the Appropriations Committee for Higher Education. During the course of the last four months, I think both committees have had ample opportunity and certainly a great deal of chance to debate this particular subject matter, this particular issue. We have met with the chairman of the board of Illinois Student Assistance Commission. heard testimony regularly from the executive director. We've talked to people from the Governor's Office and all of our staffs have had a great deal of consultation with various others. I think that it's only reasonable and proper this year that we've had that opportunity and I think there's a much, much better understanding of the entire issue of the sale of the assets. I'm not sure that we all I'm not sure that we disagree with the idea of selling assets, but we've certainly had an opportunity for greater discussion this year. I wanna thank Representative

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

McCarthy and his committee. And I wanna thank Representative Miller, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for Higher Education, for the opportunity to completely, thoroughly debate this issue. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do think this is a unique I think that it is certainly fiscally proposal. responsible, that's why we laid it out that if we don't make that money available, we don't go forward with the program. It's fiscally sound. There is a funding source for it. I think it's gonna hap... you know, help thousands and thousands of families across our state. And that \$500 that goes off their sophomore, junior, and senior year tuition if they're in one our public universities, that tuition is quaranteed. So they will absolutely see a reduction from this year's tuition to next if we're able to go forward with this. I have every confidence in the commissioners at ISAC. They're professionals and they have professional help at looking into this as to whether this proposal is worth doing, and I think they will make a fair decision. But if the money's there, I think we should have the mechanism in our books that we can go ahead and spend it, and I would encourage everyone to support all of the lower and middle-income families of our state and support Senate Bill 2225. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2225?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting

128th Legislative Day

- is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 1497. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1497 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady Cook... the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Speaker. Perhaps if we can adopt the Amendment and then discuss the Bill on Third Reading, if that's all right with the chamber."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1497. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1497, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, on Senate Bill 1497."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Governor's proposal in the area of preschool programs

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

for the state's 3- and 4-year-olds. As you know we have, for the last 20 years, we have had a program that provides preschool services to 3- and 4-year-olds who are at risk of school failure without an early learning boost. This Bill, Senate Bill 1497, would not change that priority. priority would continue to be serving children who are at risk of school failure without a little additional help. But it would make possible the expansion of the preschool program; first, to children and families whose earnings are under four times the poverty level. Today, for a family of four, that would mean approximately \$80 thousand. And if we were then able to expand beyond that need, we would be permitted to provide voluntary preschool programs for all comers, all 3- and 4-year-olds. We know that early learning is a terrific aid, not just to kids who are at risk of failure without it, but it's good socialization, good educational opportunities for all children. Again, this program would be voluntary. It would retain the priority of today's program, which is the kids at particular risk, but it would give families an opportunity to provide for early educational opportunities for their young, even if their finances may not make that available on the private market. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for this very sound educational program."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook... I mean, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she'll yield."

128th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Thank you very much. Representative, is there an anticipation that this will be the year that perhaps children who currently are not meeting the at risk priority ranking will... will... those students will all be served and maybe were gonna go into the other populations?"
- Currie: "It is likelier that in the coming fiscal year, we've appropriated 45 million additional dollars, it's likely that most if not all of those dollars will go to the at risk children. Today there are somewhere between 8 and 10 thousand 3- and 4-year-olds who meet the at risk definition who are on waiting lists. And as I said, our first priority will always to be to those… to those youngsters."
- Eddy: "And that's established already by statute regarding how that money is prioritized."
- Currie: "It is. And this statute would... what this statute would do is first of all, expand to the category of middle-income families four times and under the poverty level, and then expand beyond. But it would retain first, the at risk youngsters as the state's priority; next priority, would be the families who have some income but are not affluent; and then third, would expand the pool to include all comers."
- Eddy: "So without this, the funding would still be there at the level of \$45 million, but there just wouldn't be the clear priority mechanism that this spells out that when we serve the at risk, that the next dollars begin to go to the next priority, which would be those students who are in families of income levels four times the poverty level, if I read that correctly."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Currie: "Yeah, and for a family of four, right now, to date, that would be \$80 thousand approximately, or less."

Eddy: "I appreciate that very much. I appreciate the answer to your question. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support this legislation because it does simply prioritize the spending. Without this there really isn't the kind of clear direction that this Body could give to the expansion. This gives us the opportunity to make sure that dollars that are available in that program have a priority that would be low income as the next priority. This is a wonderful program. This is an investment in my eyes and I think that every dollar spent in Pre-K certainly has proven to be investment rather than an expense, and I think this makes sense that we set up a system whereby when dollars are now going into that program, that there is a priority. And I also understand there's a reporting function in this so that the State Board of Education will report back to the General Assembly what percentages of how many students or some type of reporting that the at risk numbers as compared to the income related."

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Currie: "Thank you."

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

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Ryg: "Okay. We've had some discussion about the problems of adequate education funding in the State of Illinois. And

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

part of the problem is that we're spending money on expensive programs such as special education and remedial education. And there's some compelling statistics that I think are needing to be considered as we consider this measure. It's known that 80 percent of brain growth happens before the age of five. Yet, we spend less than 4 cents of every education dollar on this age group. Economists weigh in saying that early learning saves money by reducing costs for expensive interventions like special education and remedial courses. Arthur Rolnick, from the Federal Reserve Bank, calculates a 16 percent rate of return for early childhood, compared to other public investments such as sports arenas. And Dr. Arthur Reynolds of the University of Wisconsin showed that each dollar invested in early learning yielded \$7 in savings or future earnings, based on the actual experiences of children in Chicago. The largest savings comes from reduced delinquency, which is the reason that this initiative is also supported by Fight Crime, Invest in Kids Illinois. Similar results have been found across the country and the findings are consistent that it's quality that matters. High quality programs yield results. So we know that parents want their children to go to preschool. We have existing waiting lists and thousands more children are left out because their parents earn too much for existing programs but not enough to cover the cost of private preschool. This is clearly not only the right thing to do for the children of Illinois and their families and our communities, but it is also a cost effective measure to ensure that all our children have a great start in their

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

educational careers. I urge everyone's support on this important measure. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he (sic-she) will."

Mulligan: "Representative, is there still a 2-year sunset or..."

Currie: "There is on the new part of the program,

Representative, not on the state's existing targeted

preschool program for children at risk."

Mulligan: "Okay. And you said earlier it's not mandatory if a parent does not want their child to go?"

Currie: "Absolutely not. Totally voluntary."

Mulligan: "All right. And about how many programs do you think would be covered in the first year?"

Currie: "Well, we think we'll be... well, right now the state's serving about 75 thousand at risk 3- and 4-year-olds. And we think just based on waiting lists, that we'll add approximately 10 thousand to that number, and at least at this moment that would be the universe of children who are identified as at risk whose families want them to participate in an early learning program."

Mulligan: "So, is it realistic to say that there's a 2-year sunset? Is that the only reason they're doing that is so they can assess the program or decide the money because..."

Currie: "And you'll note that there are..."

Mulligan: "...it's a 4-year at least?"

128th Legislative Day

- Currie: "...there are reporting requirements from the state board so that we will be in a position to evaluate how the... how the... how the program is working."
- Mulligan: "Do schools that currently have existing programs, will it be easier for them to qualify in the first round?"
- Currie: "Well, it has always been an RFP process and there are certain requirements. You have to have certified personnel, people who are certified to be early education teachers. If you have 20 kids in the class, you need a certified teacher and you need an aide as well. So, I think the marks we've had from the educational experts is that our requirements are good requirements and our state preschool programs are generally regarded as very sound. And that will not change. We're not changing the requirements with the expansion that's in this Bill."
- Mulligan: "And this Bill is the same Bill that we sent to the Senate. We're gonna send another one. Or the Senate had... the Senate hasn't voted on it."
- Currie: "This was... we heard this in committee attached to a different Bill, but it's the same language."
- Mulligan: "Okay. To the Bill. I've always adhered to the fact that young children are shaped at a very young age, long before they started publishing all the data. And when I was first in the General Assembly I served on Governor Edgar's Birth to Eight's task force, which a number of the people, particularly, then Representative Ronen, now Senator Ronen and I worked together on a lot of these issues. And a lot of the issues that have come from Voices for Illinois Children and these initiatives started with that task force

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

which had some successes and some failures that really spurred us on to become more organized and to look at these I think anyone that has young children at home or young grandchildren can certainly see the benefit of this and that our state should do something like this and certainly explore it. It seems to be a good issue. Many of our children or our grandchildren were lucky enough to be able to have preschool because their parents could afford Many are not. And I think there's a definite edge to those children that do have some time in a preschool That's why many of us are going to vote for it. It's not that we necessarily agree with the budget or where the funding is coming from, it's just that it's a longtime coming. It's not that it's this Governor's plan, it's the plan for the last several Governor's that a number of us who have been here over any period of time, and I'm sure those that were here before us, have thought about doing something like this. And it's an excellent program to look into. The only thing that I have any criticism about and it's not this Bill, was that the early intervention people did not get a cost of doing business raise this year, which I'd like to see maybe a little bit of this money go towards that because those are the kids that are gonna need this the most and we need to be ready. But I think there are many of us that have worked on this issue for a long time that would like to see a program like this initiated and hope that it will be well managed and will move forward, and hope that our school districts will avail themselves of it."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Currie, this is purely the mechanics of the program. Am I right?"

Currie: "This establishes the expansion, the potential expansion of the state's Pre-K programs."

Mitchell, J.: "So basically in law now, we take care of the at risk kids and basically there's a backlog of at risk kids?"

Currie: "Yes."

Mitchell, J.: "This mechanism allows us to clear that backlog, hopefully. Then we look at the second tier..."

Currie: "Exactly."

Mitchell, J.: "...and that's even outlined in the Bill by saying that those 3- and 4-year-olds that are less than four times the poverty rate at that time..."

Currie: "Right."

Mitchell, J.: "...will have the first shot voluntarily..."

Currie: "Right."

Mitchell, J.: "...at preschool programs."

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Mitchell, J.: "Then we go to the third tier, if there's any money left..."

Currie: "Right."

Mitchell, J.: "...which would be all 3-year-olds after that would then have a chance..."

Currie: "Right."

128th Legislative Day

- Mitchell, J.: "...and then we look at the 4-year-olds. And that's probably going to take about five years to get..."
- Currie: "Probably the four... probably the 4-year-olds will sign up before the 3-year-olds."
- Mitchell, J.: "That's right. Four-year-olds first because we wouldn't have a gap in the..."
- Currie: "But yes. But that's the idea. We have a three tier system and our focus will always be first on the children who are at risk."
- Mitchell, J.: "And that's what is included in this Bill.

  Basically it expands existing law so that we have a road map
  or a guideline for 3- and 4-year-olds to enter preschool."
- Currie: "Precisely."
- Mitchell, J.: "There's no money in this Bill?"
- Currie: "Well, we appropriated an additional \$45 million in the budget Bill that was adopted yesterday to the preschool, to the state's existing preschool program."
- Mitchell, J.: "I understand that. But this Bill itself has nothing to do with appropriations."
- Currie: "This is... this is... right. This is a substantive Bill."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. And this concept has already been in the Senate?"
- Currie: "I don't... I know that it's been in Senate Committee,
  Representative; I don't know if they have voted on it on the
  floor. Has not yet passed the Senate Floor, but it has been
  heard and approved in Senate Committee."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Well, thank you for answering my questions. I appreciate it."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Meyer: "Representative, could you tell us, does this program mesh with Head Start?"

Currie: "Well, it's a separate program and has been for the last 20 years. But frequently, those who offer the state funded program two and a half hours a day, often the sponsors of the program mesh it with a half day Head Start program for the other part of the day. So it does not... there's nothing structurally that connects the two except that this is a two and a half hour program and some Head Start programs operate on a short term. I know of programs where they do HEAD START in the morning and state funded Pre-K in the afternoon."

Meyer: "Well, why doesn't this mesh with that?"

Currie: "Ours is a different program. We have different standards, higher standards, in fact, for the stated funded Pre-K than the Head Start and they are not required to screen for Head Start eligibility and we are. Our focus is clearly on at risk."

Meyer: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Currie to close."

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

Education, early education is a sound investment of our money and it's a sound investment in our children's future.

I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."

128th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1497?' 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? Representative Bassi. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 835, Representative Bradley."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 835 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading. The Bill's been read a third time, previously, today."
- Speaker Turner: "Read the Clerk... read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 835, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley, J.: "I had previously explained this Bill. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we request a verification should this receive a Constitutional Majority?"
- Speaker Turner: "Your request will be honored. Do you have more to say? Turn Representative Winters back on."
- Winters: "Thank you. Thank you. Yeah, I had to put my coat on there for a few minutes so I could get warmed up here. By the way, could you ask the Comptroller if he would pay the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

gas bill for the furnace... for the Capitol so we might get some heat on back in here?"

Speaker Turner: "Haven't seen him."

Winters: "Okay. Well, if you'd send a message over to the Comptroller's Office. I'm sure the Treasurer has found enough money that we could actually pay the bill. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Winters: "Would he pull the Bill from the record again?"

Bradley, J.: "No."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he won't."

Winters: "Well, not... not yet. We're back to this issue with seven or eight major wildlife refuges across the state, miles of water, swamp, and mud, open land: Chautauqua National Wildlife Refuge in Havana, it's only about 50 miles from here; Crab Orchard in Marion; Cypress Creek in Ullin... is that how you say it? Ullin... Ullin... do you know, John?"

Bradley, J.: "Ullin."

Winters: "Ullin, okay. Emiquon National Wildlife Refuge, also in Havana; Meredosia in Meredosia; Middle Mississippi River. How... how big is the Mississ... Middle Mississippi Wildlife Refuge in Marion? That has to be fairly close to you, I believe."

Bradley, J.: "I don't know how big that is."

Winters: "I'm sorry."

Bradley, J.: "I don't think it's near Marion, is it?"

Winters: "Well, I don't know. Marion's in Southern Illinois, I thought you might know. And two..."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Bradley, J.: "Well, there... there's... Yeah, but without being flippant, there's a Marion County, also."

Winters: "Okay. You mean it's as big as a county?"

Bradley, J.: "I didn't say that, did I?"

Winters: "Well, I couldn't hear, so..."

Bradley, J.: "I... no, but I..."

Winters: "...I thought you might have."

Bradley, J.: "You know that I didn't say that."

Winters: "I'm not... I'm not sure what you said."

Bradley, J.: "We're... we're about 10 feet from each other and you know that I didn't say that."

Winters: "I couldn't hear for sure. And the last one, as far as I know, is Two Rivers National Wildlife. So, we have a total of, I believe, eight of 'em. Again, the Bill is a land grab. Any municipality that can get close to one of these wildlife refuges, again, the State of Illinois does not control the boundaries or the establishment of national wildlife refuges. That's why they're called national, not state. So by passing this Bill, as extravagantly drawn as it is, we're giving control of our own land-use policies to the Federal Government. We are a state. We're part of this nation, but we shouldn't let dictates from Washington determine how big our cities can become. Why should they be allowed to annex across wildlife refuges, miles away from their own boundaries, to grab some of them some of that prime commercial property they might find on the other side of swamp? How are they gonna establish municipal services? Are they gonna put the sewer lines across the bottom of a wet wildlife refuge? For one thing, the national

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

departments are not going to allow us to do that. Are they gonna drive the fire trucks across and the police cars so they can service? They better have pontoons for their local vehicles because they sure can't drive a road across these It's absolutely ridiculous. wildlife refuges. understand why we allowed forest preserves to be annexed across because municipalities... typically the counties that have forest preserves are relatively urban. They have a lot of smaller communities; then forest preserves by their design are relatively limited in size. And again in my county, hundred and fifty acres would be a large-size forest preserve. There are a few in Cook County that are extensive along some rivers that are a little bit larger, but again, they are completely different scale. So why are we allowing municipalities statewide to access across these boundaries without limit, without any limit, whatsoever? If you've got a specific parcel, Representative, I would encourage you to bring it back here to us specifically for a local situation. But don't try to ram it through when you know that one of our Members who is intimately involved with this, his community does not want this to happen. You've known for weeks that he was gonna be gone today. Why delay it until you know that the major opponent is not going to be allowed to be here..."

Bradley, J.: "No, I didn't. Hold it... hold it, hold it. I tried to call this Bill yesterday and he was sitting right there.

All right."

Winters: "What happened?"

128th Legislative Day

- Bradley, J.: "And he had a note that was inapplicable on it, I couldn't get it called."
- Winters: "You've had the opportunity to call it for weeks."
- Bradley, J.: "Now, hold it... hold... hold it. I'm gonna get accused of something, I wanna respond to it. I had no idea that Mr. Bost was not gonna be here today. I wish Mr. Bost was here to discuss it. I tried to call it yesterday when Mr. Bost was here and I couldn't because he had an inapplicable note on it."
- Winters: "Well, just out of honoring the fact that he's no longer here... it looks like we're gonna be here tomorrow. Would you hold it 'til tomorrow when he might have a chance to get back?"
- Bradley, J.: "No, I'm calling it today."
- Winters: "Well, what's the problem if... if, you know, wouldn't you feel if you had an issue that was intimate to your district..."
- Bradley, J.: "The House has finished its work, I'm not taking a chance that we're not coming back tomorrow, that we don't have work to do tomorrow, that we don't do anything tomorrow. This Bill's been on the Calendar. He's had inapplicable notes filed on it. I am not hiding anything. I'm not trying to ram anything through. I tried to call it yesterday. He was sitting right there when I tried to call it and he had a note on it that was inapplicable. Now, he could've pulled that inapplicable note yesterday and we could've had a debate yesterday."
- Winters: "Now, we also understand that when this Bill was up in front of the committee that heard it, that the City of

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Carbondale brought up speakers to speak against it, it was not called that week but instead it was rammed through the following week when they had no notice to be up here to speak against it. Therefore, it acted like in committee there wasn't any opposition."

Bradley, J.: "Now, wait... wait, wait. I got no knowledge about that. I don't know if that's true or not. I know that this Bill has been laying... has been out there for a while. We had an open hearing. It was set by the House. Okay. There were people that were welcome to come up here and testify and there were several people that came and testified in support of it from both sides of the aisle and from communities all over Southern Illinois."

Winters: "I won't accuse you of subterfuge of trying to not allow the community leaders who opposed this. I'm not gonna accuse you of doing that. Okay, 'cause I don't know that for a fact, you may be entirely innocent. All I know is..."

Bradley, J.: "When... when have I ever been unreasonable with you or anybody else?"

Winters: "Not... not before this Bill."

Bradley, J.: "When have I ever been unreasonable, Representative? When I have Bills I always reach out to try to make 'em as bipartisan as possible."

Winters: "Well..."

Bradley, J.: "When have I ever been unreasonable?"

Winters: "All I'm saying is the community leaders of Carbondale felt that they were not allowed the opportunity to give their testimony in committee and I'm calling that to the attention of the Body that this Bill is not right. Again,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

we should be not making statewide, grandiose power grabs a possibility for municipalities all across this state, particularly when the Federal Government is the one that determines the size and the extent of these fish and wildlife boundaries. They are so much larger; they're an entirely different scale than any other type of natural area that we have allowed annexations to cross in the past. a step beyond anything that we've done before and probably very, very... not probably, it is very inappropriate to give up our state's rights in determining where municipalities can and cannot extend. Again, there are so many problems with this Bill that I encourage all Members to consider very carefully whether or not if your Congressman managed to get the funding for fish and wildlife organization of the Federal Department of Interior would come into your community, would you like it if your municipalities could expand across miles of territory and grab other prime commercial or industrial sites against other municipalities who do not want that to happen? With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much and look forward to the verification."

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

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise at... with a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your..."

Davis, M.: "I'd like to introduce the optometrist… a very famous optometrist in the State of Illinois. His daughter is in the balcony, Kristin Carter. Kristin, where are you? Thank you. Give her a nice warm welcome. Thank you."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Meyer, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Meyer: "Representative, I take umbrage with something that you said here on the floor. You maintain through inference that you're being fair about this Bill. Yesterday, Representative Bost, called our Leadership and informed them that he had told you he would be... that he would not be here today."

Bradley, J.: "No."

Meyer: "That's... that's not correct?"

Bradley, J.: "No."

Meyer: "Well, maybe we better get that straight with Mr. Bost when he comes back because he informed our Leadership that he told you he would not be here today, Sir."

Bradley, J.: "No. No."

Meyer: "And until that, why don't you take the Bill..."

Bradley, J.: "No."

Meyer: "...out of the record until we can get that part straightened out..."

Bradley, J.: "No, I..."

Meyer: "...because I don't... it's fair..."

Bradley, J.: "I'm sorry."

Meyer: "...if you knew."

Bradley, J.: "No."

Meyer: "Okay. You've said you don't know. I'm just stating the fact that I don't think it's good process down here. If you

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

know that a Member that is adamantly opposed to this Bill is not going to be here..."

Bradley, J.: "If I didn't... if I'd... if I'd have known, Representative..."

Meyer: "Excuse me, Sir..."

Bradley, J.: "If I'd known... if I'd have known, Representative..."

Meyer: "...I'm talking first."

Bradley, J.: "...I'd take it out."

Meyer: "To the Bill. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I don't believe that it is fair, that's the kind of process that we want down here if another Member knows that a Member who is adamantly opposed to a Bill is not gonna be here, that they choose that day out of all the days they could've asked to have this Bill called... to have it called on the House Floor. I've also been told that the mayor of Carbondale, very specifically, came to a committee where this Bill was posted expecting to give testimony against it. The Bill was not called. It was called the next week when the mayor who is affected by this Bill was out of town... out of the country as a matter of fact. Those are... that's part of the process that I think is... it stinks if it's factual. Now, to the Bill. In terms of what we are doing here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, take a look at the... at the policy that you're setting here in this state. I don't care what community it is. If you can annex through a preserve like this across a lake, that... those are vast amount of territory to be able to annex across. personally don't think it's good public policy regardless of who the communities are. When you can annex 20 to 30 miles,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

I think we have to take that into consideration as to what are we allowing communities in the state to do. It's just not in the interest of good public policy. This Bill has been around since March 23rd when it passed out We're now in overtime, according to committee. Calendar. This wouldn't have even come up if the budget had been passed on a timely basis. This would've been a moot problem. It would've been solved at some later point or the two communities could've gotten together to solve it. That's what we ought to be allowing to happen here, is the communities solve it. They shouldn't bring this stuff to us. We're not the referees on this. But in terms of public policy, take a look at the amount of territory that you can... you're allowing people to annex over if you allow this to pass. I just implore you; take a look at it from a public policy perspective. We all do favors for our friends on legislation. You need this in your community, I need something in my community, but this goes far, far beyond This is changing dramatically the public policy of our state on where we allow communities to annex and how far away, going through a preserve area and across a lake that they can annex. Thank you."

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

Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Stephens: "Representative, I was just talking to the Governor this morning. We were having coffee and he said that he did

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

at one time find you disagreeable. So your earlier comment was in error."

Bradley, J.: "I stand corrected, Representative."

Stephens: "Help me... help me understand the specific issue."

Bradley, J.: "Yeah."

Stephens: "Why are we doing it?"

Bradley, J.: "Well, there is the annexation statute provides that a community can go across a 'forest preserve'. There's a question as to whether or not a wildlife refuge would be included in that definition of forest preserve. So all this Bill does is include the actual wildlife refuge language in there. There's a... the way it came up, as I've been very upfront about, there's a group of people that live within Williamson County near Carterville. There's a wildlife refuge in between them. And they voluntarily wanna join Carterville. They're in Carterville school... they're in Carterville school district. They get Williamson County fire protection. They get Williamson County police services. It's simply a voluntarily thing. This is not a volun... a forced annexation, Representative. This is simply allowing people to choose. Now these people, as I understand it, could choose to be in some other committee... or community but it would allow them to have Carterville as an option to come into that community. It's simply..."

Stephens: "Under your change in the statute, let's talk about the possibility of forced annexation in the future."

Bradley, J.: "No, there's no... my understanding is this would not force anybody to come into a community. Voluntarily they

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

would come to the city council... petition the city council, they could be included."

Stephens: "Is there such a thing as forced annexation?"

Bradley, J.: "I don't know."

Stephens: "The... I'm not sure about the merits of the argument between Carterville and Carbondale. I do know this, that today I... we passed legislation... or a Resolution about Paul Simon's..."

Bradley, J.: "Yeah."

Stephens: "...parkway. And I know that his daughter is running for the mayor..."

Bradley, J.: "Yeah. Yeah."

Stephens: "...of Carbondale. And I don't... I'm pretty sure she's not gonna think kindly of you."

Bradley, J.: "Well... sorry."

Stephens: "All right. Well, I was trying to set the record straight here."

Bradley, J.: "Hey... hey, Representative, just one other thing, too, because... in my defense, too, that came up earlier, Representative Bost was here this morning. He answered the quorum call. And I've been wanting to call this Bill all day. So, I'm not trying to sneak it by him."

Stephens: "Representative, we've worked together on many issues and I have the utmost respect for you and Representative Bost has been a friend of mine for many years and both are honorable men. I don't know about the dispute. I have not talked to Representative Bost but there have been at least implications, if not outright statements, that somehow he is being wronged here."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Bradley, J.: "Yeah."

Stephens: "If there is a possibility that we could just slow this down for even a few minutes that maybe you two could talk on the phone. I... I would just like for his..."

Bradley, J.: "We... we..."

Stephens: "...in respect to Mike Bost, I would like to be able to say the things that he thinks are necessary to be said about this. We have tried to do that but I don't know that we've accomplished anything. The... come on, let's not criticize somebody for not being here on a day that..."

Bradley, J.: "Well..."

Stephens: "Oh, excuse me. Excuse me. He is at his son, a lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, has just gotten his degree this spring in... his J.D. in law and he's at his swearing-in right now. But you know what, he doesn't need an excuse. There are... there've been several of us that have not been able to be here every day and let's not criticize the Representative for not being here. All I wanna do is to make sure that his argument is heard."

Bradley, J.: "And... and the argument, I think, has been made well by your side and yourself, Representative Winters, et cetera."

Stephens: "Representative, I... and I will... I guess we're gonna have no choice but to let that stand. What we need to make sure we do... this has been a contentious Session anyway. You and Mike Bost are friends. I don't want you to wrong him, he doesn't wanna be wronged, and I don't think that you want to wrong him. I think what he wants to do is stop the legislation. Now, I don't know how we're best able to do

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

that. I am worried just on the merits of the legislation that we're setting... we're opening Pandora's Box here, that there are going to be problems in the future because of this change. I don't know that to be a fact. I'm worried that it might occur. All I can do is, I guess, stand and say, you know what, we've made our arguments. We've asked you to consider some other method by which we could address this so that Representative Bost could be here. This is not the... I guess that's not gonna happen. We will just respectfully disagree with the legislation. We'll assume your honor and we'll do our best to beat your Bill."

Bradley, J.: "Thank you, Representative."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, you've been harangued out here that you were trying to sandbag these individuals. Who's Representative Bost's Senator?"

Bradley, J.: "Senator Luechtefeld."

Fritchey: "How did he vote on this Bill in the Senate?"

Bradley, J.: "This Bill came out of the Senate 56-0."

Fritchey: "Yes, it did. Because all of them recognized that this was a legitimate issue and it was not a partisan issue and was not grandstanding, correct?"

Bradley, J.: "Right. I assume... I don't know why they voted... but it was 56-0."

Fritchey: "And Senator Forby didn't wait for Representative...

Senator Luechtefeld not to be there, correct?"

128th Legislative Day

- Bradley, R.: "No, that's correct."
- Fritchey: "And Senator Luechtefeld had the ability to debate the Bill over there, correct."
- Bradley, J.: "That's correct."
- Fritchey: "Yet, all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle voted for this legislation, correct?"
- Bradley, J.: "That's correct."
- Fritchey: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you have stopped just short of calling this man a liar and a sandbagger on this issue when he doesn't deserve either one of these. He's got a Bill that's important to him. He's working this. It came out of the Senate unanimously. I urge its support. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Kelly, for what reason do you rise?"
- Kelly: "To the Bill. I just wanted to make a comment as a Member of the Local Government Committee. I know you're asking Representative Bradley to pull this Bill, but Representative Bost was in committee that day and he stood in the back of the room and he made no comment. And there are avenues... there were avenues for him to make comments so he could've subbed for himself... he could've subbed on the committee to ask questions. I, too, stand in support of the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang from the County of Cook, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill but also to defend the Gentleman. I don't know what we've come to in this Body, but if we're gonna be forced to check with everybody who's

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

on or off the floor to make sure are opponents are on the floor when we run Bills, we'll never get to run Bills except the unanimous ones. We have a responsibility to debate things here. This is when the Bill is on the board. The Gentleman didn't decide when this Bill is on the board. That's as they say above his pay scale, someone else makes that decision. This Bill is on the board. Mr. Bost isn't here, that's unfortunate. The Gentleman's had conversations with Representative Bost. But I don't know why the Gentleman has to take a Bill out of the record because someone who opposes it is not here. That's just the way this process works. Vote 'yes' or vote 'no'. The Gentleman's got a Bill, do your thing."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Delgado, what reason do you rise?"
- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the Members of the House.

  I, too, rise in support of Senate Bill 835 and I would move the question."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Molaro, the Gentleman from Cook, for what reason do you rise?"
- Molaro: "I... I've never heard of this waiting for an opponent.

  Matter of fact, I know how to slow a Bill, I was waiting for many, many days for Pritchard and Sacia not be here and they never missed. And if they would ever missed, I would've called that Bill immediately. So, I don't know what we're talking about."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley, J.: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 835?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Please vote your own switch. There has been a request for a verification. Please vote your own switch. There has been a request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Eddy. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no'. And we will proceed with the Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, verify the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
Acevedo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; Bradley, J.; Bradley, R.;
Brosnahan; Burke; Chapa LaVia; Chavez; Collins; Colvin;
Currie; D'Amico; Monique Davis; Will Davis: Delgado; Dugan;
Dunkin; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Franks; Fritchey;
Giles; Golar; Gordon; Graham; Granberg; Hamos; Hannig;
Hoffman; Holbrook; Howard; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Joyce;
Kelly; Lang; Lyons, J.; Mautino; May; McCarthy; McGuire;
Mendoza; Miller; Molaro; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz;
Rita; Ryg; Scully; Smith; Soto; Tenhouse; Turner;
Verschoore; Washington; Yarbrough; Younge; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Feigenholtz, Representative Feigenholtz. Okay."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady is at the door."

Winters: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady's in her seat."

Winters: "In her seat, okay. Representative Granberg."

128th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He's at the back door."
- Winters: "Representative Joyce."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Joyce is in the phone booth."
- Winters: "I don't see anybody sitting in the Bill box. Oh, I'm sorry, that's not Representative Bill box. I'm fine... I'm fine.. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "So, the final vote is there are 63 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 2049. What's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2049 was previously declared lost today. A Motion has been filed by Representative John Bradley, pursuant to Rule 61, having voted on the prevailing side, 'I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2049 failed.'"
- Speaker Turner: "There's been a Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2049 failed. 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there's 65 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitut... and the Motion passes... the Motion to reconsider is adopted. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 2049."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third reading of this Senate Bill."

128th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Osterman: the House. Earlier when this Bill was presented there were some questions about opposition. And as I stand before you today, I know of no opponents to this legislation. 150 is in support. Chicago Federation of Labor is in support. The Laborers International is in support. Chicago Building Trades Association in support. So are all the engineering construction industries, The American Institute of Architects and the Illinois Council of Engineers, all are in support. We've taken away any opposition to this Bill. Again, this legislation simply allows public building commissions in Illinois to a use a design-build method when they are constructing public buildings. And I would simply ask for an 'aye' vote from everybody."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Verschoore, for what reason do you rise?"
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Since the last vote, I... I was... in my opposition, I was an honest opposition at the time. Since then I've got on the phone and made a call to the Quad Cities... or to the a Chicago Fed and I understand now that they're not in opposition, so I will be voting 'yes' on this Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan, what reason do you rise?"
- Dugan: "To the Bill, Speaker. I, too, also want to a make sure that it is understood after checking with some of the opposition that we did have to this Bill sooner when we

128th Legislative Day

- voted on it before, the unions and the labor are in support of this Bill. So I do, also, ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate... Senate Bill 2049?' 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? Representative Cultra? Poe? Rose? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Supplemental #2 we have Senate Joint Resolution 91, Representative Marlow Colvin. Committee Reports, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 04, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for Senate Joint Resolution 91."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Colvin on Senate Joint Resolution 91."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House... excuse me, Senate Joint Resolution 91 deals with the State's Employee Group Insurance Act of 1971. When it was established... when the insurance program for community college benefit recipients was established, the City of Chicol... the City Colleges of Chicago were expressly excluded from the college insurance program under the statute. Here we are nearly 20 years

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

later dealing with the high cost of insurance, we're asking that the state form a joint task force to further discuss and explore the feasibility of including City of College... City Colleges of Chicago teachers to have access to this insurance program. The teacher unions are in support of it. There's no known opposition to it. It passed unanimously out of the Senate yesterday and ask for support in the House."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Colvin, would you... can we take the Bill out of the record for a minute? Take the Resolution out of the record. Mr. Clerk, you can put it back in. Read Senate Joint Resolution 21... 91. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution's back in the record? Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Reso... back in the record."

Eddy: "I have a couple questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, can you tell us why the City Colleges of Chicago were excluded from the original insurance group?"

Colvin: "I can't tell you... I can't tell you the reason why they were originally excluded from the original legislation. I think in the years since that Bill was enacted it seems to be expressly unfair that to exclude one group of teachers from the insurance program. With the Resolution, we hope to put together a task force that will investigate and make some recommendations as to the best way to proceed in terms of giving them access to the insurance program or using some

128th Legislative Day

- alternative program to make sure that they have access to fair cost of insurance as well."
- Eddy: "At this time is there a substantial difference between the premiums and the coverage choices that the members of the..."
- Colvin: "I'm sorry. Could you just start over, repeat that? I didn't hear you."
- Eddy: "Yeah. Yes, Sir. At this time is there a substantial difference between the coverage... the health coverage and the premium costs for those who are in the City College of Chicago and the group you're attempting to do the study?"
- Colvin: "Yes, there is a difference. There's a difference."
- Eddy: "And the purpose of this ultimately would be once a task force is able to study the current conditions in the Chicago system as opposed to the system for the statewide employees then try to determine what effect that inclusion might have on the larger pool?"
- Colvin: "That would... exactly. That would be part of their study and a part of their analysis with the end result being, what's the best and most fair way to make affordable insurance options available to teachers in the City Colleges of Chicago system."
- Eddy: "So at the end of the day, once the task force reports its finding, is there a deadline to report the findings back?"
- Colvin: "October of this year, Sir."
- Eddy: "Okay. So once they report the findings back then would it be your intention to come forward with enabling legislation that would allow them to join that pool if the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

conditions of the task force were to suggest it's favorable?"

Colvin: "It very well could be. Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "Okay. So that's... that's what you're... that's what your purpose is..."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...is to try to give that type of... to solve a problem that they have in their situation."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So... so similar concerns for other groups that may need inclusion could kind of look at this as a precedent being set for the pathway into that larger pool to enjoy those benefits."

Colvin: "I'm not sure I understood your question."

Eddy: "Well, if we're looking at this for the City Colleges of Chicago, I don't necessarily have a problem with that, but if there is another group that is eligible... I remember last year I brought county hospital... small county hospital groups in to... to try and measure... That's what... that's really kind of what you're looking at, that methodology to make sure they belong in those groups of the task force before you bring 'em in."

Colvin: "Yes, Sir. I think you're exactly right and that's why we have such a... just several months. We have six months here to make a solid recommendation as to the best way to proceed to deal with this one very specific issue."

Eddy: "And once they come in, if they come in, they'll pay the premium. They'll pay a buy-in if there's a necessary buy-in

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

in order to join that group because of the established rates. They'll have to pay any of those costs."

Colvin: "Well, that would be... I would say yes. But obviously, that would be the work of the task force to..."

Eddy: "But that's your intention then, enabling legislation would include them buying into the group at the rate they would need to."

Colvin: "And that would be correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

Colvin: "Yes, Sir, I couldn't disagree with that. That's right."

Eddy: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Meyer."

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

Representative, I believe... I think I heard you correctly

when you were asked the question as to why they were

excluded originally. You stated that you didn't know."

Colvin: "I couldn't speak to that, no."

Meyer: "Okay. Well, having served here for 14 years now, I've found that there are really two sets of laws for the state. There's one for most of us and then there's one for the City of Chicago and Cook County. So, perhaps they were asked... that they asked not to be included to start with, which is the way it normally works down here is that we think we have a good idea and then we work at passing it and the city and Cook County say, but we don't wanna be a part of it so that... that's probably why. I doubt very much if they were just excluded just on the basis they had the votes to include if

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

they wanted to be. The question I have, though, is currently who provides that insurance service? Who provides that insurance service to those people?"

Colvin: "To the state group or the Chicago group?"

Meyer: "No, the Chicago group."

Colvin: "They do themselves; they're in their own insurance pool."

Meyer: "Is their insurance pool in trouble?"

Colvin: "Not particularly, is it... I wouldn't characterize it as in trouble. But I think the goal here is to develop what would be most and best cost effective for teachers in that system."

Meyer: "Do they have the same benefits in their current program as they have in the state program?"

Colvin: "No. No, it's... there's a number of differences."

Meyer: "Do they have the same cost?"

Colvin: "No."

Meyer: "If they would be included in the state program, you're...
you're totally willing to have them pay the same cost that
the rest of the state has?"

Colvin: "Absolutely. And again, I think, with the purpose of the task force is to explore those avenues."

Meyer: "Will your task force also include an analysis of the loss ratio for that group?"

Colvin: "Could you repeat that? I didn't hear your last part."

Meyer: "Would your task force investigation or consideration also include a cost... a loss ratio analysis of that group that you want to bring into the state program?"

Colvin: "Sure. Sure, if they wanted to."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Meyer: "I'm sorry. You said sure what?"

Colvin: "Yes, if they wanted to, I think they would..."

Meyer: "Well..."

Colvin: "...it's reasonable... I think it's reasonable to assume that they would be exploring this from a number of different angles and I would imagine that that would be one in which they would explore."

Meyer: "All right. Thank you for your responses."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass SJR 91?'
All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say
'no'. The opinion of the Chair's... 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question,
there are 104 voting 'aye', 0 'no', 0 'presents'. And this
Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, we're
going to proceed down that Calendar. Under the Order of
Resolutions we have SJR 129. Representative Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a simple House Joint Resolution. What it is, it's a highway in my dis... in my district that they have now named the Big Island Road. It's partially a IDOT route and it's partially a township route and they want to name it the Big Island Parkway. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote and I'd be gla... happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass HJR 129?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

How all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Durkin. Clerk shall take the record. On this... there are 105 voting 'aye', 0 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does pass House Res... House Joint Resolution 129. On the Order of Resolutions we have HJR 130, Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 130 urges that the United States and Illinois Departments of Agriculture fund research and make grants available to determine the efficacy of using miscanthus as a power source. I am told that establishing energy crops preserves rather then endangers landscapes. Miscanthus, which is a field grass, has the best energy per space ratio of any energy crops. Harvested miscanthus can be processed down to the last fiber leaving no production waste, ashes from the combustion can reenter the cycle as fertilizer. I would like 'yes' votes from my colleagues."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rose, the Gentleman from Champaign, what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "To the Bill. Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill... Resolution."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I salute the Lady on this. The miscanthus... the University of Illinois's miscanthus project is being led by a constituent of mine and lives in Monticello and a number of their test plots are in my district. And this would be a wonderful fuel source for the future and it has become a wonderful fuel source for England. And I really appreciate the Lady bringing this important matter before the Body."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 130?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have HR 120... 1259, Representative Scully, the Gentleman from Cook."

Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for your support for House Resolution 1259 honoring Constable James Quinn for an office... as an officer of the Chicago Police Department who died in the line of duty in 1853. Because of the passage of time, his death in the line of duty was not properly recognized. in the history books. When the Chicago Police Department was recently conducting its investigation and assembling the list of all those officers who have fallen in the line of duty, Constable James Quinn... Constable Quinn's death was overlooked. We ask for this Resolution. It is... this is the exact same Resolution that was adopted by the Chicago City Council at the end of March, asking the police department to review this case of Constable Quinn and ask that his badge be included in the honor star case in the police department. And that he be included in the name of the Municipal Memorial under construction honoring those officers who have died in the line of duty."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1259?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'... I should say, say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is

128th Legislative Day

- adopted. We have House Resolution 1266, Representative Froehlich."
- Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1266 simply designates the week of September 10 to 16 as railroad safety week in the State of Illinois. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1266?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have House Resolution 1275, Representative Bill Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1275 urges the United States Congress to put a veterans' clinic on the grounds of the Lincoln Developmental Center."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"
- Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Gordon: "Representative, I read the full text of this and I... I guess, I just... do you foresee us leasing this property to... to the Federal Government? Are they gonna buy the property? I mean, how do... how do you see this happening?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Well, this is a project in the future. This is an initiative of the City of Lincoln. The mayor wants this, so we… details could be worked out. Right now there's nothing there, quite frankly, so anything would help the state budget."

128th Legislative Day

- Gordon: "So, do you see a lease or a purchase? Do you see..."
- Mitchell, B.: "I said anything would be a beneficial to the state treasury since right now nothing... it's not being used at all. It's an expense."
- Gordon: "I..."
- Mitchell, B.: "So whether it's a lease or a sale, it would be a net plus to the treasury of the State of Illinois."
- Gordon: "So you... you would completely take it away as Lincoln Developmental Center and turn it into a VA clinic?"
- Mitchell, B.: "No, the Lincoln Developmental Center is closed now."
- Gordon: "I understand that. I'm just saying, do you see it no longer being used for a developmental center and..."
- Mitchell, B.: "No, there's a large campus..."
- Gordon: "I'm not done yet, Representative. Or seeing it completely and only used for a VA clinic? Is that your intention?"
- Mitchell, B.: "That's not their... I don't know how many acres there are, but right now under the present plans, there's four buildings to house about ten clients per building I believe. So there's plenty of acreage on that campus for many usage."
- Gordon: "Thank you. To the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the fact what the Representative is trying to do, but the full text of this Resolution doesn't have any details and to... and to make a... a comment like this about the City of Lincoln and then how to use this property and whether you're gonna sell it to the feds or lease it to

128th Legislative Day

- the feds, there's just a lack of details in this. And it just... it doesn't make any sense to me. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1275?' All those in favor shall say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. Opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have House Resolution 1265, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Resolution 1265 urges Congress to pass legislation calling for the federal approval of the extension of Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. I would move its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1265?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' has it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have House Resolution 1288, Representative Reitz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. I'm sorry. Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1288 urges residents in school districts to test for the presence of radon. I have a school in Waterloo that has a class that has been tracking this for a number of years. And doing tests and... and it's... from what I've learned of it with them and other people and talking to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, I would urge everyone in the General Assembly also to try and test their house for that and that's what this does."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1288?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. Opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have House Resolution 1291, Representative Chavez, the Lady from Cook."
- Chavez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaking... Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, House Resolution 1299 resolves that in the land of immigrants as a great American nation we should sing our national anthem together in English. Thank you... only. I ask for you..."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentlemen from Knox, Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you rise?"

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

- Moffitt: "Representative, I know this is an issue that's come up and I really appreciate you stating this position. I just want you to know how much I appreciate that. And I think that's... that's appropriate. And... and certainly we are a blending pot nation and yet, we are Americans and I appreciate the fact that we want to continue as Americans and yet, respecting traditions. So, I appreciate what you're doing here."
- Chavez: "It's a respect on my end. It's an honor to help this House Resolution. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the Lady's Resolution. I, too, would agree with her that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

although this is America and we as Hispanic Legislators are the first and foremost to be out there fighting for immigrant rights. But also believe that our national anthem should be respected, not just by those people in this country but in other countries abroad. And when they sing it, it should be sung in the language that it's meant to be sung in and that would be English. I would ask for your support. Hopefully, we can all support this Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1291?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

"Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1300, Clerk Bolin: offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 1301, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 1302, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1303, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1304, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 1305, offered by Representative Eddy. House Resolution 1306, offered by Representative Hamos. House Resolution 1307, offered by Representative McCarthy. House Resolution 1308, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 1309, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolutions 1310, 1311, and 1312, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 1313, offered by Representative Brosnahan. House Resolution 1314, offered by Representative Dunkin. And House Joint Resolution 135, offered by Representative Ryq."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "The Clerk moves for the adoption of the… the aforementioned Resolutions. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And those Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Myers. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that I've talked to some of our colleagues that are... are asking if they should be checking out of their... out of their hotels tonight. And can we have some direction from the Chair of whether or not we will be adjourning tonight or will we be in tomorrow? I know... I know that's still a nebulous question, but is there any indication from the Speaker as to what's going on?"

Speaker Turner: "I thought checkout time was 12:00 at most hotels. So, I assume that you're here for the night."

Parke: "Well, the fact of the matter is, Art, I know we can make light of it, but there are people who really need to know whether or not they should keep their rooms. You wanna come back to us on that?"

Speaker Turner: "I'll get back to you."

Parke: "Thank you."

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

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I need some technical help.

I've been searching around the computer trying to find the live video feed from the Senate budget debate. I can't seem to find it. Could you a send me some technical help and see if we can't find a Senate budget debate some place?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "I don't think the cameras are on in that room."

Winters: "I'm surprised."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "We might be able to find it on ESPN. I understand there was a multi round dispute over there."

Speaker Turner: "Page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Third Readings we have House Bill 3904, Representative Dugan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3904, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Of course, this was the Bill that we had debated earlier, which is the School Construction Bill that I would like to see passed. It... what it'll do is address the 24 schools that are on the FY '02 school construction program. They have already been considered eligible. Some of the schools have actually sold their bonds. They've done their part of it. Some of them have even built the schools expecting what they were agreed to and promised by the State of Illinois. They will lose their opportunity because there's a 5-year referendum limitation here and they're going to be losing it. So, I would like to ask that a favorable vote on this to do a \$500 million School Construction Bond Bill, which has been of course done many times in the future ever since the state started the school construction grant program. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

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

Eddy: "A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Eddy: "How many votes would ensure a successful passage of this?"

Speaker Turner: "This Bill will take 71 votes for passage."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you. Representative, earlier today we had some substantial discussion regarding this Bill. However, I wanna kind of go over a couple of points..."

Dugan: "Certainly."

Eddy: "...so that everybody has a chance to refocus a little bit.

It's a very, very important issue. It's obviously an important issue to the children in the districts that you discussed, the 24 districts. But can... can you point in the Bill to a specific designated funding source to pay off the bonds that it would take to issue... to build these schools?"

Dugan: "The General Revenue Fund, Representative."

Eddy: "Can... can you point to a source of funding in order for the specific dollar amount to go into the General Revenue Fund that would pay?"

Dugan: "The... the... we expect the growth to cover it,

Representative. I believe we're close to a billion dollar

growth in the General Revenue Fund in the state and so the

money ha... from the General Revenue Fund, which is what we do

use to pay off General Obligation Bonds."

Eddy: "Is that the same growth that's supposed to pay for other budget items that we... we looked at yesterday? Is that the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

same money? And if so, how can the same money pay for two things?"

Dugan: "I'm sorry, Representative, could you just hold for just a second. Correct. Representative, I'm sorry. As far as the money that goes into that particular fund, the General Revenue Fund, as in the past for the school construction grant program: cigarette and liquor tax goes into the fund that has been used in the past for the school construction, telecommunications tax. I believe back in the late 1990s, it was the General Assembly who felt the need to raise the taxes in cigarettes and liquor and telecommunications in order to raise funds to sell school construction grants, the program for bonds for the school construction. That is still the same process as what I'm asking to do. The difference being is I'm asking to do it without an increase in taxes at all, because of the growth in the state in the taxes from this program..."

Eddy: "Representative, how much... how much annualized contribution to pay those... for the 500 million, how much would it take annually?"

Dugan: "Annually, it ranges between 45 to 21 million."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, if we can have just a little bit of order. This is a school construction bonding Bill. Everybody in here talks about how important school construction bonding is but nobody's willing to listen to the debate regarding how that's gonna be paid for."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Eddy: "Could you repeat your answer regarding how much in revenue it will take to pay \$500 million off on an annualized basis?"
- Dugan: "Yes, Representative, according to the fiscal note it's estimated the debt service will range between 45 and 21 million for this \$500 million."
- Eddy: "Okay, I wanna make sure that everybody heard the answer.

  The answer was it would take between 45 and 21 million dollars annually for how long?"

Dugan: "Twenty-five years."

- Eddy: "So somewhere between 21 and 45 million dollars for 25 years. Why... why the... ya know, 21 to 45 we're talking about over double. Why the... why the large divergence there in the money, why can't you pin it down on \$500 million in bonding to a number that comes closer to something between 21 and 45?"
- Dugan: "Because, Representative, as we move forward in... as you do whenever you sell General Obligation Bonds, depending on again, we'll state this year we had about a billion dollar growth in the state. We may be able to as far as the payments for our debt of course is... can be based on... we can put as much money as we want into education and this of course is a part of funding education, and so if the cost to provide these schools with school grant construction grants then I believe it's a good investment. And we then looked at what we need to pay out of the General Revenue Fund, which is how we funded it ever since it was started in the 1990s."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Eddy: "Representative, we're... if this was to pass we would be adding \$500 million in bonding debt to a state that has gone from 7 to 20 billion dollars in bonding debt. It's a state that 3 years ago spent four cents out of every new dollar, four cents out of every new dollar on debt service that now spends seven... over seven cents of every new dollar on debt service. We have a growing economy here in the state that's getting eaten up... all of the new revenue to the state is being eaten up by debt service. How do you propose to be able to pay for something out of General Revenue when new money coming in is being diminished by the fact that we're having to spend 7 cents or 7.4 cents now on debt service? How does that work that you can spend this money several times?"

Dugan: "Well, Representative, the only thing that I can say and of course without getting into spit... specific dollar figures. I mean we've increased the moneys that we have given to the education fund every year for the last 3 years. In fact, this year I believe in this year's budget we put about 417 million, which is an increase from last year. So, therefore, as we go forward and we have a growth in revenue in this state then I would believe that it would be the intent of many here to make sure that we make education our top priority and I believe that can continue to happen as it has every year."

Eddy: "Representative, is there any specific language in this Bill? You mentioned the 20... 23 school districts. Let... let's make sure everybody in here understands there's two different issues here. One issue is the fact that we have

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

23 school districts that did not get funded from entitlement letters that they received from the State of Illinois 3 to 4 years ago. Those 24 school districts, the cost would be about a hundred forty-nine million dollars. Are you asking for a hundred forty-nine million dollars in this Bill?"

Dugan: "No, I am not."

Eddy: "So, you're asking for \$500 million, which goes well beyond the... the need that we have committed to... to those 24 school districts."

Dugan: "Well, Representative, it... it does not address the need of the school districts in the State of Illinois, because I believe if you look at FY '03, FY '04, and FY '05, you will see a continued list. It is true that the ones that have gone through the process and have been given the eligibility letters are the 23, but the need is still there 'cause we can see them on the list of all the schools still."

Eddy: "Okay. So, Representative, would you agree with me that those 23 or 24 school districts that we're talking about are different... they are different substantially from other districts who have not been directly promised money?"

Dugan: "They... the... the only difference they have is their need has been entitled by the State of Illinois but the need is with all the other schools that are on the list also."

Eddy: "That's a substantial difference. That is a substantial difference."

Dugan: "Not to the schools, I believe, Representative."

Eddy: "Absolutely it is, because some of those… those districts are facing issues related to bonds like arbitrage. It is substantially different. My question is, if there were a

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

possibility of funding those 24 school districts with a hundred and forty-nine million dollars that we could find in General Revenue, why wouldn't you support that rather than trying to pass a \$500 million capital Bill that you know I think, Representative, that... that Leader can't pass? Cross earlier today pointed out logistically that this is not possible. This is something to allow people to vote on something to make it appear as if... as if there's a chance that these schools will be built. And we both know that this is not gonna make it. If we sat down together and worked on a way to fund those schools... You know what we really have done? We have taken the children of those 23 school districts and we have made them political pawns to try to pass \$500 million in capital bunding... bonding when \$149 million dollars will do."

Dugan: "And, Representative, with all due respect, as far as using the children as a political pawn, I have two schools on this list. I have 24 schools that have sat on a list since FY '02 for funding from this state that they were promised and they have built schools, they have sold their bonds, and it is the responsibility of this state in order to do it. The way that I have proposed to do it is the same way that the House has done it ever since they started this program in the 1990s. As far as to whether or not this can pass, it is my intent to do this legislation to give those 24 schools what they are entitled to and to move forward with the school construction grant."

Eddy: "Representative, I have a question for ya then."

Dugan: "Yes."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Eddy: "Earlier today you had the opportunity to vote to discharge a Bill from Rules in order to fund those school districts, two of which you have just stated are your school districts. My question to you is, how did you vote when it came time to discharge a Bill that specifically dealt with those two school districts? What was your vote on that Bill? The Motion to Discharge?"

Dugan: "I didn't vote on the Bill."

Eddy: "What was your vote on the Motion to Discharge and overrule the Chair so that we could be talking about that Bill?"

Dugan: "There was a vote on a Motion to sustain the Chair,

Representative, not to discharge."

Eddy: "The point of the matter is, and you know what the point is, you had the opportunity earlier today just like everybody else in this Body who says they care about those 24 schools to vote to have that brought out here by overriding the Chair. You didn't vote to override the Chair because you wanted to see this Bill considered. My question is, what's the difference if you're in favor of those two schools, why don't you support my Motion to get a Bill out here that's realistic?"

Dugan: "Because, Representative, I have a Bill right here in my hand that we're debating that will make sure that those 24 schools get their money. And so, therefore, to have two Bills the… doesn't make any sense. This Bill takes care of the 24 and also the other schools that have applied to this state. I believe the school construction program in the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

State of Illinois is a very important program and I want to continue to see it go forward."

Eddy: "Representative, I'd like to see it go forward as well. You're... you're not gonna find anybody in this chamber who'd like to see it... that program go forward more than me, but I also think we have a responsibility to fund it and to be upfront. Now, as to the cost of those 23 or 24 school districts this year, this year, it appears as if we're gonna have well over \$900 million in new revenue. Why not do something completely different and novel and take a responsible approach and pay those people first, because we owe them the money. Why don't we take some of that \$900-plus million and do what you and I both want to do and that's fund those schools on that list that deserve the funding first?"

Dugan: "Representative, with all due respect, as I looked into and researched the school construction program and I look at the program that was set up by the General Assembly back in the 1990s, I believe that it is a good program. I believe that it makes sense to not... to sell the bonds as we sell General Obligation Bonds all the time to fund the things of the needs of our state. I believe that this is possible. I believe that it is the same thing that has been done, it is a way to fund our school constructions and therefore, I proposed the Bill to do that."

Eddy: "Representative... Representative, you know that that is not gonna happen because you know to do that you have to have votes from people who want to take a responsible approach to this. We would like to join you in a responsible approach

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

to funding these schools. We're offering you that opportunity. You know that that's the only way it's gonna happen, because you can't do it unless you get the support. Five hundred and seventy-seven million dollars, I have a sheet here that shows \$577 million in the budget that we passed for... for programs and for items that have not... have absolutely no direct line item or... or our knowledge what there doing for..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your 10 minutes is up.

Representative Cross, the Gentleman from Kendall."

Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak but I think some people would like to defer a little time so Representative Eddy could finish. If we could do that. I know there..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Cross: "...are probably another 50 or a hundred Bills we need to do tonight, but if we could stay on this and get it done."

Speaker Turner: "It's only about 75."

Cross: "Is there... are there 75?"

Speaker Turner: "Yeah, about 75."

Cross: "'Cause I... I wanna get to those and I know it's important that we do. But if we could let Roger finish, that'd be nice."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "I'd like to yield my time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Parke yields his time to Representative Eddy. Turn Representative Eddy back on for 5 minutes."

Eddy: "Than... thank you very much, Representative Parke and Mr. Speaker. Representative, I just don't understand how we can

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

come out here and... and we can try to run a Bill for a... for political purposes when children are in the middle. Look, there's \$577 million of pork in that budget we passed out of here. Why can't we take a realistic approach, a responsible approach and say there's a hundred and forty-nine million dollars in... in need that has been substantiated that we have entitled those school districts to and spend a hundred and forty-nine million dollars of over \$900 million in new revenue on keeping a promise? What would be wrong with that approach?"

Dugan: "Nothing's wrong with that approach, Representative. And my Bill will give the hundred and forty-nine million dollars to the 24 schools that are waiting for the funding."

Eddy: "Representative, your Bill would also add \$500 million in long-term debt to a state that is swimming in debt. talking about doing something that would take care of the same problem that you see and that is that we have 24 schools, 24 districts where the State of Illinois has promised children that they would have a environment that would be fit the... the year 2006. have you... I've been to these buildings. I've seen the These children need our consideration. children. children deserve better than politicians standing up and trying to pass a capital Bill that allows somebody to fly around the state and hand out all kinds of additional capital money in an election year. This... the children of this state deserve individuals to look up to who will do the right thing. And the right thing to do is to ... we had a Bill in here earlier this year to try and mandate that we teach

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

kids about financial literacy. Financial literacy? We have an opportunity to show 'em what it means in real terms. We can show them that you actually, when you're talking about financial literacy, you actually pay those things you promised with real money. Wouldn't that be a great... wouldn't that be a great lesson for the children of this state if they had the opportunity to know that their elected leaders knew what financial literacy meant?"

Dugan: "Is that a question, Representative?"

Eddy: "Wouldn't it be nice if the stu... the students got to see us be financially literate to... to put into place some of the practices that were in the standards that we're supposed to teach children about financial literacy?"

Dugan: "And I also think it's important that we show the children of this state that they are our top priority and the needs for school construction, the 24 and the others on the list are our very explicit fact, that's a fact, Representative. And this is the proposal that I have made in this legislation in order to address a concern that I have and that many schools have throughout the State of Illinois. I understand that you possibly do not agree with the funding proposal but it is the same funding proposal that we have used since the 1990s."

Eddy: "Well, let me ask you a question. Let me ask you a question."

Dugan: "Yes."

Eddy: "You and I both know this isn't gonna pass because people are not gonna take the same kind of approach to this on this side of the aisle as your side of the aisle, because we're

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

not gonna add another \$500 million in debt. We both know that. Once that's done and over with, will you join me in trying to get a responsible approach to this school funding out of Rules Committee by allowing us to vote on that? If it's not going to vote... if we're not gonna have a positive vote on your methodology, why don't... why don't we try mine?"

Dugan: "Well, Representative, and I certainly respect your idea of how you believe that it's best to fund these schools that need to be funded..."

Eddy: "That's not what I'm asking ya. I'm asking you, will you join me in supporting the same type of spending for children that you're espousing in this Bill in a different approach that funds those schools being built with real money? Take it out about \$900-plus million, take it out of the \$577 million in pork that's in there, and show those kids really that they are the priority by spending on them first because we owe them and then we'll talk about a new capital program. Then we'll talk... let's not ... let's not make those kids part They don't deserve it. They do not of this discussion. deserve to be... to be tossed in with this political discussion about a bonding Bill, because... because they are part of a totally different set of school funding. Let's deal with that. Let's take a responsible approach. That's my question. Will you join me in that approach? Will you try to look at it from that angle?"

Dugan: "If you... if you are asking me if in the future, Representative, will I join you as far as making education and continuing to make it a priority, I will say 'yes'. I

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

will say to you at this particular point, I have a Bill and if the children are the…"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Eddy, bring your remarks to a close."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ya know, I... I have worked very, very hard this year in a bipartisan manner on a number of issues related to schools. And I have agreed with my friends on the other side of the aisle and I have actually worked hard to get votes on Bills that are important for education from early childhood to reorganization to 6 percent issues. But there is no more important issue that's facing this Body than what to do for the children of those 23 districts. We have a responsible approach. I would appreciate the opportunity to debate that. At this point, we can't do this. We have to do it the right way. We have to show our children that we can do it the right way."

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

Pritchard: "I didn't hear your calling my name. To the Bill. We've heard from the speaker this afternoon that she has 2 of these 23 school districts in her district. I have one of them in mine. And like many of you from both sides of this aisle, I'm in a fast growth district, which means that our schools are growing and not able to keep up with the demands for classroom space. We, as a Legislative Body, need to do something to address the issue of school construction and maintenance. We've ignored it for way too long. Our colleagues across the rotunda have already dealt with a construction Bill and have turned it down as too expensive.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

This is a scaled down version, but it's still more then we can accommodate in our budget based on General Revenue. The speaker alluded to the fact that we have done this many times before. But what we relied on General Revenue funding to pay for our interest and principle on construction debt, we didn't have the \$21 billion in debt that we have today. We had only a quarter of the Medicaid obligations that we have today. We didn't have the many needs that are based out of our General Revenue Fund that we're using today. Times have changed. We must look at this issue with new creativity, in a different fashion. I would like to join my colleague Sponsor as well as others in this Body dealing issue of deferred maintenance and the construction. This is not the Bill to do that. I would ask for your 'no' vote on this and your commitment to proceed with some realistic ways of funding school construction this fall. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Rose: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates... She indicates she will."

Rose: "Representative, does money grow on trees?"

Dugan: "No, I don't think so, Representative."

Rose: "Money doesn't grow on trees?"

Dugan: "No."

Rose: "'Cause that's what this Bill is. When is the other side of the aisle gonna figure this out: \$2 billion of unpaid Medicaid bills, \$1 billion in pension raid this year, a billion last year, 450 million in fund sweeps. But hey,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

money grows on trees. Let's go pass a \$500 million General Obligation Bond authorization with no way to pay for it. Part and parcel and no joke, Annazette Collins just handed me a \$200 bill with Representative Ken Dunkin's face on it. And you know what, now I know how this is gonna be paid for, funny money that apparently grows somewhere around Representative Collins' chair."

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

Meyer: "Thank... one second. We have a tight aisle here. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Turner: "He... She indicates she will."

"Re... Representative, there have been a lot of figures Mever: thrown out here at you today. I realize and I understand you want to do something for the children of Illinois. But it must of... you must believe that what you're doing here is not in the best interest of the children of Illinois if, in fact, all it does is run up debt and cause the rating of the bonds of this state to fall because of that. We have... and we've talked about this on a number of occasions over the last couple days on the House Floor. We have already indications from a major bond house out in New York that they're looking at downgrading the... the... the bond rating of the state. And it's gonna cost us money. It's gonna cost the children that you hope to serve, through what you're attempting to do with your Bill today by that down rating. Why is it that you won't back a Bill that will take the money out of the current budget, money that is there, money that you don't have to spend on more Member projects, they

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

only go to your Party, as a part of a budget agreement? All… all you have to do is agree to spend it in the children of the state and do it in a logical way that won't impair the bond rating of this state. I'm asking you, why won't you do that?"

Dugan: "Representative, I'm not quite sure what part of that is a question. But if you're asking me as far as why I won't support another Bill that's a proposal to fund these 24 schools, there is not another Bill on this House Floor to sup... to have."

Meyer: "Representative, that's lip service. You know it."

Dugan: "Second... I'm just..."

Meyer: "I know it. Everybody in this room..."

Dugan: "You asked me why I'm not supporting another Bill."

Meyer: "I'm asking you a very specific question. Why won't you support a measure that would allow you to accomplish what you're attempting to accomplish without further impairing the bond rating of this state?"

Dugan: "Because I believe as I said to the other Representative that not only do we have to fund the 24 schools that are on the list, we have to look at the need that we know is very apparent with the other schools that are on the list. It takes us into investing and giving the 24 and looking at what we can do to go forward to help those other schools and that's why. This is the Bill that I propose. This is the one that I support."

Meyer: "Why is it that you did not propose take... as your funding stream then taking the money out of the current budget? The full amount of money that you want to borrow is there. All

128th Legislative Day

- you have to do is release the Member projects that you had to put on the budget in order to get people to vote for it. Why wouldn't you do that as a funding source then?"
- Dugan: "The debt service is in the budget, Representative, and all this does, the debt service is paid out of the General Revenue Fund as we have always paid General Obligations Bonds out of the General Fund."
- Meyer: "Well, Representative, I can see we're going no place so I... I'm just at this point going to just stop my part of the discussion and let others talk. I believe our Leader wants to talk."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."
- Davis, M.: "Representative Dugan, where are these schools to be built?"
- Dugan: "Where are the... the ones that are on the list, the 24? Sangamon County, Wayne, Cook, Shelby, Williamson, DuPage, St. Clair, Rock Island, Will, DeKalb, Perry, Franklin, Cook again, Lake, Cook again, Kankakee, Kankakee, Madison, DuPage, St. Clair."
- Davis, M.: "So, Chicago will get some of these schools. Now, do you believe that some African Americans should work on these projects?"
- Dugan: "On what projects, Ma'am, the school construction projects?"
- Davis, M.: "Yes, Ma'am."

128th Legislative Day

- Dugan: "Yes."
- Davis, M.: "You believe some African Americans are actually capable of meeting the high standards of the building trades and that they should be a part of school construction?"
- Dugan: "Yes. I believe... I believe that anyone that is in the building trades should be able to be in the building trades in the apprenticeship program."
- Davis, M.: "Well... If you believe that, why were you opposed to the legislation that would have mandated that the building trades provide numbers of African Americans in their apprenticeship programs or in their building trades?"
- Dugan: "With all due respect, Representative, I did not oppose having that... getting that information. What I said was, is that information is already available to us and so we didn't need legislation to get that information."
- Davis, M.: "Well, some Legislators here... about a number of them feel that even though that legislation is available from the Federal Government, it is not presented in a standardized form. And they felt that by requesting the state to mandate that information that it would be given or provided in a standardized form and not be difficult to obtain. You know what... what's the secret?"
- Dugan: "And as I spoke to those Legislators that have concern or have made it known that they cannot receive the information that is considered public information, Representative, I have more than offered to help with whatever we need to do as far as getting information but also..."
- Davis, M.: "You want to join… you wanna be on the Black Caucus?" Dugan: "I certainly will…"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Davis, M.: "You say we have to come to you to get information?"

Dugan: "No, I did not. No, I said... I... I offered to help in any way that I can."

Davis, M.: "We... We don't need your help getting information that's available to anyone. We need your help in getting the state to pass a law and this was a simple Resolution that said that... no, it was law that you have... that they have to provide the information to the state. Now you expect us to vote on this bond issue that you want, but you think you don't have to support issues that help African Americans who are as... are as intelligent, as brilliant, as skilled as anyone else to get on the building trades. So you should not expect this group to support your issue when you feel that we have to come to you for information that's available to anybody."

Dugan: "Would you like me to respond, Representative?"

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Dugan: "Okay. As far as my support of minorities and women in the trades..."

Davis, M.: "I'm not saying minorities, I said African Americans."

Dugan: "Well... Ma'am, the Bill that we were talking about..."

Davis, M.: "Well, Ma'am, my name is Representative Davis."

Dugan: "It was minorities and women was what the legislation was for. Okay. So that's how I'm addressing that. As far as what... as far as my understanding of what some believe the problem is, I have... I have what the Chicago Women in Trades, worked with that organization, understanding their concerns. I have in my district been a... as far as working with and...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

and teaching so that we can get people to the point of they have the requirements to enter into the apprenticeship trade, I have done that. So, I'm sorry that you feel that way..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis, bring your remarks to a close."

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "As opposed as I am, as opposed as I am... Yeah. As opposed as I am to the idea that only certain people can belong to the building trades, I realize the need for schools to be built in Illinois. It's a very difficult predicament that we find ourselves in when you think that some people only think their group are capable of being in the building trades. Now, this Bill is gonna put millions of dollars into the hands of construction workers and contractors and African Americans are gonna vote on this Bill but will not be able to participate in the work that takes place. I'm gonna leave it up to our caucus chairperson of whether we should support this or not. So I'm gonna leave it up to my caucus chair, Marlow Colvin, whether the Black Caucus should support this Bill because we have issues that have to be resolved in this Body."

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

Cross: "Just a couple of quick questions of the Sponsor and I don't... I think there've been some very good points made already. Representative Dugan, you said this was your top

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

priority. Is this one of your top priorities of the Session?"

Dugan: "No, I said education was my priority, Representative."

Cross: "All right. Is this a top priority of yours?"

Dugan: "This is one of the issues that I have been working on this year, yes, Representative."

Cross: "Okay. So, you'd say it's... where does it rank in terms of your priorities to get these schools funded?"

Dugan: "If it... It's high on my priority list as education is in the school... school construction."

Cross: "Okay. But it's... so it's one of your... say it's one of your top priorities to fund these schools."

Dugan: "It is one of my priorities this Session, Representative."

Cross: "All right. So, it's not one of your top priorities?"

Dugan: "Representative, I wanna pass this Bill."

Cross: "Okay."

Dugan: "I'm bringing this Bill for a vote because I believe that it is very important. If... if what..."

Cross: "Right."

Dugan: "Where it is on my priority list as far as the need of the schools throughout the State of Illinois, I'm not quite sure why that's important what... except I brought the Bill and it is a priority."

Cross: "I'm just kind of curious. If it's one of your priorities, why'd you wait until it's technically impossible to pass in the Senate? Why did you wait and call it the last... the last day of Session?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Dugan: "Again, and I... again, as I say, Representative, and I think it's been said before as far as when Bills are called and how the system goes through, I have been asking for this to be let out. We don't know, we're assuming and we don't know that the Senate won't be here for another three days and again, we can pass it and we can still address it in the Veto Session, if that need comes up."
- Cross: "So, you... you've been talking to Leadership, letting them know this is a priority of yours? You've been... you let the Speaker's Office know this is a priority of yours?"
- Dugan: "Yes, they knew that, Representative."
- Cross: "Oh, they knew that. Did you let them know before you voted on the budget that this was a priority of yours, that this... these schools needed to be funded in the amount of a hundred forty million? Did you tell them that?"
- Dugan: "It's really been a priority every since I got here and found out the State of Illinois was not funding the school construction program from FY '02."
- Cross: "Right. Right. So, there are people, ya know, as we talked about a little while ago earlier this morning there's \$800 million in unaccounted for pork in the budget. We only need a hundred and 48 million. There are people in this process that are holding out their votes for the budget to make sure their priorities are met for education. Why didn't you say to the Speaker, I'm not gonna vote for the budget until you pay for these schools? It's that... because it's a priority of mine. Do you not... is it not that important to you, Representative?"

Dugan: "It's a priority..."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "There's a hundred... there's 800 million in pork and all you had to do was say, I'm not voting for the budget 'til you fund these schools. Why didn't you do that?"

Dugan: "It is a priority of mine for the school construction program that is needed in this state to continue. That is why my proposal calls for a \$500 million sale of bonds in order to address the needs of the 24 schools and to proceed forward with maintenance and other school construction that we need."

Cross: "So, it's not... there are people over in the Senate today that aren't voting for the budget because there's some issues that are near and dear to them and they actually seem to... their priorities seem to be important to them and they're saying, I'm gonna hold off on my vote until I get what I want for issues I think are important to me. You weren't willing to do that, Representative, is that the case?"

Dugan: "Representative, I determined that..."

Cross: "Clearly, you weren't, Representative. It's obvious because you voted for the budget. It flew out of here with 800... or not... it didn't flew, it flew out on your side with \$800 million in pork. Tons of money available to pay this off with cash, but you chose to not make it a priority, nor did any the other people on your side of the aisle that have these schools in their districts, which I think is a sad, sad tale and an indication of your lack of commitment to funding these schools. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it's been said, this is a scam. It can't pass the House or it won't get over to the Senate in time. The Constitution

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

requires three days of a Bill to be read. It needs a 6-day posting requirement in the Senate. There's not a revenue stream. The Majority Leader has said, this Bill shouldn't ... won't get called 'cause there's not a revenue stream. are doing something worse to the people of the State of Illinois in these school districts by actually floating this Bill that has absolutely no chance of passing. You're gonna get your Roll Call, Representative. You're gonna do your press release. But I think you're doing these schools a disservice. You're doing 'em a disservice by running this Bill on the last day of Session. You did 'em a disservice by not making this a priority in the budget. You made it a disservice... or you committed a disservice to those school districts by not saying to the Speaker and the Governor and the President of the Senate, this is so important to me it needs to be in the budget. That is not something that anybody in your district oughta accept. So I would encourage people to vote 'no'. We all know what this is. It is scam. It is politics as usual for a Party that says, we're gonna change the way business is done or the way business is... This is a far cry from this. This is business as usual. And it's a very, very sad day for the school children of Illinois."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stephens: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis, Ron Stephens is giving you another 5 minutes. Talk about coalition...

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

coalition building. Representative Davis. Turn her on. Ron said turn her on."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Stephens. I always knew you were a brilliant man. Representative Dugan, as we pass legislation that affects many of our districts, not just your district, downstate districts, Chicago districts. And we know that the result of this legislation will mean not just new schools. Right? Not just repaired or maintained schools, but it'll be people working. It'll increase job opportunities for people all over our state. Is that right?"

Dugan: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "So, Representative Dugan, can you imagine how I feel when I know I've been responsible for bringing these dollars to Chicago, downstate to your district and yet I don't see my people working? Can you imagine how I feel? Do you imagine the guilt that comes over me when I know I'm responsible for that happening?"

Dugan: "Yes, I can imagine, Representative. Yes, I can imagine how you feel."

Davis, M.: "What would you suggest that I do about it? Now, I'm gonna tell ya what my suggestion would be."

Dugan: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "My suggestion would be for my caucus not to vote for this Bill."

Dugan: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "And then it won't happen. You know that?"

Dugan: "I understand that."

Davis, M.: "You're... It will not happen."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Dugan: "I understand that."

Davis, M.: "What do you suggest?"

Dugan: "I'm not... I'm not sure what to say, Representative. I'm not sure that there's anything as I tried to explain to you as far as the issue that is out there as far as the apprenticeship program and what we need to do to do that is not... I... I respectfully disagree that the reason... the way to address that concern is by asking for information that we already have. That is not in the ways that I have addressed the problems with apprenticeship and women and minorities getting into the trades is by programs that we set forth to make sure. Like the Chicago Women in Trades and other programs that we set up in order to make sure people have the qualifications in order to meet the requirements of the apprenticeship programs. I have done that ever since I have been in the trades."

Davis, M.: "So you're saying that you set up programs and these are pre-apprentice or apprenticeship programs that help people to qualify for the building trades?"

Dugan: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "Okay, do you think we haven't done that?"

Dugan: "I'm... I'm not sure, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Well, we have... we continue to do that."

Dugan: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "We continue to have pre-apprenticeship programs.

The problem is, the tradesmen that we're gonna pass this Bill and help them go to work will not put African-American men or women into their labor unions. And it has become a red hot issue in the United States of America but especially

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

in the State of Illinois. We have more men in prison who are African American than who are in college because they are not given an equal opportunity to work. So every time you are opposed to an opportunity all we were asking for were the numbers so that once you see those numbers you can say, well, you can see you're not letting the African Americans in this union, you're not letting them in here, you're not putting them in your apprenticeship programs."

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis, if you would kindly address your remarks to the Bill. That's House Bill 3904.

  I think the reference is to a Bill that's no longer in."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. You know what I'm gonna say. I'm gonna say to the Black Caucus I would suggest that you vote for this Bill this time. We oughta give them one more chance this time, this time. Vote for the Bill. Thanks."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was gonna yield my time to Representative Monique Davis but I'm not sure if she's done yet. Are you... she's done."
- Speaker Turner: "She's done and you are, too. The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not finished yet. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "It won't be long. Go ahead. We do want to be equal."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

- Reis: "Representative, you mentioned you have two schools on this list. Have they built yet? Have they done any construction and are just waiting on reimbursement?"
- Dugan: "One of 'em has in my district. I know there's a couple in some of the other districts that have already."
- Reis: "Okay. I noticed in your legislation here and I took a look at yours and the one we filed. There's no specific mention of the 24 schools. Why didn't you insert that into the Bill?"
- Dugan: "It doesn't have to be specifically stated. The Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability makes it very clear and CDB that when this money in the school construction program goes forward and there's funding it automatically goes to those that have already been listed as entitled."

Reis: "Wasn't that..."

Dugan: "And so does state stat... statues already says that, state statue says that."

Reis: "Wasn't those same specific things mentioned when these schools were originally funded?"

Dugan: "I have no idea, I wasn't here."

Reis: "Okay. Well, I think you know where I am going with this and it comes down to trust with this administration. We specifically mentioned each school in our Bill and would be requesting MOUs on each one of those school districts signed between the district and the Governor. Is there anyway we can get those on these? Now, I don't think this is unreasonable. Everybody on your side of the aisle asked for a MOU every time you do something. So how do we know that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

this money if it's approved is gonna go for these 24 schools? How do we know it's not gonna get dumped into something else again just like the bonding ability was done on these in the first place from Illinois FIRST?"

Dugan: "Representative, as I stated, state statute requires... the law requires that the 24 that have already been listed as entitled receive the money. So it's in state statue."

Reis: "That doesn't seem to stop this administration."

Dugan: "You can trust me, Representative."

Reis: "Your name's not at the bottom of the… the signing of the legislation. I... I have a real problem. I have a school on this too, Fairfield Grade School that's been waiting 3 years on their money. And, you know, you say you wanna work with us on this, should this Bill not receive the Three-fifths Majority it needed, are you willing to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration and work with us to try to get this passed? You say this is priority of yours."

Dugan: "Representative, I hope, again, I'm gonna ask for a vote.

I hope all those that support the children in school construction will vote for it. If it doesn't and the Bill fails then I will continue as I have been for the last couple years to work on the school construction. We need to address this situation."

Reis: "So will you put it on Postponed Consideration?"

Dugan: "I... I'll decide when the time comes, Representative."

Reis: "Well, you're not... okay. To the Bill. Ya know, this is political, it's been said several times. If you're really interested in working on something, I've seen Bills fail on that side of the aisle and the Sponsor usually goes and

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

tries to work on a few people to get their... their Bill passed and when they're comfortable they have secured the votes, they'll... they'll move it again. There's not gonna be any of that here because they're not interested in it. They're just trying to get a Roll Call vote. A political Roll Call vote and ya know, to make fun of this to say that you're gonna pay for this and run over a \$200 bill to Representative Rose and say, this is how we're gonna pay for this, a fake \$200 bill is ridiculous. We have to pay for all of this stuff. And ya know, I thought I'd seen it all yesterday but no, it comes back again. So, I encourage our side of the aisle to do what we've always done, we ask for MOUs, we ask for a revenue stream to pay for any new bondedness. We have another Bill that we'd like to debate as well that would fund just the 24 schools this year, and take care of those priorities. We think those are priority as well. And I encourage people on our side of the aisle to vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "My name was used in debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Are you sure?"

Rose: "It was used in the debate by Representative Reis just 30 seconds ago, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "I thought he was talking about the flower."

Rose: "Hopefully, he was talking about the U of I basketball player next year."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to be clear because frankly, I've been sitting here stewing on this for the last 10 minutes since this joke. I'm raising a valid point. There's no way in this budget to pay for this. General Obligation Bond, it's gonna be a debt for the next 20 years in the State of Illinois and there's no funding mechanism. And I raise a valid, legitimate point about how it's gonna be paid for and what I get is a phony Ken Dunkin vote November 5, 2002, \$200 bill to pay for it. That is exactly how your side of the aisle has run this phony baloney money in a phony baloney budget."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flider, the Gentleman from Macon."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Do you need 5 minutes, too?"

Flider: "Oh, just a couple, I think. I just want to reiterate a couple of things and ask the Sponsor some questions because a lot has been said... a lot has been said to politicize this and there's always an effort here I think to try and move us away from the facts to something that the newspapers will pick up as quotable so that, ya know, a person like this Sponsor who is a very honorable person who's got two people on this list as trying to make a difference for her district. And one of the questions that she had was what the cost would be for the bonding."

Dugan: "What the cost would be?"

Flider: "For the bonding, yep, per year."

Dugan: "The cost would be somewhere between 45 and 21 million."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Flider: "Okay. The... the comment that she had made earlier was that the cost would be 21 million dollars per year in bonding. I would just say this, that from the standpoint of what we're trying to accomplish here, we're trying to build some schools and even if we have... we do not have an opportunity to see the... even if we do not have an opportunity to see the Senate act on this, we'll have a position for the fall Veto Session and that's certainly the right message to be sending to our schools. Thank you."

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

Mulligan: "Ya know, I wasn't going to speak to this but the last few minutes there was some points made about the funding. If you wanted to pay for these schools, you've got \$577 million you're taking home in pork on bond money that a lot of us voted for that have a revenue source. We gave you a tough vote a couple of years ago to have those bonds to be used. You're using them. You're gonna pay the debt service on them and your taking them home in pork. Don't stand there and moan about schools that aren't paid for if you're not willing to do the hard deed. The hard deed is take the bonding money you already have, the money that has a revenue source that a lot of us put our li... our votes at our district and our own careers on the line to vote for the revenue sources for that. Find a leader in your second floor who would be here once in awhile and come up with some way to do it. Turn down the pork and put the money in the schools. Stop moaning."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3904?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, not having received the Constitutional Majority, fails. On Supplemental Calendar #3 we have House Bill 1918, Representative Molaro. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report." Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 04, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1918."

Speaker Turner: "Under Supplemental Calendar #3 we have House Bill 1918. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro." Molaro: "Thank you. This is a Motion to Concur. As you know, we passed the horse... horseracing Bill out about... a few days ago with 70 votes. Emil... President Jones sat down with some public policy people, as well as the riverboats, and they thought it would be a good idea that instead of the riverboats being out there for the next 20 years paying this, they thought it would be a 2-year sunset so everybody knows the horseracing industry as well as the riverboats where they're at. And then in the next 2 years the idea would be that no matter who's out there and what we're doing, this General Assembly as well as the Governor's Office will sit down and figure out what we're gonna do or not do with the expansion of gambling. With that being

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

said, the Senate passed it with 40 votes. They sent it over. It's the same exact Bill that we passed only it's now with a 2-year sunset. Same exact Bill, all this says is a 2-year sunset. So, I would ask that we concur with the Senate's wisdom."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in reluctant opposition to the Bill. This will be the fourth time that the House will have had an opportunity to vote on this Bill. two times Mr. Molaro was unsuccessful, the third time he We'll find out what happens on the fourth time. nothing happened in the Senate to make the Bill better. Indeed, what happened in the Senate, I believe, makes the Bill less interesting. The Bill, as we have discussed previously, is one that is patently unfair. It's unfair because it taxes one industry to help another industry. We've discussed this many times. We know ... even those of you who will vote for this Bill today know it's bad public policy to tax one industry to help another, even if they're related industries. As I said before, it would be like taxing lightbulb makers to help the candle makers because they're not doing so well now. I have said many times on the floor of this House that I am a strong supporter of the horseracing industry. The people in the industry know it, you know it. I've worked very hard to help the horseracing industry. But we have to do what's reasonable and responsible. Passing a Bill that provides for poor public policy is not reasonable or responsible. Additionally,

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill's unconstitutional. It picks out four of the nine riverboats to tax to help the horseracing industry. Not all nine, four of the nine. don't know how that's fair public policy. I don't know how And surely, one of those taxed that's fair taxation. filing a lawsuit declaring this riverboats will be unconstitutional, and surely they will prevail. Ladies and Gentlemen, the... I find it peculiar that we have had in the law requirement that because of something called 'recapture' we're supposed to have been providing subsidies to the horseracing industry the last several years. This year it would've been \$14 million but we didn't even appropriate it. Fourteen million that should've been in our own budget to help the horseracing industry's not in there. instead of doing that, we're going to tax four riverboats to do what we were unwilling to do ourself. Additionally, this year one of the racetracks, Fairmount, got about a million dollar subsidy from the General Assembly, a separate million dollar subsidy for Fairmount from this General Assembly. For those of you who are targets and always have your staff people hovering around you, telling you what you should and shouldn't vote for, let's remember that this is a increase. A tax increase is a tax increase is a tax increase, whether it's on business, whether it's riverboats, whether it's on labor unions, a tax is a tax is And so, those of you who think it's okay to tax riverboats because it's popular in your district, it's still a tax. And for those of you who are concerned about voting for tax increases, you are taking a industry that's pretty

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

highly taxed today and adding a 3 percent tax on that industry, but only part of that industry. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a responsibility to do what's right. What they did in the Senate makes the Bill less valuable to us because this Bill was sold as a Bill that would help us save the 30 or 40 thousand agriculture jobs in the horseracing industry. And even if that were true, which I don't believe it is, even if that were true, a 2-year sunset tells you all you need to know. A 2-year sunset won't save any jobs. A 2-year sunset means that for 2 years the horseracing industry will get a hundred million dollars, and when the 2 years expires those same jobs who you wish to save permanently will be gone permanently. So this is a hundred million dollar payment, subsidy, to an industry that will not be able to save the jobs permanently in an unconstitutional way because of unfair tax policy. Nothing has changed about any of that. For those of you who are targets, think very carefully about this. You don't wanna go home and tell your people you voted to tax anybody, I don't think. Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should reach the requisite number, I would request a verification."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Meyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Meyer: "Representative, I have supported your legislation in the past, I continue to support it today. It does concern me, though, the Amendment that was put on over in the Senate. What we're attempting to do here is to save an industry that

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

employs tens of thousands of people in this state, directly with racing or as a peripheral businesses that feed... feed into the racing industry with product. And my concern is the 2-year extension only. What message does that send to those that we're trying to attract here to the... the state to bring their... the larger... the better horses here to race and to increase the involvement of the people of the state in this industry? What message does that send and how do we get beyond it?"

"Well, the only thing I could say to that is obviously Molaro: it was not in my original Bill, the 2-year sunset. President of the Senate thought this was wise because he wanted... also what you're saying about the horseracing industry, he wanted to give some, you know, finality to the casino industry and some of the public policy people who thought that shouldn't go on forever. The only thing I'm hoping, Representative, 'cause I'm agreeing with you, that within the next 2 years there will be a clear statement from your side of the aisle, as well as mine, there's no way we're gonna do any kind of gaming Bills as this ... evidenced by this Bill without a coalition. And we're just hoping that within the next year to 2 years there will be a resounding statement from this General Assembly as to where we're headed. So our... the industry, the 30, 40 thousand people, the farmers, the feed industry, all the people that we're trying to save that will be gone in 2 years, even if we were to change it, can stick around and now stay and understand that there's something here now to keep their industry alive until that ultimate public policy is made.

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Unfortunately in election year, as you well know, that's not gonna be made. So I think we'll be making it either in November or next spring. And I think after talking to the horseracing industry, talking to the tracks, and talking to all the horsemen and everybody who feeds into this, they are okay with the Amendment. They are fine. They think that we're all gonna get together and do something comprehensive and this is a good Bill for now."

Meyer: "Well... I understand what you said to me, I accept it, I continue to support your Bill as it is amended. I am disappointed with our brothers and sisters across the rotunda that they would choose to put this limitation on it that kinda clouds the issue in terms of what we're trying to accomplish within that industry. Thank you."

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

Hassert: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Molaro: "No, I..."

Hassert: "Okay. Thank you."

Molaro: "No, I'm not, Sir."

Hassert: "Thanks. Representative, it's my understanding last year or so when we reduced the 70 percent tax down to 50 percent on boats and held... had the hold harmless agreement made that there's... and you might not know this, but my understanding was there's an agreement made with the boats at the time that there'd be a 2-year grace period before we

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

went back after taxing the boats some additional taxes. Are you aware of that?"

Molaro: "Yeah, I've been told that by the gaming industry. They told me that."

Hassert: "Well, you're not aware that the Governor made that commitment?"

Molaro: "No, I wasn't in the meetings when those took place."

Hassert: "I understand Representative Hoffman was in that meeting. Is he on the floor? He must be negotiating the budget over in the Senate."

Molaro: "He's gonna speak, I see his light on. So, he'll... he'll answer that."

Hassert: "Okay. Well, that was my understanding, but you're unaware of that agreement?"

Molaro: "Yes. Yes."

Hassert: "Okay. And Representative, are the boats in favor of this Amendment? You indicated that they're... they're not in favor of this Amendment, are they?"

Molaro: "No, the boats... the boats are not in favor of House Bill 1918 or any of its Amendments."

Hassert: "Okay."

Molaro: "What I am saying is this makes the Bill better for them 'cause instead of paying forever they only have to pay for 2 years."

Hassert: "But they are definitely not for this?"

Molaro: "They're against it. They're against it."

Hassert: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

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

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Tryon: Gentleman's Bill and wish to speak directly to the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield? We are here again debating this... the horseracing Bill and it's a serious time for the horseracing industry. And as I... we reflect back on our previous debates, I think it has to be said, again, that what's happening today to the horseracing industry in Illinois was exactly what the horseracing industry told us would happen when we allowed the casino and the riverboat industry to begin to flourish in our state. And every time they've made that argument, we have proceeded and expanded the casino industry. We've told them, we will help them in a numerous ways. But yet, again, we find ourselves in 1999 debating whether or not we were gonna allow the riverboats to gamble at dockside. And I think it's necessary to point out that the dockside gaming decision made an accumulated profit since 1999... or revenue increases since 1999, a \$4 billion cumulative. Now, where did those dollars come from? They came from gamblers. Some of those gamblers once went to the horseracing industry. So, what we find today in Illinois is we find a horseracing industry whose purses are down 42 percent. An industry who can't attract necessary trainers it needs to attract to run its business. We took a horseracing industry that was once one of the country's finest horseracing industries and it's now second from the bottom in this country. Other states that allowed riverboat gambling and casino gambling felt the same pain there with their horseracing industries that we felt, but they've reacted. Some states have allowed slots in the

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

horseracing tracks. Other communities have done similar things to what we're talking about doing here. I think that it's imperative that we come up with this solution. It may be a short-term solution today and we'll revisit it in 2 years and maybe we'll have the tenth license resolved then and everybody would be happy. But this isn't a tax on the candlemaker to give it to the dry cleaners. It's not a tax of one industry to give it to another industry. only one gaming industry and in this state it consists of casino gambling at riverboats and it consists of horseraces. There are only so many gamblers. When one of these industries hurts another industry... or just in... within another business within that same industry and that industry employs 40 thousand people in this state, I think we have to react. Let me tell you just one example of my county... in McHenry County, Illinois, where we have 43 horse farms and 13 breeders. When we look at that and we look at the farmers that have to grow the feed, we look at the trainers that have to train the horses, we look at how it impacts our agricultural community, we see that we have an industry that needs to be preserved. Today is the day that we need to make that decision. We need to keep these 40 thousand jobs in our state. It's necessary and I certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Mitchell, J.: "Are you sure?"

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Turner: "Just start asking. Tell him you're gonna vote 'no'."

Molaro: "I'm sorry."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Molaro, I think you've gone over some of the promises that were made to the horsemen over the years that have not come to fruition. Isn't that true?"

Molaro: "That's true."

Mitchell, J.: "So, there's been promises made and broken on both sides of this issue?"

Molaro: "Oh, no question about it."

Mitchell, J.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. One of the things that we've gotta remember is that there are a finite number of gambling dollars in the State of Illinois and in any state and those particular dollars are shared by many industries. The horseracing industry has had a tough time but it is a sport, and it does need revenue to continue to operate. Now, we're not just talking about the racetracks, the trotters, the pacers, the county fairs, all of these horsemen share in the purses. This is an industry that's both gambling and a sport. They're good people, I happen to be a horseman myself, and I know a lot of these folks. My father was clerk of the races for years in Brown County. So, it's not just particularly gambling, it is an industry. There are people's jobs and occupations at stake. It's a fun sport. And trust me, you can go to the races and not spend a dime gambling and still really enjoy yourself. But can you imagine going to a riverboat and watching people I don't think so, that's not why you go. Ladies and Gentlemen, this industry has the right to survive, has a

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

right to thrive as all other industries. And I don't think it's gonna hurt the riverboats one little bit to share a little bit of that gambling money with the horsemen for a couple of years. That's all it is, now there's a sunset. The President of the Senate has a different idea, that's fine. But at least we have something to keep an industry afloat for a while. I think you can vote on that because this isn't an expansion of gambling, this is keeping people alive without expanding gambling, but moving the money around and not hurting any of the industries. Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Molaro to close."

Molaro: "We've talked about this so much even ad nauseam. I just wanna make clear that we did with my Amendment before is that... remember the impact on the tracks... the northern tracks have come from the four riverboats up in the Chicago area that make over \$200 million and that's why we picked that figure of \$200 million. Also, we gave it a 2-year sunset, this is better for the boats, this is better for public policy. So we made a Bill that got 70 votes better and we also had 40 votes from the Senate. This was... help an industry with 35 thousand employees and hurt no one, 35 thousand employees and hurt no one. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1918?' This is final action. All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Please vote your own switch. There has

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

been a request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 37 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
Acevedo; Bassi; Beaubien; Boland; Brady; Brauer; Burke;
Chavez; Colvin; Cross; Cultra; D'Amico; Daniels; Monique
Davis; Will Davis; Delgado; Dunkin; Durkin; Eddy;
Feigenholtz; Flowers; Giles; Golar; Graham; Granberg; Hamos;
Hannig; Hoffman; Holbrook; Howard; Joyce; Kelly; Krause;
Mautino; May; Mendoza; Meyer; Miller; Mitchell, J.; Moffitt;
Molaro; Mulligan; Myers; Parke; Pritchard; Ramey; Reis;
Reitz; Rita; Rose; Ryg; Sacia; Saviano; Schock; Scully;
Smith; Stephens; Tenhouse; Tryon; Turner; Wait; Washington;
Watson; Winters; Younge; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "One moment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some but not enough. I withdraw my request."

Speaker Turner: "Again, this Bill, having received 66 'aye', 37 'no', and 0 'presents', the House does concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1918. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Speaker in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 136, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, May 04, 2006, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 1, 2006, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 2006 at 1:00 p.m.; and when the Senate next adjourns for more than three days, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 1, 2006, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 2006."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Adjournment Resolution.

  Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. For what purpose does Mr. Saviano seek recognition?"
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I just want to let everybody know the end of Session party will be tonight over at Capitol Steak House sometime after six we'll get it started. All Members, staff, press are all invited to attend and bring your IDs. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are prepared to adjourn. The House has taken all required action to implement and adopt the budget for the next fiscal year. And all matters are now in the control of the Senate. So we're in a position to leave. We're gonna have a few short speeches but let me just advise everyone clean out your desks, leave the laptop computers. Leave the computers, but clean out your desks because of the renovation of the chamber. Mr. Cross."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, let me just first say if it gets a little noisy here, I'm not gonna ask for a caucus. We're... I just but... but thank you, this is nice. As you reminded me a minute ago, I thanked everybody one other time on April 7, the scheduled adjournment date, but I would a just briefly like to say a few... few words. I want to thank our Members on this side of the aisle. This has not been an easy Session. It is not easy to be excluded from the process. But we made some decisions and stuck by some ideals and principles that we thought were best. And I think the Members on this side of the aisle handled that very well all things considered. And I want to thank them for the way they handled things. Our staff did an incredible job led by Jack Kubik, our new chief of staff. Jack, I appreciate everything you've done along with everybody from Scott Reimers to Kevin Artl to Vicki Crawford. Thank the staff in the Clerk's Office they also... through Brad Bolin do a very good job. Mr. Speaker... yeah, Brad Bolin, thank you. Also want to thank the Democrat Members of this Assembly. While we have had a lot of differences this Session, you are... do a good job and work for your districts as I think as ably as our people do. So it was a pleasure to work with you when we could. And finally, Mr. Speaker, I know that we've had differences and we will continue to have differences, but we have tried to work with you in a... I think, a civil and cooperative manner and we will where we can continue to do that and I wish everybody a good summer. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

128th Legislative Day

5/4/2006

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Cross. I would like to thank all of the Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, for a productive Session. We've had our differences as Mr. Cross explained, but our assignment upon coming to this chamber is to take these issues as they come, render individual judgments and to discharge our duties to the people in our district who sent us here and all of us did that on this occasion. So, again, thank you to all of the Members. I do want to thank Mark Mahoney, the Clerk of the House. I want to thank the members... members of my staff: Tim Mapes, John Lowder, Rob Uhe, and Mike Thomson. I can tell you they did an outstanding job and they... they put in the required amount of time because I was there with them. So, again, thank you. Just so you understand, there's work to be done in the Senate. I've advised Senator Jones of this action on two occasions today. He's aware that we've done our work and that we're sending him an Adjournment Resolution and we're about to leave town. So, thank you and have a very, very nice summer. I hope to see all of you in this chamber in the fall. We will see you in the fall but I hope it's in this chamber. So, with that in mind, Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 14 at 1 p.m. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 14 at 1 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."