135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- Speaker Flowers: "The hour of 10:00 having arrived, the House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Elmo Rodgers of the First United Pentecostal Church in Danville, Illinois. Reverend Rodgers is the guest of Representative Black. All guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."
- Reverend Elmo Rodgers: "Our Lord as we come before You this morning we're so thankful and so grateful for the country that we live in. We're thankful this morning, Lord, for government because we know that government has ordained by You. Father we're asking of You this morning that You would grant these people the wisdom and knowledge that's needed to carry out this government. Lord help them to make the right decisions, to make the right votes, help them Lord, give them the wisdom, and knowledge that they need to know what their people need and what their people want, and to vote, and to work on behalf of their people that they represent. Lord we're asking that Your blessings would be upon this, this gathering here this morning, and we'll thank You for it all in Jesus Name. Amen."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Black 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 Flowers: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Kubik, are there any excused absences on the Republican side?"
- Kubik: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Cowlishaw, Hassert and Tom Johnson are

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- excused today."

  Speaker Flowers: "The record will so reflect.
- Speaker Flowers: "The record will so reflect. Representative

  Jeff Schoenberg, are there any excused absences on the

  Democratic side?"
- Schoenberg: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Representative Kaszak and Representative Harold Murphy are not with us today, they are excused."
- Speaker Flowers: "The record will so reflect. With 113 answering the roll call, a quorum is available, is present. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk McLennand: "Message from the Senate from Jim Secretary of the Senate. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives and the passage of House Bills 61 together with Senate Amendment #1 and ask Ι am directed to inform the House of the House concur. Representatives that the Senate has concurred with House of Representatives and the passage of House Bill 232 together with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 232 and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of House 504 together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 504 and the adoption of which I am instructed to concurrence of the House. Instructed, directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives and the passage of House 1705 together with Senate Amendment #1, Senate #2, Senate Amendment #3, Senate Amendment #4, Amendment Senate Amendment #5, Senate Amendment #6, Senate Amendment #7, Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 1705 and the adoption

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives and the passage of House Bill 1786 together with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1786 and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. These Bills passed the Senate as amended on May 19, 1994.

- Speaker Flowers: "First Reading of House Bills, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction First Reading of Bills. House
  Bill 4248, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an
  Act to create the Economic Development Income Tax Credit
  Board. First Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Flowers: "The House will resume its business in five minutes. Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My light was about to burn out. About 40 minutes ago I think the Chair announced that we would resume business in five minutes.

  That deadline having come and gone, what is our approximate time table now?"
- Speaker Flowers: "We should be getting started in about five more minutes."
- Black: "At this point, at this point, Madam Speaker. I do have an inquiry of the Chair. If...it has come to my attention, by venue of the morning newspapers, that there was a second fire alarm in the Capitol yesterday at approximately, I'm not sure, approximately 7 p.m. and that this fire was discovered in the legislative printing unit, a rather large waste basket, I believe and I find that today many of the Republican Amendments are missing. Would there be any connection with that second fire and the fact that I can't find many of the Republican Amendments today, Madam

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker?"

Speaker Flowers: "I would rather not answer that."

Black: "Aa ha. Taking the Fifth Amendment I see."

Speaker Flowers: "Use your imagination."

Black: "Well, I've heard that those printing presses running a little hot but I think things are out of control completely. The Amendment in front of me somewhat charred, but at the appropriate time we would like to introduce it."

Speaker Flowers: "Thank you."

Black: "Well thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker. To the previous speaker, I was just informed about those missing Republican Amendments.

They're going to be mixed in with crumb rubber to be used on the highway road projects."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today is the day that I am surrounded by birthday boys, on my right, Jack Kubik is celebrating his last birthday as a single man, his 39th birthday and on my left, Representative Saviano is celebrating his 36th birthday. So I'd like to ask everybody to join in wishing both of them a Happy Birthday."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3289, Representative Blagojevich."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3289 has been read a second time
 previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,
 offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please take this Bill out of the record? Representative Brunsvold on House Bill 2528, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Representative Wennlund, for what reason do you rise?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Is there a committee in session currently at this point in time? Is there a committee that's been convened?"

Speaker Flowers: "No there..."

Wennlund: "It's not a committee?"

Speaker Flowers: "The committee is in recess."

Wennlund: "The committee is in recess? Is that official? But if
the committee that did meet this morning, regarding
Medicaid?"

Speaker Flowers: "It recessed."

Wennlund: "My understanding is that...whatever that was, committee or whatever, is currently meeting at this point and time. Hearing testimony?"

Speaker Flowers: "It is my understanding that the committee is in recess."

Wennlund: "It's not a committee?"

Speaker Flowers: "The committee...again my understanding is that the committee is in recess."

Wennlund: "It...well...if the committee is in recess is there what they call a markup session going on at this point in time? Or is this just...is this just like Captain Billy's road show that Speakers convene to hear some Medicaid testimony? Is that what's going on? I didn't hear you."

Speaker Flowers: "I have no comments on it. What's the question?"

Wennlund: "The question is, there appears to be some ad hoc group, committee, or road show hearing testimony as we speak and how are we to conduct any business here in the first place. But I guess the bottom line is, that today marks the official deadline in the Senate to hear House Bills on Third Reading. So I guess, as I asked for it yesterday, in addition to the first fire alarm that we had.

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

the second fire alarm around 6:00 p.m. last night really spelled out the need for an evacuation plan. And we need two types of evacuation plans, one, to deal with the emergency like a fire, but the second one to deal with emergency in the House Floor. We need to evacuate this House because there is no business that can be conducted. So what are we doing here?"

- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me. Representative Lang for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Two items in response to the previous speaker. Firstly the committee has adjourned, there's a working meeting going on similar to the kind of working meeting that goes on in this Capitol all the time to negotiate a Bill, I don't see what the problem is with that. And the second comment I would make is one I have made before, if there are those on this House Floor that believe they're wasting their time they ought to just pack up and go home."
- Speaker Flowers: "On the Order of Second Reading, Government Administration, Representative Dart, on House Bill 3935.

  Out of the record. House Bill 3040, Representative Edley.

  Out of the record. House Bill 3840, Representative Judy Erwin. Out of the record. House Bill 3317, Representative Frias. Out of the record. Representative Hartke on 2800.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2800 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stephens."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Stephens on Floor Amendment #1."

  Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Amendment 1 allows

  that a truck tractor may draw two unladen agricultural,

  commercial, or utility, or livestock trailers. If...I

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

would withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Stephens."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2..."

Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Stephens."

Representative...proceed Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 amends the Bill to allow that a agricultural, commercial, or utility, or livestock trailer may be towed by an operator that is regularly...by an operator that is regularly engaged in the business of selling those types of trailers, or that the operator...and that the operator is transporting those trailers in the course of his regular business and that the combination of the vehicles do not exceed 65 feet. I move its adoption."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2800. Representative Dart on the question."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He says...indicates that he will."

Dart: "Representative, is the Department of Corrections...Department of Transportation, have they taken a position on this Amendment?"

Stephens: "I'm not aware that they have."

Dart: "Is this...how is this different from Amendment #1?"

Stephens: "Well if you're in that business there aren't that many people that sell these trailers. We are talking about livestock, and commercial trailers, and the Amendment allows just for the transport from the manufacturing facility, which often times is out of state, to their sales

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- facility, for commercial use only, and then from there they are just...they would be distributed for sale."
- Dart: "And how was... Is this vastly different from Amendment #1 that you withdrew?"
- Stephens: "I think there was just a technical difference in the Amendment."
- Dart: "Just technical difference. Was the Department of Transportation on board with Amendment #1, do you know?"
- Stephens: "I'm sorry."
- Dart: "Was the Department of Transportation were they in favor of Amendment #1?"
- Stephens: "I don't know that they were in favor of it."
- Dart: "How many people would this affect, do you know? Or does this affect this specific area?"
- Stephens: "I'm not aware, Representative. I don't know that it is a significant number throughout the state as far as the number of dealers. And if you told me there were 20 or 50, somewhere in that range, it might be less."
- Dart: "And this language, this Amendment...Amendment 1, which was similar, has been sitting around for two or three weeks, I guess. And Department of Transportation has taken no position at all on this?"
- Stephens: "Staff advises me and that they've not and I'm not aware that anyone has spoken for or against the Amendment."
- Dart: "They don't see that there would be any problems with these type of vehicles on the roads at all?"
- Stephens: "Representative, again they've not told me whether they are opposed, I think they're neutral but I don't know that they have made their position known."
- Dart: "And state police they as well, they have not said anything about these being hazards on the road or anything?"
- Stephens: "That's correct."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Dart: "No further questions."

Speaker Flowers: "The... Representative Hartke on the Amendment." "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the Hartke: House. I have mixed emotions on this Amendment as it's being presented. As a farmer, I know that many individuals agriculture buy livestock trailers and so forth. of those are manufactured in Missouri or Tennessee and then transported by the trailer dealers into the State of What this Amendment is asking is that they be Illinois. double...double hitched to allow a triple conglomeration of vehicles down our state highways. The Department Transportation is somewhat opposed to this because of length of the vehicle and the hitch makeup, as they are opposed to several years ago when it was suggested pickup truck with an RV fifth wheel camper and then trailing a boat behind it, was requested to be allowed on state roads. This is the same type of configuration that'll be traveling down our highways. Now as a farmer, I think it could reduce the cost of that trailer by the dealers to the farmer, because this will mean an extra trip if he has to go to pick up two trailers, he's making two trips as opposed to getting the two trailers in one trip. a farmer I would like to see this pass, but as Chairman of the Transportation Committee I can see where this will lead to...to some other problems, of the length and the trailing of the safety of that vehicle down our interstates and so forth. I just want Members to be aware of that on this piece of legislation. I admire the Sponsor trying to do what he's doing for agriculture but I think we've got to take a look at what that may mean down the road."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black on the Amendment."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Gentlemen of the House. Ι think the Chairman of the Transportation Committee probably expressed the ambivance that many of us have. But I think you need to look at this Amendment very carefully. It clearly states that combination shall not exceed 65 feet. Now that is the legal limit for semi tractors on Illinois highways present time. Now we allow a trailer tandem, what many of us call a double trailer combination, already on Illinois highways, I'm sure many of you have seen them driving to and from Springfield, where a freight trailer is hitched to the trailer on the front of the tractor and that doesn't seem to cause any trouble. But furthermore, this Amendment clearly states that these two livestock trailers will be unloaded, they must be unloaded, and what they're after is a manufacturer to be able to transport these trailers, perhaps to a dealer, or to a farmer, or agricultural producer that has purchased the trailers. And it's very narrow in scope, it's very limited in scope, it does not put the overall length of this combination in any greater length then is already allowed on Illinois highways. think it is a reasonable Amendment that would help those manufacturer of...manufacturers of agricultural implements to deliver them. I see nothing wrong with the Amendment, Madam Speaker. I don't really think it's as controversial many people would like us to believe. And pursuant to Rule 55 (c) I am joined by four of my colleagues in asking for a Roll Call Vote on Amendment #2 to House Bill 2800. And I would urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, just to close briefly. This is a pro-agriculture, pro-economic development, pro-common sense Amendment and I urge its adoption."

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner on the Amendment."
- Skinner: "The problem with this Amendment is that it's going to allow double, double bottoms on two lane highways and I, unfortunately, still have two lane highways in my district. They all should be four lane but they're still two lane. And I'm afraid that this is going to imped commuters trying to get to and from work. And for that reason I respectfully ask a those who are in the suburban area to cast a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Flowers: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Madam Speaker, would you take the Bill out of the record?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Hicks on House Bill 4070. Representative Hicks. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 4070 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4070."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 4070. Let's see if I can refresh my memory. Oh yes, it is coming back to me now. The Secretary of State may issue specialized plates to anyone who has obtained a certification of State of Illinois Firefighter II. The Secretary of State will be responsible for the design and applicants shall be charged a \$15 fee in addition to the registration fee to defray the costs of said plate. That's all Amendment #1 does."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Amendment #1 to House Bill 4070. On that Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would stand in opposition to Amendment #1. Amendment #1 actually deletes all the original language passed through committee...passed through committee, I think without a dissenting vote. We're simply trying to set some specifications for the designated license plates, this simply cuts the Bill and I would stand in opposition to Amendment #1."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black to close on the Amendment."

Black: "Well, yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I...it was not my intent to strip the Gentleman's Bill. I didn't catch that, I do apologize for that. But, you know, we're less than 12 hours removed from having two fires in the Capitol, right here in Springfield, our...this Capitol. more than a hundred years old. And I think to tell those dedicated firefighters who sped to the Capitol twice yesterday, in the nick of time, to put out a fire down in the Rathskeller, God forbid that that Rathskeller would have gone up in smoke, what would we have done for food? Then...then horror of all horrors the legislative printing unit caught on fire last evening, and again thanks to the dedicated effort of the Springfield Fire Department that fire was extinguished. Can any of you imagine the absolute trauma if the legislative printing unit had burned up yesterday? Good heavens, why we could of...we would of probably had to send most of the Democrat staff home today. Who are probably down there now using that equipment, running off sheet after sheet of Amendments that the State of Illinois certainly can't live much longer without. So, twice, twice in the last 12 hours our firefighters sped to

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

our rescue here at the Capitol, and all this Amendment does is want to honor those firefighters by giving them a special license plate. If they achieve the designation of Firefighter II, a very good honor. And I won't...you know I just don't understand why my good friend and colleague would not want this firefighter plate on the Bill. I tell you if we vote this down and God forbid we have a fire today, they may not show up. So I just stand...I just stand in total support of our firefighters."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the Gentleman has such a compelling argument there that I have to change my mind. Representative Black, I think your argument is so compelling, I have to accept your Amendment and I would ask everyone to vote in favor of your Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4070. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 4070, a Bill for an Act in relation to special license plates. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Along with Amendment #1 of Representative Black this Bill simply creates designated license plates for a number of different groups. This would basically set forth a pattern by which instead of having a number of different designs we would have one basic design, and we would be able to attach, to that, a type of plastic covering that would show specifically what those different groups are so

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- it would actually be a cost saving to the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions, I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the passage of House
  Bill 4070 as Amendment. On that Representative
  Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."
- Rutherford: "Thank you. Representative, will there be any additional cost to the Secretary of State's office in administering this program?"
- Hicks: "In reality, Representative, I think this could in the long run, be a very cost saving measure for the State of Illinois and for the Secretary of State. This basically would say that they could take all of the different groups of specialized license plates that we have in this state, we could combine all those together now, we could attach to this a...actually a plastic overlay that would put in a very specific area could be designated then for the different groups, the civic groups, the fraternal groups and the wonderful firefighters for the Amendment we just placed on it."
- Rutherford: "Outside of the...outside of the Amendment we just adopted which specifically notes, are the specific organizations, fraternal organizations noted in the legislation, Representative?"
- Hicks: "Representative, would you ask that again? I couldn't
  hear you, I'm sorry."
- Rutherford: "Are the specific fraternal organizations or civic groups noted in the legislation so we know exactly what we are talking about here?"
- Hicks: "No, Representative, I tried not to do that. Who came to me actually were the Rotary Clubs of Illinois came to me

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

wanted to have a Rotary plate, and I thought rather than trying to again have a specific plate for just the Rotary and when the Optomist came to me, and when the Kiwanis came to me, I thought if we could do it one time for everybody, and stop all of these specialized plates that we have, that we all bring to the legislature every year because somebody came to us. I thought this was a much better way of doing it and we might be...maybe be able to take care of everybody with one fell swoop."

Rutherford: "And just one other quick question. Then who will finally decide the tag? And so, will that come through the Secretary of State's Office, or a screening process, or committee or..."

Hicks: "Absolutely, it will go right through the Secretary of State's office. Those different organizations could apply to the Secretary of State for the way their logo would actually appear on that license plate. It would have to be approved through the Secretary of State. We wouldn't want to take that authority away from him in any way. And then once that approval is done, with an agreement with that specific organization, then their membership could apply for it."

Rutherford: "Great. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Brady: "Larry I...if I understand this right we're going to pass one law that will allow any group to apply to the Secretary of State for license of plates. And the Secretary of State will have approval of those groups? I guess my concern on it, have you limited in this language some way in which certain groups could be denied, legally?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- Hicks: "Is...does my language, does my language limit groups?

  No, I think that really goes up to the discretion of the Secretary of State on deciding who the civic groups are, the fraternal groups are, who could possibly be not-for-profit type of groups that would apply for that. It would be up to them to say whether or not they are legally optionate, within this, to be able to be accepted."
- Brady: "And here and maybe...let me more specific Larry and I, in all seriousness, what happens if we make a law that says you can apply and the courts interrupt that you cannot be denied. And then a group like the Branch Dividends comes in and says we want our own plate, or the Klu Klux Klan, would this law allow the Secretary of State to deny them plates? That would be my big concern."
- Hicks: "Well in the legislation we talked about fraternal community and civic organizations, now if the...under that definition the Secretary of State would determine that the Branch Dividends, or the KKK is a civic organization possibly, or a community organization then I guess it's up to him to say yes or no. In my book they would not be considered as a good community organization, and I think I would probably want to deny their application based upon the fact they are not a good community organization."
- Brady: "And I guess that's my question, do you think this language gives the Secretary of State that right?"
- Hicks: "In my opinion and if we wanted to go back in years to come, I think that that would me my interpretation of what I am attempting to put forward so there would not be any divisiveness down the road."
- Brady: "So for the purpose of legislation intent you're intent is that we will grant the authority to the Secretary of State to deny freely, and so to speak, discriminate amongst which

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

groups?"

Hicks: "Well I wouldn't want to use the word discriminate, but I would think that for those purposes we would certainly want him to use his best judgment in saying that community organizations, those civic organizations in the community, would be the ones that we would want to see eligible for this type of plate."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Speaker yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Lawfer: "Representative, I have a Bill that calls for a special EMT plates, I think that Bill is in Rules Committee and hasn't moved out. But on the other hand, that Bill may not be necessary if this Bill would pass. Is that correct?"

Hicks: "Absolutely, Representative. I think we could do away with a lot of the different types of legislation that we've seen yearly, your EMT plate for example, they could certainly qualify. I would hope to be able to have a special designation placed upon a special license plate, and we would want that left up to the Secretary of State to make that decision. I think we would want any good organization in the State of Illinois who wants to have a specialized license plate to be eligible for this. And I think your legislation then would really be incorporated within this."

Lawfer: "In other words then if this legislation is passed, either the EMT organization or part of that organization could apply for these plates to be issued and then if that was approved then they would do that, is that correct?"

Hicks: "That would be correct."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the passage of House Bill 4070. All those in favor of voting for House Bill 4070 as amended vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted? Have all voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 104 voting 'aye'. This Bill, having received the required...Representative Ackerman would be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Coy Pugh would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. 106...with 106 voting 'aye'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Homer on House Bill 2817. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 20..."

- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Representative
  Lou Jones on House Bill 4090 this is Government
  Administration, Third Reading. Out of the record. On the
  Order of Government Administration, Second Reading, we have
  Representative Lang, House Bill 3540. Out of the record.
  On the same order we have House Bill 2807, Representative
  Lopez. Out of the record. Representative Ben Martinez on
  House Bill 3297. Ben Martinez. Out of the record. Mr.
  Clerk, can we go back to Representative Ben Martinez, House
  Bill 3297, Government Administration, Second Reading?"
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3297 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Daniels."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Daniels on Floor Amendment #2.

  Withdraw. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoeft on Floor Amendment #3.
  Withdraw."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3297, a Bill for an Act that amends

the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ben Martinez."

Martinez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all I'd like to thank the other side the aisle for withdrawing the Amendments. House Bill 3297 requires public schools, K-12 to include a unit οf instruction studying the events of Hispanic-American History. The cost to State Government is minimal since each school board determines the amount of time devoted to the instruction. The school board would be able to absorb the cost of such additional instruction. There already exists a unit of instruction studying the events of atrosities of 1933 to 1945, and also, a unit of instruction studying the events of Black history, events of the history of women. This unit of study would bring pride to hispanics students to be able to learn of their heritage. It is of utmost importance to the...our young people in my district, in particular. Ι ask your favorable support."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the passage of House Bill 3297, on that Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in very reluctant opposition to this, there's probably no more sincere Sponsor who would carry this Bill on the House than Representative Martinez. However, trying to put personal emotions aside, it is an unfunded curricula mandate. The Gentleman is absolutely correct, we have done this for any number of groups who want their particular contributions to

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

the American culture and history incorporated into the history curricula. I think at sometime we need to just stop and think about, are we going to teach American History or are we just going to just teach individual units based on the contribution..."

- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Black. Excuse me.

  Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to take this Bill out of the record, temporarily."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please take this Bill out of the record? Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to request a Republican conference immediately. It would last probably 45 minutes."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well if the Republicans are going to have a conference I need to make an announcement. Many of you were invited to a tennis tournament by the Southern Illinois Industrial Association which is to be held this coming Monday. Former Representative Bob Walters has asked me to advise you that that tournament has been cancelled. And for those of you who have already sent your money in, he is...he sends you his gratitude."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black requests a Republican conference for 45 minutes. The House will reconvene at 12:30 p.m. Representative Ostenburg, for what reason do you rise? Representative..."
- Ostenburg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Before the Republicans leave for the caucus, I would like to introduce in the gallery members of the Class A Championship Football team from Marion Catholic High School, Chicago Heights and their coach, Dave Latell, on

135th Legislative Day the end there."

May 20, 1994

- Speaker Flowers: "On the Order of Third Reading we have House Bill 4090, Representative Lou Jones on House Bill 4090. Out of the record. On House...on the Order of Government Administration, Second Reading, we have Representative Lang House Bill 3540. Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 2807. Representative Lopez. Representative Morrow on House Bill 3950. Representative Charles Morrow. Representative Moseley on House Bill 2805. Representative Moseley. Representative Ostenburg, Bill 3320. Representative Ostenburg. Order of Third Reading, Government Administration. Out of the record. Representative Phelps, (House Bill) 3213. Order of Second Reading, Government Administration. Out of the Representative Coy Pugh. Representative Cov Pugh on Government Administration, (House Bill) 3386. Representative Coy Pugh. Out of the record. Representative Woolard, (House Bill) 2795. Representative The Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Woolard. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2795, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Wildlife Code. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Flowers: "Representative Woolard."
- Woolard: "I'd like to have the Bill brought back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman would like to have the Bill brought back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'.

  The 'ayes' have it. The Bill is back on Second Reading.

  Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Balanoff, on Amendment #1 to House Bill 2795."

Balanoff: "Let's go. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Amendment #1.

Many people across this country are concerned about a growth hormone which increases the amount of milk that is produced by cows. It is called Bovine Growth Hormone. They're very concerned because there are doctors that have said that this could cause cancer. As a matter of fact, there was a professor from the occupational health and safety at the University of Illinois and many others. The State of Maine, the State of Vermont, and indeed the dairy state, Wisconsin, have passed legislation now that would require labeling of milk products that are made (not from cement mix) that...contains milk that was commingled from cows that were treated with this bovine growth hormone. And I'd certainly ask for a Roll Call Vote and urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "On the question, Representative Hartke. On the Amendment."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor
yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Hartke: "Representative Balanoff, if you have a cow that produces milk that is not injected with this hormone and one that is and you took the two milks and put it in separate viles, could you tell which one if you took a chemical test on which cow was injected with the hormone and which one was not?"

Balanoff: "My understanding is that currently there is no test."

Hartke: "Excuse me?"

Balanoff: "My understanding is there's currently no test to be able to test if there is more of the BGH in it or if there

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

is not."

Hartke: "I think you're incorrect on that."

Balanoff: "Okay, I might be."

Hartke: "I don't think there is any test out today that could tell the difference whether a sample of milk was produced from a cow that had the hormone and one was not. Therefore, what I think you're trying to do is trying to create something here that has been proven to be safe. It is not harmful to anyone. I think what you're going to do is cause a flurry of consternation and expense in the general public, and you're causing a scare that is not there. Do you have any idea what this hormone is used for in dairy production?"

Balanoff: "My understanding is it increases the amount of milk that is produced by a cow."

Hartke: "That is correct. It does. Do you have any idea what the cost of this is?"

Balanoff: "The cost of the hormone?"

Hartke: "Yes."

Balanoff: "I'm not sure...I'm not sure what the cost of it is."

Hartke: "What is the ultimate goal of that dairy farmer who uses this growth hormone?"

Balanoff: "Well, I would imagine that it is to increase the amount of milk produced and therefore increase the farmers...or the dairy farmers profits."

Hartke: "Yes, it is. He is in hope of increasing more pounds per milk per cow. Any cow that produces more milk will also bring more revenue in for that agricultural producer. Now I'm not a dairyman, but I do know that what you're trying to do is putting a scare out there. This is going to cost consumers more money..."

Balanoff: "I would absolutely disagree with the idea of putting a

- 135th Legislative Day May 20, 1994
  scare out there."
- Hartke: "...not to protect the consumer at all. I think this is an anti-consumer Bill. It's not a health issue, and I would urge my colleagues to defeat this Amendment."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wennlund, on the Amendment."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I have a point of order. The original Bill was an Amendment to the Wildlife Code. Amendment #1 is an Amendment to the Grade A Pasturized Milk and Milk Products Act. I certainly don't think that's germane, and I would request a ruling of the Chair on that before I proceed."
- Speaker Flowers: "We'll check. Representative Wennlund, your point is well-taken. The Amendment is non-germane."
- Wennlund: "Madam Speaker, thank you very much."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Davis. Representative Monique Davis, on the Amendment. Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Thank you, Madam Speaker..."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Dart. Representative Woolard, for what reason..."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that due to the fact that the Representative is not present that... We would like to check the germaneness on this one, as well."
- Speaker Flowers: "Your point is well-taken, Sir. The Amendment is non-germane. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Granberg, on Amendment #3."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The same issue arises on

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- Amendment #3."
- Speaker Flowers: "Your point is well-taken, Sir. That Amendment is non-germane. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Woolard, on the Bill. Third Reading."
- Woolard: "Madam Speaker, I'd like it moved back to Third and held in that position, if I may, please."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill... Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Wennlund, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wennlund: "Madam Speaker, the rules provide that when a Bill was moved from Third back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment it cannot be considered on Third Reading on that same legislative day and I ask the Chair..."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wennlund, the Amendments were
   not adopted; so, therefore, we can move it onto Third and
   proceed."
- Wennlund: "Fine."
- Speaker Flowers: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2795, a Bill for an Act amending the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Woolard, on the Bill."
- Woolard: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to just take the Bill out of the record at this time. Thank you."
- Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Coy Pugh, on House Bill 3731, Government Administration, Second Reading. House Bill 3731. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3731. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- Speaker Flowers: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record. Withdraw Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dart."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 is the police protection enhancement Amendment. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3731. On that, Representative Black, on the Amendment. Representative Erwin. Representative Judy Erwin."
- Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. I would like the House of Representatives to join me in welcoming the eighth grade class from the Katherine Cook School on Chicago's north side. Thank you for being here today."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, on the Amendment. The Gentleman moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3731. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Biggert."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggert, on Amendment #3."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Biggert."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggert, on Amendment #4.

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Withdraw, Mr. Clerk. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3731, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Pugh, on House Bill 3731, as amended."

Pugh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3731 is designed primarily to make it a hate crime for individuals that are homeless to be afflicted by other individuals with any kind of atrocities. This Bill resulted...was the result of an incident that took place in New York where an individual...a homeless individual was asleep on a park bench and set afire while he was asleep. And this will just codify the inhumane treatment that homeless people are subject to on a daily basis."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wennlund, on the Bill."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "How is a homeless person defined in the Bill?"

Pugh: "A person without a home."

Wennlund: "Well, there are a lot of different...a lot of different kinds of homes. I mean, I go camping in a tent;

I mean, that's my home for the two or three weeks I go...I go camping, I mean. How does a person tell when a person's homeless when he commits a crime?"

Pugh: "Well..."

Wennlund: "Does this require them to be labeled? Does this require homeless people to be labeled like cement bags?"

Pugh: "Well, I think homeless people are already labeled, not so much like cement bags you know but for the most part

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

they're overlooked. And this Bill is designed to bring some attention to the plight of the homeless, and to bring some kind of attention to the fact that homeless people are people too and they deserve the same rights, and privileges that every human being deserves."

Wennlund: "But my question is is that one thing about the law that...that has to be clear to everyone in this state is the law must be plain and simple and easy to understand. How is a person supposed to know when Joe Sitzback walking down the street is homeless? How do we know that?"

Pugh: "If he doesn't have an address, if his address..."

Wennlund: "Oh wait a minute, I get it. Before you commit the crime, you got to go ask them, 'Hey, wait a minute, where do you live? You live in a home?' And then he commits the crime, and then he'd know, but if he didn't ask them or ask for his drivers license before he's going to commit a crime against this individual, how would he know?"

Pugh: "I don't think...I don't think criminals...I don't think people that...that are...that commit crimes against homeless people are really that concerned about asking someone for an identification...a piece of identification before they shoot them with a bow and arrow or...or set fire to him while he's sleeping on a park bench."

Wennlund: "Well, let me...you know, if it's a situation as is contained in the Criminal Code where if a person commits a hate crime when by reason of actual or perceived race (we can tell that most of the time; color, creed - you can't tell religion), how do we tell or how does anyone tell when a person is homeless without a label? Is there a perception of a homeless person? I mean, actual or perceived, so is there a perception of homeless people?"

Pugh: "I think when an individual is asleep...found sleeping on a

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

park bench, I think when an individual is found sleeping in Chicago under lower Wacker Drive on a crate, I think when an individual is...is found going to a shelter on a regular basis, that he could be easily qualified as a homeless person."

Wennlund: "Does this Bill only apply to sleeping homeless people?"

Pugh: "No, Sir, it does not."

Wennlund: "It applies to all homeless people?"

sleeping, for instance?"

Pugh: "It applies to all individuals that are homeless, yes Sir."

Wennlund: "The Bill, as I read it, just says 'homeless person status'. Certainly, we know the other categories, but I'm serious about this. One of the things about the law in this state and in other states is that people, you know, are presumed to know the law; and if they're going to be presumed to know the law, how does a person determine if someone is homeless even if they're...when they're not

Pugh: "Well, there are certain identifying factors to individuals who are homeless. For the most part, they're usually carrying shopping bags or...or not very clean. There's just certain characteristics, Representative, that goes with being homeless."

Wennlund: "What are those characteristics? Are they set out in the Bill, these characteristics so that people will know that if a person who has these characteristics would be classified as a homeless person? I mean, I don't see anything in here about shopping bags or even sleeping."

Pugh: "Well, once...once the crime is committed, then it's left to the courts to decide whether or not the individual that committed the crime was aware that the individual was homeless. If there was...if there was no intent, or there

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

was no knowledge that the individual was homeless, then there wouldn't be a crime."

Wennlund: "Well, hundreds of crimes are committed every day in this state and my question is, 'With all these crimes being committed, what...is there more crimes against the homeless than there are against other individuals that they should have this extra protected status of a hate crime?'"

Pugh: "There are certain crimes being committed against the homeless that are not currently on the books. This law is designed to identify those particular crimes."

"All right, thank you very much. To the Bill, and Gentlemen of the House. Now, I can understand a lot of the categories that are contained in this..in this original legislation that amount to what we call 'hate crimes'. And maybe I...maybe I've been living under a rock, but I really run into anybody who hates the homeless. I mean, how could you hate the homeless? That's like hating apple pie and motherhood. This is...this is ridiculous. Bill by adding yet another category to the hate crimes and maybe we ought to add ratites in here, too, and make hating ratites a hate crime. This is ridiculous. This increasing the status of these hate crimes, you know, before you know it we're going have Members of the House in there, and if stay in Session any longer, I'll tell you what, Members of the General Assembly are going to be included in here by all your constituents back home. let's get Now evacuation plan and get the hell out of here."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Ryder: "Representative, are you aware of any other categories of hate crimes that have been considered or passed by the

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

General Assembly?"

Pugh: "I can't say that I am."

Ryder: "So, you are making a single exception for homeless people. Is that right?"

Pugh: "No, Sir. I'm assuming..."

Ryder: "You are what, Sir?"

Pugh: "There are currently on the books, and I stand corrected, currently on the books a person commits a hate crime when by reason of actual, or perceived race, color or creed, religion, ancestry, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, national origin that a homeless person status, or another individual group. So, currently there...there are statutes on the books, but acts against homeless people are not included in those."

Ryder: "Representative, I appreciate the edification on that particular issue. So now you are suggesting that because of an address, because of where a person..."

Pugh: "Because of lack of an address."

Ryder: "Very good. Because of the lack of an address, a person then has a...a accelerated penalty for an assault. Is that right?"

Pugh: "No, Sir. The...and I don't know what you mean by accelerated, but the...the law would basically call for an individual to conduct some community service in the amount of 100 hours."

Ryder: "Is that an enhanced penalty? Is that over and above the penalty that one receives for assault?"

Pugh: "No, Sir. I would assume and...I would assume that it's
 less than for assault."

Ryder: "You're asking for a penalty for an assault of a homeless person to be less than an assault of another...another person? Is that what you're telling me?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Pugh: "Well, the...the crime of assault... I'm not familiar with the law as it relates to the actual sentence for the crime of assault, so I can't...I can't say whether or not they should or shouldn't receive less or more time for committing the same crime on a homeless person. I'm merely stating that...I'm merely stating that a crime against a homeless person should be identified just like a crime against any other individual."

Ryder: "Representative, I would simply ask the staffer that...the young man that's right there next to you knows a lot about criminal law, and I'm sure that if you were to ask him, the staff (there he is, he's looking at me), if you were to ask your staff person there, I'm certain that he would be able to tell you that all persons in the State of Illinois are covered by the current laws concerning assault, and other against people, and that in order for the hate crimes that you described it is...it is based upon address or lack there of, but based upon hatred, or upon prejudice that is readily identifiable. You mentioned race, you mentioned sexual preference; there are other areas here, none of which, none of which deal with the way that a person chooses to, where they choose to live or not to live. If that were the case, then I would suggest to Sir, that you are opening up the hate crimes Bill for crimes against downstaters. When we would go to your city as a downstater and I'm assaulted, because people don't like downstaters, that we could be included under the hate crime Bill or vice versa when folks from the city come downstate if they are mistreated in some fashion. Sir, with...with the Amendment or the Bill that you are offering is that there is no way until after the fact to determine that the person injured falls into this

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

category. As a result, they...the enhanced penalty that you are describing sets apart these people, the homeless people (or at least as you described them), the end result is that it's after the fact. There's no proof that you can indicate... How am I to know?"

Pugh: "Well, the proof, I mean you're getting into an evidentiary matter, and that's something for the courts to decide.

That's for the courts to decide."

Ryder: "No, Sir. It's for us to decide. We make the laws. W۵ make the laws, not the courts. The courts interpret those If your Bill doesn't have specificity, then you're simply opening the door for courts to make whatever decision they wish. That is why we spend the time and effort. You can ask your staffer, he's right there, been in court before, you can ask your staffer, the courts are there to enforce the laws. I don't want to prosecutor the ability to suggest that a downstater in Chicago can be, because of an address or a lack of address, can be a subject of a hate crime. I don't want to take advantage of you city folks if you come down to Pekin to be taken advantage of, or Canton, or other places of that regard. What you're doing, Sir, is setting up a Bill is impossible to enforce. You're setting up a Bill that is impossible for any court to enforce."

Pugh: "Well, if you want to deal with possibilities, getting the Bill passed by the Senate is...is probably impossible, also. The status of, and you alluded to the fact of identification of a homeless individual, and a homeless individual is identified based on their economic status. And I'm sure that an individual from Pekin or from any of the downstate communities are, for the most part, not economically disadvantaged and they're going to have...and

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

they're going to have identification on their person which shows that they have a residence. What we're merely attempting to do, and I don't know if you're aware of the fact that in Chicago some homeless individuals were used for target practice by people with bow and arrows, people..."

Ryder: "I am agast at that, and I would suggest..."

Pugh: "You should be, and you should be..."

Ryder: "...that the people that committed that crime should be prosecuted."

Pugh: "...when you're talking about...when you're talking about the enhancement of penalties, when you can consider...when consider you can enhancing penalties for 13, 14. 15-year-old children who are out there because they don't have a proper education to know right from wrong, but we're talking about enhancing a penalty for some of the grossest atrocities afflicted upon people, and we have a problem passing legislation to protect the rights of those individuals. I submit to you, Sir, that we as Representatives are responsible for protecting the rights of not only a preferred class, but for every individual within the State of Illinois."

Ryder: "And I agree with that, Representative, and that's why I believe that those youngsters should be prosecuted under the laws. I would submit to you, Sir, that under the current law those youngsters are going to be prosecuted under the Juvenile Act and this Bill will not apply to them at all. So the very circumstance that you wish to correct would not be even touched by the Bill that you suggest. Now, you said something interesting here and when you suggested that the Bill, or excuse me, that the people who were being injured or being used for target practice were

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

there because of economic status. Nowhere in your Bill does it state anything about economic status, Sir."

Pugh: "We were talking...you raised a question relative to the identification of a homeless individual, how was one identified, and I stated to you that the homeless individual was identified based on economic status."

Ryder: "That's not what your Bill says. Your Bill talks about an address or lack there of or frequenting shelters. does not indicate to me economic status. If that's the case, then you should put in there that homeless people are those that are under the poverty level of income or maybe you should be placing in there that homeless people are in a different category. I also submit to you, Sir, that Chicago does not have a monopoly on those folks that are in poverty, nor does it have a monopoly on those folks that So I would suggest to you that your Bill needs a definition that works. I may quibble over whether we should be doing a status crime such as you've described, but the problem with your Bill is that the definition doesn't even accomplish that fact. Those youngsters that attempted target practice on a homeless person did a despicable act, but I don't believe that because it was a homeless person that it's any more despicable than if those youngsters had used you for target practice or your staffer there for target practice. I don't believe that that act is any worse because those youngsters did that. that that act is despicable in and of itself: it doesn't need enhanced penalties. What it needs is the prosecution of the State of Illinois. What it needs, I submit, is for you to join us to reduce the age of accountability so that these youngsters could be prosecuted under adult laws and not under the Juvenile Act. To the Bill, if I

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker. While I don't question the Sponsor's motivations at all, but to try to make a law from one act, incident, which in this case was bows and arrows and target practice, makes bad law. In addition, it's bad law because definition is so vague and inadequate that could...that it could encompass someone that's moving from Canton to Springfield; someone that's moving from Chicago to Peoria; they are without an address, they are without a Under this Act, they are therefore homeless people home. and if those people were in some way assaulted or harmed, enhanced penalty could be applied even in a case then an where it doesn't exist. In other areas of religion, the attacks are obvious. And as a result. they're motivated by hate. there's no question that Ιn this situation, it's simply motivated by...it could be motivated by immaturity of young people or simply an assault on any people. The Bill itself is vague. It makes bad law. I have supported one of the Amendments on many other occasions, and will support that Amendment on other occasions, but the underlying Bill here is so bad that I will not be able to vote in favor of the Bill, and I would urge other colleagues to do the same."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Homer, on the Bill."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm perplexed as debate. If Representative Pugh were a target in a district that the Republicans hoped to capture, I would assume that they were just giving him a hard time on his Bill. oppose this Bill for the reasons that have been given makes One of the elements of the crime that he would sense. create with his Amendment, the prosecutor would have show beyond a reasonable doubt that the...that the defendant had...that the defendant was motivated by the

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

fact that the victim was homeless. So that if the evidence was such that there was no evidence of that at the time the crime was committed, then it wouldn't be a hate crime. would simply be the assault or the battery. Now we have already created hate crimes for many other categories. We've done that because the status of the people within those categories are such that they have been persecuted in society and discriminated against or because they are vulnerable because of their age, whether they be infirmed because of old age or youthful. We have provided special protections. And you know what, we've also provided special protections for, and enhanced penalties. when someone strikes or assaults a police officer, or a fireman, or a public aid caseworker, or the whole laundry list of people that we've added to that list. I'm not...we may have added Legislators. You know, every year somebody comes up with a Bill to protect judges or someone else, and we probably put Legislators in there. I can't remember. But now the Gentleman wants to protect homeless people, and someone is motivated by their attack by virtue of the status of that person being homeless, then they ought the enhanced penalty, if Representative Ryder is correct and that's not pervasive, then there won't be many prosecutions under this case. But the fact is, that if the prosecutor can prove beyond a reasonable doubt, as he'll be required to do under this Bill, that the attack was motivated by the status of that person being homeless, then by gosh they ought to be treated under a hate crime statute, and we ought to vote for the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, on the question. Representative Tim Johnson, on the question."

Johnson, Tim: "There's two fundamental problems that I have with

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Representative. And I would think one of them you this, share, and that is that by changing the categorization of a crime to enhance status we're simply doing what we've done for the last 15 years and that is to make a mumble-jumble of the Illinois Criminal Code. We did this with aggravated battery and aggravated assault. We did it with a of other areas that simply enhance penalties, put people in prison for longer periods of time on a willy-nilly basis when what we ought to be doing is re-examining the Criminal Code to see that the penalties really meet the offenses. Representative Pugh has been one of those people who's been strong voice for opposition to those efforts to try to create either enhanced penalties or at least to create categories of individuals who can be prosecuted, a Class IV felony, a Class II felony, on the second areas of special categorization. That alone is a reason to oppose this Bill. But the additional reason that I don't think anybody's alluded to yet is, it'd be a idea to read the Bill. On page 2 in line 17 through 20 of the Bill, they define homeless person status. And a homeless person in status, according to the Bill means that the person has a 'non-traditional residence, including but not limited to various other things', which means that definition of this Bill is that the homeless person, Class II felony, Class IV felony, according to the time committed has a non-traditional residence. Does that mean that it's somebody who is staying at the Day Care Inn four nights while they passed through town? Does it mean someone that's not paying rent and living with a relative? Does it mean someone who's living in a dormitory at a university which is at least in some categorization non-traditional (although I certainly wouldn't agree with

# 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

that). This is so vaque, it just simply doesn't sense. The same person can be walking across the park from point a to point b and be attacked and they have treated as one offense, and the same person can be walking from point a to point b but happen to have it be there some portion of where they 'live' and have it be an enhanced penalty. agree with you that the example that you gave is a serious one that ought to be addressed as such. Rut as Representative Ryder said, what we ought to do is prosecute the laws that we have, deal with the statutes that we have, make them make consistent sense within each other rather than making a mumble-jumble of the statutes with Now if you somehow could really define categorization. 'homelessness' and if you overcame the problem that there this statute at all, then you could make an be argument that this Bill made some sense. But there way that this Bill would ever withstand the constitutional scrutiny. This Bill is absolutely void for being vague its face, non-traditional residence is not definable. and I both know it's not definable, and all we're doing is passing another statute to create more penalties, more time penitentiaries for situations, and give prosecutors the ability to abuse the law as they don't often do, occasionally do in the areas of aggravated battery, and other areas that you and I both agree don't make sense. So really this really kind of surprises cause Representative Pugh and I have been among the few people who've opposed the...the non-incessent effort to try to enhance penalties in areas that really don't make sense. And this really, with all due respect Representative Pugh, works contrary to the direction that I think you and I have taken and others have taken in trying to make the Criminal

## 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Code make sense within each other. And, respectfully, and with all due respect to you, and I think you're well intended in this Bill, it just doesn't make sense and it shouldn't pass and it shouldn't be the law, and the Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Giles."

- Giles: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question. There's been long debate on this Bill, and I think that we should move the question."
- Speaker Flowers: "The previous question... On the question, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I...I guess I don't have any objection to you running the previous question at this time, but let me tell you my intent, I don't want there to be any confusion, I intend to ask for a Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call on the underlying Bill if and when it gets an affirmative number of votes."
- Speaker Flowers: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question

  be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'.

  The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is

  put...Representative Coy Pugh, on House Bill 3731."

Pugh: "I'd like to take the Bill out of the record."

- Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record. Representative Ostenburg on House Bill 3320. Third Reading. Out of the record. Representative Saltsman on House Bill 3591, Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Turner on House Bill 3174. The Order of Second Reading. Representative Turner. Out of the record. Representative Meyer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Meyer: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, I just had an inquiry of the Chair. I just noticed that none of my Democratic colleagues wanted to call onto their Bills, and I was just

- 135th Legislative Day

  wondering if nobody wants to call a Bill, if maybe we could adjourn and go home for the weekend."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Meyer, we will take that under serious advisement."
- Meyer: "Thank you."
- Speaker Flowers: "On the Order of State Operations, Special Order of Call, Representative Blagojevich, on House Bill 2542.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2542, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Cross on Floor Amendment #1."
- Cross: "I want to withdraw that at this time."
- Speaker Flowers: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dart."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Dart on Floor Amendment #2. Withdraw Amendment #2. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Blagojevich."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich on Floor Amendment #3. Withdraw. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
  Andrea Moore."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Andrea Moore. Withdraw,
  Amendment #4. Are there any further?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
  Andrea Moore."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Andrea Moore, Floor Amendment #5."
- Moore, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

House. This Amendment you have heard before, it is one that relates to the gap in the law that for domestic violence cases where there's an order of protection that has been issued. There is a seizure provision, we have had full debate on this, it more appropriately really is amended onto this Bill, and I'm pleased to see this Bill called today, and I would ask your support and answer any questions."

- Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #5, to House Bill 2542. All those in favor, say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Blagojevich."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich on Floor Amendment
  #6."
- Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #6 is the essential Bill, and it says the following: 'If somebody is convicted of an Act of domestic battery, or a violation of an order of protection, two misdemeanors, that person who is convicted of those two misdemeanor offenses would lose their firearm and would lose the opportunity to have an FOID card'."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed... On the question, Representative Black, of the Amendment."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Before we vote, I have an inquiry of the Chair. Does Amendment #6 become the Bill?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Yes, it does."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, it has."

Black: "I probably thought you'd say that too, okay."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative, Representative Tim Johnson."

Tim Johnson: "I request a roll call, and also verify, if the affirmatives outweigh the negatives."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Which gun? Would you ask the Sponsor to tell us which gun is going to be seized?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich."

- Blagojevich: "Any gun, Representative, that a person convicted, any gun that, a person owns that, any person convicted of these two misdemeanor offenses would lose the right to own any gun in the same manner as any person who is convicted of a felony, can no longer own a qun."
- Skinner: "Wait a minute, we're moving from felony down to misdemeanor? We're moving down, we're requiring somebody to be a felon before we take their guns away?"
- Blagojevich: "We are, we are saying that felons, because of the policy reasons, are prohibited from having guns and we're saying that in these two isolated instances regarding domestic violence that public policy, and the safety of women, in particular, require that we take guns out of that environment as well."
- Skinner: "Are you going to send the police in to search the house, and the garage, and any storage units the person may rent?"
- Blagojevich: "With regard to how they execute the enforcement of that, I would correctly leave to local law enforcements to figure out how they would do that."
- Skinner: "Well, I'm not a lawyer, but don't you have to have a search warrant for stuff like that?"
- Blagojevich: "Probable cause would, would ... upon conviction of

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- the crime. So, if for an example that person is convicted of that offense, the same as a mis, as a felony, law enforcement would execute the same procedures."
- Skinner: "But, it's not a felony, it's a misdemeanor?"
- Blagojevich: "That's correct, and that's what we're trying to change. We're trying to extend that to these two misdemeanor offenses."
- Skinner: "Well, I, I guess I'd like a yes or no answer. Will there have to be a search warrant before a house is ransacked?"
- Blagojevich: "Representative Skinner, did you ask me a question?"
- Skinner: "Yes, ask your staff, the one you were talking to while

  I was asking the question. He can tell you."
- Blagojevich: "What was your question, I didn't hear it?"
- Skinner: "My question is. Would there have to be a search warrant, yes or no?"
- Blagojevich: "Here's how it works. The same with a felony..."
- Skinner: "That's more than yes, or no."
- Blagojevich: "The answer is you would need, you would check the FOID card records and if guns are owned in that home, that would give you the opportunity to go in and search the premises."
- Skinner: "Would you need a search warrant signed by, whoever signs search warrants."
- Blagojevich: "The first, the first prong of that would be that the person would be required to voluntarily turn in his guns. If, in fact, he did not do that, then the law enforcement would have to go before a judge, obtain a search warrant, go into the home, and confiscate those guns."
- Skinner: "So, the answer is if it were not, if the guns were not voluntarily turned in, a search warrant would be required."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Blagojevich: "That's my understanding, yes."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Brunsvold: "Rod, what offenses again are you referring to here, that are felonies, correct?"

Blagojevich: "Present law, Representative Brunsvold, says that anybody convicted of a felony loses the right to bear a firearm, own a firearm, and a FOID card. We're extending it to two misdemeanors that are domestic violence that have a domestic violence connection. Domestic battery, a conviction of domestic battery, and a conviction of violation of an order of protection. Stalking is a felony I believe and that's so covered by the law."

Brunsvold: "So, you're adding two misdemeanors to..."

Blagojevich: "That's correct."

Brunsvold: "So, in, in a domestic squabble, you're going to have a situation, that as all of us know from our constituent work in our districts, one spouse can say about anything against another spouse, correct? Rod, and really make half truths and innuendos about that spouse that would be a misdemeanor possibly?"

Blagojevich: "Theoretically I suppose they would be charged with a misdemeanor, but these are criminal cases Representative Brunsvold, and the right to bear arms continues all the way up until a point where there is a conviction in a criminal court, with a criminal proceeding where proof beyond a reasonable doubt of those domestic violence offenses is actually established. So, barring proof beyond a reasonable doubt, that squabble situation that you're talking about would preserve the right of the gun owner to

135th Legislative Day keep his gun."

- May 20, 1994
- Brunsvold: "Well, why don't you include knives and things like that. I mean, we're, you know we're talking about problems in violence in domestic squabbles and many, many times guns aren't used."
- Blagojevich: "Yes, you're right, however..."
- Brunsvold: "Baseball bats, and, and golf clubs, and rolling pins and frying pans, and they're all, all used in domestic violence. Why are we picking on guns here?"
- Blagojevich: "Because most of the fatalities in domestic violence situations occur with the use of a firearm. Last year in the United States Representative Brunsvold, 4,000 women were killed at the hands of a domestic violence abuser, and of those 4,000, 70% of them were killed by someone using a firearm, and so when I look at numbers like that, it seems to me it's absolutely imperative that we remove firearms or the ability to have a firearm legally from a situation like that."
- Brunsvold: "Which version of this Bill do you have to use a firearm in this, in this situation, or is this the other version of your Bill?"
- Blagojevich: "This version says that any act of domestic violence whether a firearm is used or not."
- Brunsvold: "So, you could use something else and then they would take your gun. You could use a, a different weapon and take, then they take your guns away."
- Blagojevich: "You can use a knife, and you can lose your gun if your convicted of that Act of domestic violence, yes."
- Brunsvold: "Well, I would ask the Members to look carefully at this, because this is not going to work either as Representative Moore's Bill I don't think will work either because the time delay in it. So, it's pretty far fetched,

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

and many weapons are used in the home and to pick out the guns which is politically for some, the thing to do today. Let's not be, let's not be pressured by what we perceive to be the voter's wishes, because I really don't think they are the voters wishes. I'd ask a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Perhaps the Chair could enlighten me as to why there's no, the date stamped as to when this Amendment was filed is relatively faint, and I've gone around and looked at many copies. We cannot tell when it was filed, we just received the copy. Perhaps the fire in the Legislative printing unit damaged the rubber stamp yesterday, or what?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black it was filed first thing this morning."

Black: "First thing this morning."

Speaker Flowers: "First thing."

Black: "As you can see, I have a little square on my sheet, but there's nothing in it. Maybe we need to get a new rubber stamp or perhaps smoke damage did that. Okay. Well, Madam Speaker, again, to the Chair."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black..."

Black: "I simply join Representative Johnson in asking for a Roll Call Vote, pursuant to Rule 55 (c) on Amendment #6, and I am joined by four of my colleagues in requesting that we certainly make sure you've heard Representative Johnson's request."

Speaker Flowers: "I wanted you to know that the fire did damage the stamp and that's the reason why..."

Black: "That's what I was afraid of. Heavens knows what else has been damaged, though I'm sure we'll discover though, next

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

week."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Andrea Moore, on the Amendment."

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. Will the Speaker yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates..."

Moore, A.: "Now, just so that I understand this clearly, the difference between Amendment #6, and #5 is that yours provides that after a conviction of the order, the violation of the order of protection, that's when the seizure of weapons occurs."

Blagojevich: "Yes."

Moore, A.: "So that the House understands clearly, Amendment #5 was, was put in place and everyone in this House voted for it last time to address a gap in the law. While the order is issued, while there's a hearing where a of protection judge determines where due process is given completely. then there the order of protection is issued and if it was thought by the judge, then the seizure of weapons could occur. Amendment #6 does not address that gap in the law. The statistics that you used to gain support for your Bill, are, in fact, important, so important that I would remind the House that there were two women in my district in Lake County last year that were, in fact, assaulted and one was murdered, while under the order of protection, not after the conviction, Representative, but while under an order of protection. Continually, we hear from the police there isn't anything we can do while the order of protection is issued, unless there's been a violation, but the judge can make that determination with a fact finding hearing, and Amendment #5 has been changed so significantly that I think the House needs to be aware. Your Bill does not go far enough, it's too late for women after the conviction. It

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

needs to be while under the order of protection, and I would ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Representative Moore, can I respond by asking you a question? Do you support the concept of seizing firearms from people convicted of domestic battery..."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich, Representative, you are out of order."

Blagojevich: "Andrea Moore, well, Representative Moore I would encourage you to support this Bill. I supported your Amendment, and your Amendment passed out of this House and it is now in the Senate. It seems to me that if we can pass your version in the Senate, I would applaud that, and I would go around the whole state and applaud that. But, if we can't pass that in the Senate, seems to me this is the next best alternative. I would like to see the seizure of a firearm at the stage where an order of protection is issued, but if we can't get that, I would like a conviction."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich, please.

Representative Cross, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Cross: "Thank you. Representative, there's also, I've got a copy of the Amendment, there's more than just your Bill in here it looks like. Does this Amendment also include the Police Protection Enhancement Fund?"

Blagojevich: "No. I'm sorry, yes."

Cross: "Is, is there anything else in it besides the Police Protection Enhancement Fund in your language?"

Blagojevich: "No."

Cross: "Okay. What is the Police Protection Enhancement Fund?"

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- Blagojevich: "It's an Amendment that I think we've seen before, and it simply allows for the additional funding of more police, and I think that's a good idea."
- Cross: "The Amendment that the Speaker's sponsored on the previous Bills?"
- Blagojevich: "Correct. He has the wisdom of sponsoring that, yes."
- Cross: "What's, with respect to your Amendment, the language here. You also, besides order of protection, violation of order of protection, domestic battery, I see stalking and aggravated stalking as well. Is that your intention? We haven't been talking about that the last few minutes."
- Blagojevich: "It's not in the Bill, because that stalking and aggravated stalking is a felony already and it's covered."
- Cross: "Is there any..."
- Blagojevich: "It's also in the Bill, so it is superfluous, because the reality is if those are felonies, you cannot have a gun already. If there exists a misdemeanor that does that, then that would, you would lose it, but it does, I don't think that happens."
- Cross: "It also adds that, or a substantially similar offense of another jurisdiction, are we talking about a state jurisdiction, or an..."
- Blagojevich: "I'm sorry Representative, I didn't hear the question."
- Cross: "It also refers to, it lists that domestic battery, stalking, aggravated stalking, etc, more of a substantially similar offense in other jurisdictions. What jurisdiction are you referring to?"
- Blagojevich: "Laws in another state, that sort of thing."
- Cross: "The next start, there's an area that gives the Department of state police the authority to revoke a firearm. How are

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

- we going to notify the state police of a conviction of an order of protection, or a violation of an order of protection, just mechanically how are we going to go about doing this?"
- Blagojevich: "I would imagine that the same rules would apply in that situation as it presently apply when someone is convicted of a felony, probably the state's attorney's office, or the local prosecutor's office..."
- Cross: "I'm just curious, what is the, do you know the mechanics of how we're doing that now, and what we're doing?"
- Blagojevich: "That's a good, that's a good question. You and I
  were former prosecutors, we should know this, probably.

  Maybe Representative Dart can give us an answer."
- Cross: "Does he know the answer?"
- Blagojevich: "The leads units within the state's attorney's office. He just confirmed what I suspected was the case.

  Unfortunately, I didn't know it beyond a reasonable doubt."
- Cross: "How are we, mechanically then, how are we taking the guns, or the firearms away? I know the FOID card is, is to be revoked, but then what do we do?"
- Blagojevich: "I, theoretically it would work like this. The guys' convicted of beating his wife, you are now, the FOID cards are checked."
- Cross: "Or her husband, whatever the case may be."
- Blagojevich: "Correct, absolutely. It's gender neutral, but the statistics are very obvious that it usually happens to women. The FOID cards are searched by the state police. They then ask that convicted domestic batterer to bring in voluntarily his or her gun. If they don't do that, then the state police would have to ask a local prosecutor's agency to seek a search warrant to go into the house in violation of a law. If they want to go to that extent,

- 135th Legislative Day May 20, 1994 that's what they would do."
- Cross: "Do they have the authority to do that under this Bill, or another one? Do you know?"
- Blagojevich: "Existing law allows it for felonies, we're not tampering with existing law in term, with regard to that part."
- Cross: "My, my concern is not in issuance of the FOID card, it's in the revocation portion. I understand the mechanics of applying for a FOID card, but subsequent to an offense after a FOID cards been issued. How do we get the guns turned in? Assuming we don't have a search."
- Cross: "Right. If they don't voluntarily do it, and we, that's the first step, then it would be, if there's probable cause to think that there are guns in that situation, then a prosecutor would, would have to do what they do if a felon has a gun. The same procedures."
- Cross: "And, how are we going to know what guns that are there are, or are not there, in the house?"
- Blagojevich: "We're going to allow that to local law enforcement, and that's their job. We're going to delegate authority as we do so well, here. Nothing changes with regard to enforcement of this, as presently exists for anybody convicted with a felony, or of a felony."
- Cross: "And, the additional offenses."
- Blagojevich: "And these additional offenses would just be, the execution would be the same as these felons."
- Cross: "We still though, Representative, I'm just, and I don't,
  I'm not following it in the language of the Bill, or the
  Amendment. We still run the risk, we don't have the
  ability to trace guns in this state, is that correct?"
- Blagojevich: "I'm sorry Representative, I didn't catch that."
- Cross: "We don't have the ability to trace guns in this state now

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

do we?"

Blagojevich: "Well, yeah..."

Cross: "I mean we just don't, we're never going to know if we, if were going to get any, the guns out there from the convicted felon, are we?"

Blagojevich: "I suppose the success rate in terms of having these guns turned in would be about the same percentages as are presently occurring with regard to convicted felons. I suppose those numbers are going to be very similar whatever they may be."

Cross: "Thank you."

Blagojevich: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Frias."

Frias: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in a point of personal privilege. I would like the Members of the House to join me in welcoming the graduating class of the Cicero School which is a school in my district. (Spanish Language). Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "That's a violation of our rules,

Representative. But... Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Would the Speaker yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will. Yes, he will."

Lawfer: "The police protection enhancement fund has not been discussed much, and this is the part of the Amendment, is that correct?"

Blagojevich: "I'm proud to say, Representative Lawfer that it is,
 yes."

Lawfer: "And how much will that collect then? What is the estimated revenue that would come into that fund?"

Blagojevich: "Two hundred million dollars a year."

Lawfer: "Two hundred million?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Blagojevich: "For more police, yes."

Lawfer: "And this would be money that would be diverted from the General Revenue Fund, is that correct? If it does not go into the enhancement fund?"

Blagojevich: "New revenue for the most part, sales tax collections."

Lawfer: "If the \$200,000,000 did not go into the enhancement fund, where would it go to?"

Blagojevich: "Hopefully into other law enforcement public protection type things, because I again, I would emphasize to all of us, our first duty is to provide for the public safety of our fellow citizens. I like the proactive approach, that's why I like this Police Amendment."

Lawfer: "And, I agree to that."

Blagojevich: "Let's get crime before it happens."

Lawfer: "I, I guess I would just needed a clarification of some of the figures. I, on the, going back to the other part in regard to the FOID card. You know, revoking a FOID card and so on, I guess you know, that can be done at the present time, but of course, it, would there be any accountability here to the number of weapons. I mean, how are we going to determine you know, somebody who has a FOID card, and is revoked and they turn in a weapon, you know, how can we be sure that that's the only weapon?"

Blagojevich: "Well, anybody who doesn't have an FOID card, a FOID card shouldn't have a weapon in Illinois. So, if you have somebody who abuses his or her spouse, and, and that person doesn't have a FOID card, that person shouldn't have a gun anyway..."

Lawfer: "In other words, if I was forced to turn in my FOID card then I would need to turn in all of my weapons at that time?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Blagojevich: "Yes, Representative Lawfer, yes."

Lawfer: "And, they would be confiscated then by what, the police, the court system, or where do these weapons end up then?"

Blagojevich: "The state police."

Lawfer: "And then they, they would be destroyed then?"

Blagojevich: "They would, and the good thing about this Bill is, it only goes after the guy's who beat their wives, or wives who beat their husbands, and are convicted of that and are proven beyond a reasonable doubt. That's why I like this Bill. They can't have guns, what's wrong with that."

Lawfer: "Well, I, I agree anybody that misuses a weapon, that that weapon should be taken away. However, I just want to make sure that you know, we're approved that that person has been guilty of a crime and that that weapon has been used in operative. In other words, but it would be, for example a person know that had a complete collection of weapons and then was accused of that would have to turn the entire collection in, is that correct?"

Blagojevich: "No, that's the beauty of this Bill, too. It's more than an accusation. That's what we like about this. You've got to be found guilty in a criminal proceeding, you've got to be convicted, be with proof beyond a reasonable doubt. You're a convicted batterer of your spouse, or your girlfriend, and we say to you, you shouldn't have a gun because you are dangerous, you can hurt somebody, and last year in the United States, 4,000 women died and 70% of them were, died at the hands of somebody with a firearm. So, we say hey, you going to beat your wife, and your found guilty of doing it, you can't have a gun."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much."

Blagojevich: "Thank you."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ronen on the question."

Ronen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise in support of this Commend the Sponsor for putting forward what is a very important and practical piece of legislation. It's very clear that we have a problem in this country. The statistics have already been stated, 4,000 women died last year, 70% as a result of a firearm. This Bill is a responsible first step to address that serious problem. Right now we say it's against the law for a felon to own a gun or to have a FOID card. This is just an expansion of that to say that those who are convicted, convicted of domestic battery, or convicted of violating an order of protection also fall into that category. We have the system in place to follow through with this, we know we is a workable solution, it's a positive first step, and I urge, urge everybody to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Hoffman: "Representative, you were talking about, hello."

Blagojevich: "Hi, how are you."

Hoffman: "Are you awake over there? You were talking about a search warrant, whether a search warrant is needed. It's my understanding that you would still have to get a search warrant in order to go into these individuals houses, is that right?"

Blagojevich: "Yes."

Hoffman: "So, your earlier statement that you did need a search warrant was just an error."

Blagojevich: "Not the first one I've ever made. Thanks for pointing that out, I really appreciate that. I'll always remember that."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Hoffman: "Yeah, that's right. Just a slight error, like, just totally wrong this time, right?"

Blagojevich: "Evidently."

Hoffman: "So, in other words, if first there has to be a conviction, right? Then in order to go into the individuals house, you have, you would have to have probable cause and receive a search warrant from, from a judge or the court, correct?"

Blagojevich: "Absolutely."

Hoffman: "So, there are protections in this Bill, so that you just can't go barging into an individual's house?"

Blagojevich: "I think constitutionally from a safeguards of the constitution, I think it's a solid as can be. As far as I know, the law regarding taking guns away from convicted felons has not been constitutionally challenged. It certainly has not been constitutionally overturned, nothing changes with regard to this. So, it's the same principle."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative."

Blagojevich: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hawkins."

Hawkins: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Hawkins: "How long would a person be without his gun? How long?" Blagojevich: "In perpetuity, forever."

Hawkins: "He would never be able to, he would never, okay. I want to move the previous question."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has moved for... Representative Mulligan, I'm sorry, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Blagojevich, if this Amendment were to

135th Legislative Day

- May 20, 1994
- fail, oh I'm sorry, are we moving the previous question?"
- Blagojevich: "Feel free to ask the question, that's okay, as far as I'm concerned."
- Mulligan: "If this were an Amendment, if this Amendment were to fail, what is left on this Bill, your original Bill, and Representative Moore's Amendment? There are not other Amendments on the Bill?"
- Blagojevich: "The Police Amendment."
- Mulligan: "No, no. If this Amendment fails, the Police Amendment is not on the Bill."
- Blagojevich: "That's right."
- Mulligan: "Just as a matter of record, Speaker Madigan's Police

  Enhancement Bill has been amended on to how many Bills that
  have gone over to the Senate already?"
- Blagojevich: "I don't, that's a good question. It seems like a..."
- Mulligan: "A fair number, correct?"
- Blagojevich: "Right. Hopefully one of those can become law so we can have more police and safer streets."
- Mulligan: "But, your Bill and when Representative Lawfer was questioning you, he asked you a question, and you answered that by putting that Bill on, you were being proactive, but you were taking off Representative Moore's Bill, which you said you agreed with, and which left your original Bill in-tact, there by removing the initial point at which, a women in a domestic violence instance may be killed long before the case comes to court. I don't consider that proactive, how do you consider that proactive?"
- Blagojevich: "I appreciate that question. I'm glad you asked that. Here's why. I completely support Representative Moore's' Amendment, and I applaud the fact that her Amendment is already in the Senate. I would like another

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Bill that does something just a little bit different to throw into the mix in the Senate. So that, we've got two domestic violence seizing a firearms Bills operating in the If for example, in these chambers where compromise and bartering and so forth happens, we have two domestic violence Bills there, Ι think we're all the better, and it's good policy. If I could think that her Bill. Amendment would be on my Bill that would bring strength in the Senate, I would say absolutely let's have it. fact of the matter is, based on what I'm hearing, her Amendment could actually raise some questions in the Senate. There are constitutional questions regarding the taking of a property right, prior to a conviction, that could. very well, mean that Representative Moore's' Amendment could not succeed in the Senate. So, I would like something that isn't as affective as hers in the I'm the first to tell you that, but it does something about taking firearms from people who are convicted of domestic violence. And, so that's the purpose, and I'll do anything I can to pass her Amendment. I have a Bill just like her Amendment, and the other part with Representative Moore's' Amendment it says this, if your, you can only, this order of protection only applies if you've used a in the act of, or a firearm in the act of domestic violence. This Bill is broader, it covers more area. of domestic violence. You don't need to have a gun, you just got to beat your wife with a, with your hand, fist, and you're convicted of that, you lose a gun, your Under Representative Moore's' Amendment, you don't too. get an order of protection, and then lose a gun if you've beat your wife with something other than a weapon, and so, many respects her Bill covers more ground, but in other

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

respects it doesn't, and the problem of actually enacting a law. That to me is a test, not just passing a Bill out of this House. Let's get it over to the Senate, and let's have it in the mix where it has a chance of being a law, so we can try to do something right now in 1994 about this domestic violence problem."

Mulligan: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill, Representative Blagojevich's' Bill, which is a very poop Bill it stands and made only better by Representative Moore's Bill which would end up that way, if we were to defeat this Amendment. It's a wonderful Bill, and Representative Moore's' Amendment is a wonderful Amendment that I think makes it a complete Bill. Amendment #6 makes it a garden variety Bill, because we've seen the police enhancement Bill on any number of Bill and, so now we have turned Representative Blagojevich's Bill into just a common ordinary Bill, one that the Senate will probably throw out. I really think we should defeat Amendment go back to look at the original Bill with Representative Moore's Amendment, which is a wonderful Amendment, and then pass that as something that we would send to the Senate with pride. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black.'

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The hour grows late, and we need to get the printing unit fixed, and the rubber stamp fixed. I move the previous question."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has moved for previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The previous question has been put. Representative Blagojevich to close on Amendment #6."

Blagojevich: "My closing is, I ask your support, I implore those who care about domestic violence, and firearms to consider

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

the practical aspect of this too. If we can pass this Bill out in it's form, we can have Andrea Moore's Amendment that's already in the Senate, are we can have this version there, too. So, we've got two tough domestic violence Bills operating in the next chamber. There's more to governing than simply passing Bills out of one Let's enact laws, let's do something about that, and if we can pass this, I would then encourage all of us, Legislator here to remember that all roads then leave to, lead to Pate Philip and that we should call Pate Philip to ask him to call this Bill in the Senate, and take a vote on so that we can pass this as law. I would ask you to do that as well, and maybe we should all write our Senators, and ask them to call this Bill all roads lead to Pate Philip, if we can pass this out of the House. Let's call him and have him call this Bill, let's do something about domestic violence right now."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 2542. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed, vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Representative Johnson has asked for a verification? Mr. Clerk would you please poll the affirmative. Representative Turner would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Lang, what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Madam Speaker, I would ask the Chair to rule this request dilatory. This is an Amendment, it only needs a majority, he would need to knock off 40 people. I don't think he can do that."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Tim Johnson."
Johnson, Tim: "I don't, I don't withdraw my request."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Proceed."

- Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the Representatives Balanoff. Balthis. Blagojevich. Burke. Capparelli. Cross. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. Dunn. Edley. Erwin. Flowers. Frederick. Frias. Giglio. Gash. Giles. Giolitto. Granberg."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Younge would like to have leave to be verified. Does she have leave? Representative Tim Johnson. Representative Johnson. She has leave. Thank you."
- Clerk McLennand: "Hannig. Hanrahan. Hawkins. Hoeft. Homer. Jones, Lou. Kotlarz. Lang. Laurino. Lawfer. Levin. Lindner. Lopez. Martinez. McAfee. McGuire. McPike. Meyer. Moffitt. Moore, Eugene. Morrow. Moselev. Persico. Ostenburg. Phelan. Prussing. Raschke-Lind. Ronen. Roskam. Rotello. Santiago. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Sheehy. Steczo. Stephens. Stroger. Turner. von Bergen-Wessels. Wirsing. Younge. Zickus. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Homer, for what reason do you rise?"

Homer: "Leave to be verified, Tim."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has leave. Representative Rotello would like to be recorded as voting 'no'. Please record him. Representative Walsh would like to be recorded as voting 'yes'. Please record him. Representative Cross would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Please record her. Representative Johnson would like to be recorded, Representative Stephens would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Johnson, are there any questions?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Johnson, Tim.: "Ready. Currie?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Currie. Representative Currie.

How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative Currie is voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Flowers: "Would you please remove the Lady.

Representative Hicks for what reason do you rise."

Hicks: "Madam Speaker, I see that 18 people weren't present, I
really wanted a poll of the absentees before you started."

Johnson, Tim.: "I'll see to that request."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please poll the absentees?"

Clerk McLennand: "Those Members not voting." Ackerman. Biggins.

Daniels. Jones, Shirley. Krause. Kubik. Murphy, M.

Noland. Rutherford. Saviano. Weller. Wennlund."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "Then we'll keep going here. Schakowsky?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Schakowsky is in her seat."

Johnson, Tim: "Ronen?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ronen is in her seat."

Johnson, Tim: "Erwin?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Erwin, Representative Judy
Erwin. Please return Representative Currie back to the
roll as voting 'yes'."

Johnson, Tim: "Giolitto?"

Speaker Flowers: "Would you please remove Representative Julie...

Representative Erwin is in the back. Representative

Giolitto. Is the lady in the chambers? Remove her."

Johnson, Tim: "Kaszak?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Kaszak. Is the Lady in the chambers? Representative Kaszak. She was excused."

Johnson, Tim: "Frias?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative John Dunn, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Change my vote to 'present', please!"

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please change John Dunns' vote to 'present'."

Johnson, Tim: "We keep going now?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Carolyn Krause would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Zickus. Representative Zickus would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Lawfer. Representative Lawfer would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Wirsing would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Weaver would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Sue Deuchler would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Mulligan, Representative Mulligan would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Tim Johnson are there any further?"

Johnson, Tim: "Yes, I have a number more. I'm just letting everybody do their thing."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, please continue."

Johnson, Tim: "Phelan?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Phelan. Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Johnson, Tim: "Blagojevich, no he's here. Representative Saltsman?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Saltsman, Representative Saltsman, he's voting 'no'."

Johnson, Tim: "Capparelli?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Capparelli. Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Johnson, Tim: "Laurino?"

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Laurino. Remove him, Mr. Clerk
Tim

Johnson, Tim: "Kotlarz?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Kotlarz. Representative Kotlarz. Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Johnson, Tim: "Bugielski?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Bugielski. Representative Bugielski. Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Johnson, Tim: "Santiago?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Santiago. Please remove him from the roll."

Johnson, Tim: "Lopez?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lopez. Representative Giglio would like to have leave to be verified. Does he have leave, Representative Johnson? Yes, he does."

Johnson, Tim: "Lou Jones?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lou Jones. Remove her, Mr. Clerk. Representative Lopez. Remove him, Mr. Clerk."

Johnson, Tim: "Did you get Morrow?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Morrow, Representative Charles

Morrow would you please remove him. Mr. Clerk would you

please add Representative Giolitto back to the roll as

voting 'aye'. Pardon me, Representative Johnson?"

Johnson, Tim: "Edward DeJaegher?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher. Please remove him from the roll."

Johnson, Tim: "Flinn?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Monroe Flinn. Please, please remove him."

Johnson, Tim: "Novak?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner would like to have leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Yes."

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Johnson, Tim: "Yes, that's fine. Novak?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Novak. He's in his chair."

Johnson, Tim: "Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Shirley Jones. Remove her, Mr. Clerk. She's not voting."

Johnson, Tim: "Representative H. Murphy?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Harold Murphy. He's not voting."

Johnson, Tim: "Mautino?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino is voting 'no'. Representative Mautino is in the back of the chambers. Representative Lang. Excuse me, Representative Johnson. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Madam Speaker, and once again going to make my Motion that the Chair rule this dilatory. The last four or five people have either not even voted or have been voting 'no'. Now, how long shall we persist in this? Would you please make a ruling Madam Chairman?"

Johnson, Tim: "Madam Speaker."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "I'll withdraw the request now, and we will be glad to take a Third Reading vote on it today too, I think."

Speaker Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Johnson. The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. 56 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Again, Madam Speaker, if you'd look at your board to make sure if there's any lights are flashing, my light has been on, and again you chose to ignore it. Now, I'm only asking for fairness, if, I know in the process that it's sometimes difficult, but if you would be, at least before you call the final, it would be helpful."

Speaker Flowers: "Pardon me, Representative Parke. Are there any

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2542, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record. Representative Granberg moves that the House stands adjourned...not yet, I was just checking everyone. Mr. Clerk, would you please read the Adjournment Resolution now that we have everyone's attention."

Clerk "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Jim Harry, McLennand: Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted following Senate Joint Resolutions. In the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives. Senate Joint Resolution 166 resolved the Senate of the 88th General Assembly of the State of Illinois the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two houses adjourn on Friday, May 20, 1994, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 25, at the hour of 2:00 o'clock p.m.; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 24, 1994 at 1:00 p.m.; adopted by the Senate May 20, 1994. Jim Harry, Secretary of the Senate."

Speaker Flowers: "Allowing for sufficient Perfunctory time...

Representative Granberg moves for the adoption of the
Senate Adjournment Resolution 166. All those in favor say
'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution
is adopted. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the yellow sheet that was passed out yesterday with the schedule for next week, it indicates that there's a 12:00 noon hearing of the House

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Judiciary Committee. That meeting is at 10:00 a.m., that's when it's posted, 10:00 a.m. in Room 118 to discuss further riverboat proposals, on Monday, 10:00 a.m."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hannig."

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

  Just to let the membership know that we've started marking up the governor's proposal on medicaid, and we'll continue that process Monday at 11:00 o'clock in Room 114, and anyone whose interested is certainly welcome to attend, we'd like to see you there. Thank you."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Granberg moves that House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, at 1:00. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and allowing for perfunctory time, the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk McLennand: "Perfunctory Session will be in order. Reading of Senate Bills with the intent of leaving them on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1144, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1147. a for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 1181, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1182, a Bill for an Act relating to the provision of financial services on state owned property. Senate Bill 1186, a Bill for an Act concerning the transfer and deposit of educational moneys, amending named Acts. Senate Bill 1258, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Elections. Senate Bill 1261, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 1297, a Bill for an Act concerning toll bridges. Senate Bill 1311... Senate Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act to amend the Home Equity Assurance Act. Senate Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital District Law.

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act to amend the Higher Senate Education Student Assistance Act. Senate Bill 1324, a for an Act relating to education. Senate Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act concerning Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Drainage Code, Senate Bill 1454, a Bill for an Act revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Senate Bill 1455, a Bill for an to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Senate Bill 1457, a Bill Act relating to medicaid cost savings suggestions award program. Senate Bill 1477, a Bill for an Act concerning aid training. Senate Bill 1480, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. 1546, a Bill for an Act 5-20, as added by Public Act. Senate Bill 1560, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Senate Bill 1570, a Bill for an Act named Act. Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act in relation to child abuse and neglect reports by service providers. Senate Bill 1595, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1620, a Bill for an Act the Liquor Control Act of 1934. Senate Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act concerning interest on judgments. Senate Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bi-State Development Act. Senate Bill 1672, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Senate Bill 1692, a Bill Act to amend the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act. Senate Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act concerning unnecessary statutes. Senate Bill 1704, a Bill for an Act to amend the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act. Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1710, a Bill for an Act concerning employee insurance

### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

benefits. Senate Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act in relation to the transfer of interests in real property. Senate Bill 1718, a Bill for an Act to create the University of Illinois Hospital Services Fund. Senate Bill 1729, a Bill for an Act in relation to support responsibilities and paternity. Senate Bill 1733, a Bill for an Act concerning school bus drivers. Senate Bill 1747, a Bill for an Act concerning child protection, amending named Acts. Senate Bill 1755, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Senate Bill 1762, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Governor. Senate Bill 1766, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Senate Bill 1771, a Bill for Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Court of Claims. Senate Bill 1773, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Lieutenant Governor. Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act concerning extension and removal of repealers. Senate Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act to amend the Lieutenant Governor's Office of Voluntary Action Act. Second Reading of these Bills, these Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Rossi: "Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the following Bills, House 1129 together with Senate Amendment 1, 4, 5. House Bill 1352, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. House Bill 1391, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 1513, together with Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3. House Bill 1569, together with

#### 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Senate Amendments 1 and 2. House Bill 1594, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. House Bill 1635, together with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. House Bill 1853, together with Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3. House Bill together with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. House Bill 2423, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill together with Senate Amendment #1 and 2. House Bill 343, together with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. House Bill 298, Jim Harry, Secretary of the Senate'. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate together with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. House Bill 356, together with Senate Amendments 1, 4 and 5. House Bill 381, together with Senate Amendment 1, 4, 5, and 7. House Bill 410, together with Senate Amendment #3. House Bill 539, together with Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3. House Bill 696, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 742, together with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. House Bill 902, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 2234, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 4. House Bill 6, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 8, together with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. House Bill 9, together with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4. House Bill 44, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 4. House Bill 99, together with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 in the adoption of which Harry, Secretary of the Senate'. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate as amended May 20, 1994. Jim Harry, Secretary of the Senate'."

Clerk McLennand: "The Perfunctory Session will be in order.

135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Second Reading of Senate Bills for the purpose of leaving them on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction - First Reading of Bills. Senate Bill 1468, a Bill for an Act concerning the reproduction of business records, amending named Acts. Second Reading of this Bill, and it will be held on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk McLennand: "Messages from the Senate."

- Clerk McLennand: #A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives, and the passage of a Bill, the following title. House Bill 3278, together with Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. House Bill 3094. together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 2809. together with Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3. House Bill 2642, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. House Bill 2638, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 7. House Bill 2631, together with Senate Amendment #1, and 4. House Bill 2424, together with Senate Amendments 1, and 3. In which the Senate, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House these Bills the Senate as amended, on May 20, 1994. Jim Harry, Secretary of the Senate'."
- Clerk McLennand: "Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will be adjourned, and the House will reconvene on Tuesday, May 24, at the hour of 12:00 noon."
- Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

  Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Rossi: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary.

  'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
  Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the
  House in the passage of the following Bills. House Bill

## 135th Legislative Day

May 20, 1994

Bill 3322, together with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. House Bill 3457, together with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. House Bill 3485, together with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 3551, together with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. House Bill 3587, together with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 6, and House Bill 3611, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 3, and House Bill 3975, together with Senate Amendment #1, in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate as amended May 20." Jim Harry, Secretary of the Senate'."

Clerk Rossi: "Being no further business, the House will stand adjourned until Tuesday, at the hour of 1:00 p.m."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 20, 1994

94/10/18

13:20:09

HB-1702 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
HB-1747 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
HB-2542 SECOND READING	PAGE	41
HB-2542 THIRD READING	PAGE	67
HB-2542 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	67
HB-2795 RECALLED	PAGE	21
HB-2795 THIRD READING	PAGE	21
HB-2795 THIRD READING		
	PAGE	25
HB-2795 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	25
HB-2800 SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-2800 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	11
HB-3289 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-3289 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	4
HB-3297 SECOND READING		18
	PAGE	
HB-3297 THIRD READING	PAGE	19
HB-3297 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	20
HB-3731 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
HB-3731 THIRD READING	PAGE	27
HB-3731 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	40
HB-4070 SECOND READING	PAGE	11
HB-4070 THIRD READING	PAGE	13
HB-4248 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1144 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1147 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1165 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
	PAGE	68
SB-1182 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1186 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1258 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1261 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1297 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1318 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1319 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
SB-1322 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1324 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1364 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1427 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1454 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
	PAGE	69
SB-1457 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1477 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1480 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1546 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1560 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1570 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1579 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1595 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1620 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1657 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1670 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1672 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1692 SECOND READING		
	PAGE	69
SB-1702 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1704 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1709 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1710 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
SB-1715 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1718 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1729 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
		-
SB-1733 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1747 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1755 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1756 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
SB-1762 SECOND READING	PAGE	70
		, 5

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

94/10/18 13:20:09

# MAY 20, 1994

SB-1766	SECOND	READING	PAGE	70
SB-1771	SECOND	READING	PAGE	70
SB-1773	SECOND	READING	PAGE	70
SB-1803	SECOND	READING	PAGE	70
SB-1832			PAGE	70
SJR-0166	ADOPTED	)	PAGE	67
SJR-0166	RESOLUT	ION OFFERED	PAGE	67

#### SUBJECT MATTER

PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	1
PAGE	2
PAGE	68
PAGE	68
PAGE	70
PAGE	73
	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE