55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The House will be order. The House will be in order and the Members will be in their chairs. Representative Johnson in the Chair. The Chaplin for today is Pastor Ralph Wingate Jr., of the Calvary Baptist Church of Normal. Pastor Wingate is the guest of Representative Bill Brady. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Pastor Wingate."
- Pastor Wingate: "Shall we pray. Our Father, we are thankful today for Your blessing to us for these men and women and they time and effort that they give to be here to help run our state. We pray that You be with each one in the business before them. We ask that You would guide and give wisdom in difficult decisions. Bless in what they do with and their families, as they are away from them. Be honored now today, we pray in Jesus' name. Amen."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today, by Representative Mary Flowers."
- Flowers 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 Johnson, Tim: "Roll Call for Attendance. Can I have your attention, please? Representative Currie is recognized to report any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Martinez is excused today."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross, your simile recognized for absences is on the Republican side."
- Cross: "We're all here, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Journal will so indicate, the respective reports of Representative Currie and

# 55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

- Representative Cross. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 115 Members answering the Roll, and a quorum is present. The House will come to order. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill...Senate Bill 111."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 111, a Bill for an Act that amends the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jo
  Davies, Representative Lawfer on the Bill. Representative
  Lawfer."
- Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 111, expands the crime of criminal damage to state supported property, to include damage to property supported in whole or part, by funds of all local government and school districts. The original legislation said state supported property. We're just inserting government supported property there in that regards, and what it does, it just broadens the part of that and makes a criminal offense to government supported property more uniform. I'd be glad to answer any questions, in that regard."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Questions on the Bill? The Lady from Cook,' Representative Currie. Proceed. Representative Currie is not present. The Chair recognizes...Representative Currie, are you here? Okay. Representative Currie is here."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Could you also let the record show that Representative Morrow is excused today because of illness. I'm sorry, I didn't have that information for you earlier."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you, Representative, and the record

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

will so reflect. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart. Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Dart: "What Amendments are on the Bill, Representative?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "I'm sorry, I did not hear your question."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could have a little order here so
Representative Lawfer can hear and Representative Dart can
ask the questions it would be helpful to all of us.
Representative Dart, do you want to repeat the question for
Representative Lawfer?"

Dart: "Sure."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed."

Dart: "Representative, what Amendments are on this Bill right now?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "None, to my knowledge."

Speaker Johnson, Tim" "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Representative, the Amendment for putting more police on the street and the Truth in Sentencing Amendment, they're on this Bill, even though they were filed?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Not to my knowledge."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Do you want those Amendments on the Bill or not?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "I believe that's up to the Rules Committee and the Committee that this went through to decide that factor."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, I imagine you had some say in that as well. To the Bill, Representative."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you."

Dart: "What is the genesis of this idea? Why is it...the need for this expansion?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "As you know, the current statute allows the state to prosecute criminal damage, however, local governments were not allowed to do this. For example, an individual that damaged a state police car under this legislation, was guilty of a Class 4 Felony, however, if that damage was done to a squad car that was owned by a city or municipality, it was only a Class A Misdemeanor, and I think that there should have been some equality in those type of damage."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Prosecutor Dart, will you proceed?"

Dart: "Thank you. Was there a particular case in mind though, that brought this about or was there an area in particular in the state, where they were having problems with local units of government having damage and were unable to proceed, or is this just something that you thought up yourself, that was just something that needed to be changed?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "I was approached by the Chief of Police in Freeport, who was...they were incurring a lot of damage to the city police cars and really they felt that the penalties for that damage was insufficient and when they looked at this and noted that these were squad cars that were bought by city funds not state, then they could not be prosecuted under this statute, and what they had were people in the back seat of squad cars kicking the rear windows out and that type, and the Class A Misdemeanor was not sufficient to be for that type of activity."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If we could we again have some order in the chamber. It's difficult for the Chair and difficult for many of the Members they've indicated, to hear Representative Dart's question or Representative Lawfer's answer, so if we could please, breakup the caucus's and bring some order to the chamber, the Chair and the Members would appreciate it, and I'm sure Representative Dart would, as well. Representative Dart, proceed, further guestions?"

Dart: "Thank you. Would this be a penalty that was covered under the Truth in Sentencing or would this person be eligible for early release, if they were convicted of this, as a felony?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "This does not change any of the penalties and I don't...I'm not sure that it would be covered under Truth in Sentencing."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Are you concluded, Representative Dart or further questions? Proceed."

Dart: "Yeah, I think you're right Representative. This would be one that would not be covered under Truth in Sentencing. What would be the legal requirements of demonstrating it, for the evidentiary purposes the local funding requirement of this law?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Well, as it is, under this current law, it has to say that there's state fund used to purchase this type of equipment or state fund used in supporting the facility. Of course, in a local municipality or police cars, are strictly funded locally and so all it has to do is just determine who purchased them and whether there were state or federal funds involved there, or local funds."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Would they still be charged on a local level, if they charge them with ordinance violations or would this be strictly a state and if so, would this be filling up county jails or state jails, prisons?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "It would be up to the state's attorney to determine how the charges would be brought."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "That's as long as the city attorney hasn't decided to prosecute too, I would imagine. Now, is there...was there a evidentiary standard that is required though, as far as for the making the prima-facie showing of the locally funded unit?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer. Your time is concluded. If you'd just bring your answer to a close we'll be finished. Briefly answer the question."

Lawfer: "If I understood your question, Representative Dart, there would be no difference then is currently being used to determine what type of funds were being used 'cause you would just broaden it then and make it more available, using the current criteria."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman.

Proceed."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, how does this change current law?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "In the...the current law states, that this Section covers state supported property. What this does is, it inserts the word government and deletes the word state."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman. Further
 questions?"

Hoffman: "Now, this would make, for instance, if some kid were to commit any type of damage whatsoever, on a school grounds, they could be guilty of a Class 4 Felony? Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "If he knowingly damages that, I mean that is part of the statute as it now exists and that would be up to the state's attorney to determine whether that individual knowingly damaged that."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, how many new cases will come into the felony court
systems as a result of this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "The Department of Correction impact says that it would be minimal."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, I have in here a note...judicial note from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Court, and here's what they indicate, they said, 'Based on review of the Bill, it is anticipated that the implementation of the provisions of this Bill may increase judicial workloads, however, it could not be determined what impact the Bill will have on the needs to increase the number of judges in the state'. I think by virtue of that, we should be concerned because I think we could possibly have a large increase in the number of judges because of this. What is your anticipated cost to number one, the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts, and then number two, to the Department of Corrections, which is already overcrowded?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Lawfer: "I think that the fiscal note or the judgement note says that it will be minimal."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, what's minimal to you? What's minimal to you?

How many judges Representative, one judge, two judges, five judges throughout the state? How many judges are we going to have as a result of this Bill? What's minimal, when you have 10,000 judges in the state, five judges may be minimal, but at \$100,000 a piece, that's \$500,000, not to mention benefits. What's minimal? How many judges because of this silly Bill, Representative?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer, do you wish to respond?"

Lawfer: "I do not think it is a silly Bill. I think it deters crime."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "To the Bill, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, well, Mr. Speaker. I think I have an opportunity to question the wit...or question the Sponsor."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "You do."

Hoffman: "Question the Sponsor, but listen..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "I'm not..."

Hoffman: "You do not have the ability in the Chair, Mr. Speaker to keep me from asking questions of the Sponsor."

Hoffman: "So far, he hasn't responded very well, Mr. Speaker, so what would be the difference?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Well..."

Hoffman: "Representative, with regards to this Bill and the making it a Class 4 Felony, how exactly does it change the current law? It's my understanding what you're doing, is

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

your expanding the thrust of a Class 4 Felony and saying that if you commit any type of damage whatsoever, even if it's only a dollars damage and it's knowingly, then you can be guilty of a Class 4 Felony, is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "All it does is broaden current law from state property to government property."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, let me just say this. I don't... I don't know if this is good, bad or indifferent. I don't think it really anything. I think it could have an impact on our state's Department of Corrections. It could have an impact on our judicial system, but we can't get an answer, because what the Representative will only tell us is, that it will only have a minimal impact. Well, I'm going to vote for the Bill, but let me tell you something, what it really doesn't do is it doesn't do much of anything. What it does...it just simply expands the definition a bit, it doesn't have any type of deterrent effect on anything and what it could do is criminalize people who really commit minimal damage, but we want to sit here today and we want to debate and we want to talk about this type of Bill, that's going to have absolutely no affect and the Sponsor will only tell us it's going to have minimal affect, I don't understand why we would do it. I don't see an 'aye' vote...a 'no' vote, a 'present' vote, it really doesn't matter because the Bill really doesn't do anything."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang on the the Bill."

Lang: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Well, Representative, it's important to us on this side of

55th Legislative Dây

May 9, 1995

the aisle that we compare the current law to what you're doing. So, let's assume that under the current law, somebody...damaged some of this property to the tune of let's say \$100. What is the current penalty and what would the penalty be under...if your law...Bill passes?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: " This law does not change the amount of current...damage. That law is already current and it does not change that."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I have no idea what you just said. Your enhancing the penalties..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Well, the reason...the reason is because the level of the chamber has gotten again to a high-level. Give Representative Lang, your respect and quiet. No one can hear because the level of the chamber has risen. Please, listen to Representative Lang. Representative Lang, proceed."

Lang: "Thank you, thank you. Actually, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that I didn't hear the answer, I heard it, I just didn't get it. So, what if that doesn't change, then what are you changing in your Bill, Sir?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Evidently, what you haven't noticed is that it is...all it does is change from state property to government property and that is an expansion. For example, state property would be a state police car, city property or local government property would be a city police car, so what it does is, that's an example of how it's expanded."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, let's work this through, Representative. Your adding local property here, so your enhancing penalties for

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

damaging local government property. So, what's the penalty for today, a \$100 worth of damage to a piece of local government property and what would the penalty be if your Bill passes? Please don't give me the same answer. Give me a new answer."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "We're not enhancing the property or the damage amount."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, then what the heck are you doing Representative? We don't understand what your Bill does on this side of the aisle and I don't think we're going to vote for it unless we know, so, maybe your staff person could answer the question for me, just hand him the microphone, but I would really like an answer to this question. What the heck does your Bill do, Representative?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "It expands it to other types of government property. It could well be expanded to include the city police cars of Chicago."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions, Representative Lang?"

Lang: "It expands what to different types of government property?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Criminal damage."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang,"

Lang: "So, does this now include schools?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Yes."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, it's not unlawful now for me to blow up a school?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "I think the question to that is very obvious."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, what are the new penalties? Let's say, you and I went out and blew up a school today, before this law passes, and next week after the Governor signs it, we blow up a school, what's the enhanced penalty? What changes?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "It would be up to the state's attorney to determine what the intent was."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative, proceed."

Lang: "You're taking my time away from me because you're talking to the chiefs, Sir. I'm entitled to finish my questioning."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed."

Lang: "Mr. Lawfer, what if the school that you and I blow up is a catholic school, what about the separation of church and state?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer on the Bill."

Lawfer: "I don't think that this is a topic that we really should be discussing here. I...this is...what you've just portrayed, is a very serious instance there, and what we're doing here is very simply just making an even playing field. To pursue racial injustice or bigotry or blowing up a school is a very serious comment, Representative Lang, and I don't believe it belongs to be part of this conversation."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I think it's serious, Representative, to present any Bill on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I think we should expect it when we ask you a question about what the Bill does, we should get an answer to what the Bill does. I've tried to paint certain scenarios but I'm not getting any answers. How about some now?"

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "There's a number of lights on, but I'll give you a another minute Representative and then Representative Lawfer to close. Proceed Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, thank you. I'm still waiting to hear what the Bill does. Can you give me a fact example, as to...anything you care to pick Representative about anything that goes on in the community today that will change if your Bill passes, what the new penalties will be or what it affects that it doesn't affect today."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lawfer."
- Lawfer: "To use your area as an example, if there was damage to a state police car in the City of Chicago, then they would be guilty under this statute. They are not guilty if they damage a police car at this time, because that's bought by city funds Now this makes the penalty to these two offenses. The intent to destroy government property is equalized."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "I believe your time has come to a close,
  Representative. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jo
  Davies, Representative Lawfer to close on, Senate Bill 111.
  Proceed, Representative."
- Lawfer: "Senate Bill 111, merely expands the Section on criminal damage to state supported property to government supported property. It levels the field that anybody with the intent to damage government property will be treated equally under this statute and I would urge a 'yes' vote on this."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 111

  pass?' All in favor vote, 'aye'; opposed, vote 'no'. The

  voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who

  wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

  Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'.

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,
is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 229,
Senate Bill 229. Senate Bill 229, we're preceding on,
Representative Murphy."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 229, a Bill for an Act that amends the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Murphy, Maureen: "Yes. Senate Bill 229 came over as amended and it was an Amendment back in the Senate, that was suggested by a Subcommittee hearing on the Bill. What we're doing is expanding the penalty for damaging a vending machine and the same as criminal damage to property. If more than \$300 in damage, the penalty will now be a Class 4 Felony. should eliminate any of the corrections impact. The definition of substance needed to be added, meaning corrosive or acidic liquid but does not include items purchased through coin operated machines. We're finding that in the first entry to a life of crime, gang members are now turning their attention to assault if you will, damaging personal property in the form of vending machines. I'm ready to answer any questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates she will."

Dart: "Representative, what is...does this have anyway at all interplay with the previous Bill we had, as far as, whether or not the machine would be government property or local government property?"

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Interplay? No."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "There's no difference whatsoever in this coin operated machine whether it's government owned or locally owned machine, is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "There's no such distinction."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Now with this, how do you define...how was the definition of substance arrived at?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The Amendment...in the amended Bill, we added, not only any kind of key, tool or instrument or explosive or device.

T.V. is wonderful, T.V. has shown some of our newest entrance into a life of crime, by using a salt solution or an acidic solution, that they could really do some damage on these machines, so the Bill will expand that definition to include any of this saltwater solutions or acidic type solutions."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "But, I'm looking at the the definition here, from the definition, if you damage the machine with a substance that you bought from the machine then you're okay, under this definition?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The answer is no."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "The answer is yes?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicated the answer is no. To you
Representative Dart, further questions?"

Dart: "Well, I'm reading it right now Representative, it says,

'Substance means a corrosive or acidic liquid or solid, but

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

does not include items purchased through a coin-operated machine at the location'. So that would mean if you purchased an acidic substance from the machine and then damaged the machine with that, then you're free under this language, correct? I mean, that's the plain reading of this."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The way that you're interpreting it, I would believe you are correct, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further questions?"

Dart: "Yeah. Why would we want to...why would we want to do that though? It doesn't make sense that if you go to a machine that sells some type of acidic acid, and I'm not saying that you have a machine that sells that, but like Coke or some other substance, with combined with something else would make the substance you're trying to get around here. If you bought it at that machine and used it on that same machine, then you can't be prosecuted here. Why would we want to do that?"

Speaker Johnson: "Representative."

Murphy: "Representative, what this has to do with the intent, that I'd like to speak to legislative intent, is the practice of what these little gang guys are starting to do. They...we need to have the substance defined and then as you know in a court of law, to catch them with this substance that we've so defined, and therefore administer the proper form of charges. So, what we're defining is what kind of substance are in vogue that they're using, I would submit to you that yes, if you bought a can of Coke and then you poured it in the opening, yes it would be very difficult at best to show intent to catch them after that deed has been done, but that's not what happening, and

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

that's not why we came up with this legislation. What is happening is they're bringing foreign substances with them, they're tagging them, they're doing about 20 of them in one evening and they carry a large amount of this substance with them and we need to define the substance, in order to have charges stick, in order to curtail this criminal activity."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Representative, I couldn't agree with your more, but here's my problem. It's you've defined the substance which is all good and fine, but then you put this exemption in there, and for the life of me can't figure out why you would want to exempt it, because here it is as you said, you've caught the guy at the scene, you've caught him with the substance, then lo and behold it turns out that one of the components of the substance he bought out that very machine. Under this law that person cannot be prosecuted because that does not come under the description of substance. Why would we want to do that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Representative, soda pop is not one of the leading damaging elements and we did write this with the help of some of the vending machine people, you know we didn't write this in a vacuum, and they had determined that their technology allows them to make easier, less costly repairs if it would be simply things that come out of their vending machines. So, the part that they are trying to, redress the criminal activity that is currently going on has to do with the kinds of substances that we have eliminated which caused much more damage then what you're illustrating. I don't think what you're talking about seemed to be a big problem with the vending machine manufacturers."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions? If you could go ahead and bring your questions to a close, Representative."
- Dart: "Yes, I really, Representative, I agree with you, I couldn't agree with you more because, there is a problem with this and I've heard about it from numerous people, but I can't for the life of me can't figure out why we're exempting things that come out of that very machine. Has there been a problem where the coin-operated people don't want you being prosecuted for using their substance against their own machine? Want are we trying to do about getting that..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Just...if you could bring your...just answer the question, then we'll proceed with the next Gentleman. Simply answer the question, Representative."
- Murphy: "Yes. Yes, Representative we didn't see a need for this.

  We were addressing the needs of the vending machine manufacturer."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang. Representative Lang, proceed."

Lang: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates she will."

Lang: "Representative, this involves coin-operated machines, what about slot machines on our river boats, does this include that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "If there are coin-operated machines, I would expect that
they would fall under that. What is your opinion
Representative? I would be glad to explore this with you?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative."

Lang: "Well, don't we already have laws regarding river boats and tampering with those machines and wouldn't this be put in conflict with those laws?"

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "I don't believe so, but you probably have your own opinion on that, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I'm not allowed an opinion, I'm in the minority, but it's your Bill, so I'm sort of asking if you believe that maybe you should hold this on Third and check this out so that you don't put yourself on a conflict with yourself."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Now, if you were the...did you write the law about the gambling boats, Reprsentative, that you're referring to?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "No, no, Zeke Giorgi did that and he did quite a fine job of that, but I'm seriously concerned about whether you're setting up a conflict. Perhaps you want these to be coin-operated vending machines, seems to me you want to go back to the drawing board and add that word by way of Amendment so there's no confusion. How about doing the right thing here, Representative?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Representative, that would be up to the jurisdictional prosecutor at the time of the event. However, let's...I believe that there is no conflict, quite simply. More importantly, gang members and young people I have yet to hear are finding their way on river boats, there are laws about that and damaging the river boat machines. Knowing that crime knows no age, however, you know it would be up to the prosecutor to make any distinction."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Well, relative to the civil cause of action, let me ask you this, the owner may recover treble actual damages so, if somebody pours something into a Coke

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

machine, and there's very little damage, and like three Cokes come out, can they sue them for nine dollars for the value of the three Cokes times three?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "It isn't about the amount of loss of product, it's the loss that is incurred through damage to machinery and mechanism and the cost of redressing them and repairing them."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "How is this proven? How do you prove that somebody did this?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy, Representative Black in the Chair."

Murphy: "There would probably be a myriad of ways to prove and again, that's prosecutorial and it depends on when the charges were made."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "I really didn't understand the answer. How do you prove legally in a civil court that, somebody tampered with this unless you have an eyewitness, how do you prove it other than that?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "As...As with any cost for civil action Representative, it would have to meet the criteria for a successful case. If there could be frivolous litigation I'm sure there could be, and the burden of proof would be in the outcome of that civil case."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "The legislation enhances the penalty from a Class A Misdemeanor to a Class 4 Felony, if it's more than \$300 in damage. How do you determine... whose figures do you use to determine whether it's more than \$300 in damage?"

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "We would probably need to have that itemization from the repairing unit of the owner of the vending machine or a third party I'm sure could argue the other way. Let's not skip ahead to the defense of the law suit that has yet to occur, Representative."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "How much do you figure this will add to the prison population if you're going to expand these penalties in this way? You're going to turn misdemeanors into felons, they're going to be in jail longer. How many more do you think we'll have in our prisons?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "I do have a corrections impact note that's filed representing three inmates. The fiscal impact of \$570,600, but I submit to you Representative, this is over ten years. I submit to you the number of these entry level criminals will be deterred by catching them with this legislation, stopping their life of crime, getting tough in the beginning of their career, so it's to short circuit their career, so they won't be taking up more space in our prisons later."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang, your time is about to
 expire. Bring your questioning to an end. Proceed."

Lang: "Thank you. Will these felons be eligible for early release?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Along with the prescription of statutes that are currently in existence at the time of their crime, yes I expect they would be Representative. They would also be eligible for boot camp if necessary."

Speaker Black: "Yes, Representative, the Gentleman from Cook,

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

time has expired. The Chair would recognize the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

- Hartke: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time to Representative Lang."
- Speaker Black: "Yes. Representative Lang, the Gentleman from Effingham has yielded his time to you. Proceed."
- Lang: "And what a charming individual he is too. Thank you very much roomie. Representative, I want to address some comments to the statute of limitations. What would the statute of limitations be on the civil cause of action?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The civil code of action with regard to damage to property statutes, our limitations would probably prevail."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Representative, your Bill says nothing about what the statute of limitations is, how long a person has to file this civil cause of action. As you know, there are statute of limitations on the books, for instance, you can't file a personal injury case more than two years after it happens unless of course it happens at the RTA or the CTA as we know from yesterday, so I'm concerned about consistency here. There's nothing in your Bill and your staff person obviously doesn't have the answer either as to what the statute of limitations is. Your Bill doesn't say what it is, if it doesn't say what it is, it's a flaw. The owner of this machine who has it damaged by this felon, might not know if they have one week, one year or ten years to file the lawsuit. When do they file it, Representative?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Representative, this falls under the civil code, whatever the civil code prescribes at this point in time or postscriptively from this point forward, will prevail."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I don't have a copy of the Bill in front of me at this moment, somebody borrowed it for me, but the civil cause of action that's created, is that created in the code of civil procedure?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "It's not in the code of civil procedure, it's in the civil code."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "I...maybe I'm not up this morning, I don't know what the civil code is. The code of civil procedure and the statute on statutes of limitations covers, limitations of actions in the State of Illinois and nothing else to my knowledge. So, you really haven't told us what the statute of limitations is, Representative. Do you know? If you don't know, you should. If it's not in the Bill, it should be in the Bill, you have a flawed Bill. And I can tell by the faces of staff around you that they know you have a flawed Bill. You cannot give somebody a civil remedy unless you tell them how long they have to act upon that civil remedy, Representative. Do you want to correct this portion of the Bill?"

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "It is our belief that to define a time for the statute of limitations, when we have the civil code before us, which I don't have a copy of, you may lend us your copy, would be a mistake, it purposely is not contained in this legislation, it is not flawed piece of legislation, and we submit there are already, remedies with regards to the statute of limitations, in other Sections of the Code."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, let me point out, there are no remedies to the

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

statute of limitations, that's what it is, statute is a statute. But, let me ask you this, Representative, relative to the statute, this unknown length of time, when does it begin to run? Does it begin to run from the date of the act? Does it begin to run from the date that the owner knows about the machine being tampered with? Does it begin to run from the date of the criminal conviction? Does it begin to run from the date of incarceration? Does it begin to run from the date of parole? Does it begin to run from the date of parole? Does it begin to run from the date of parole? The property is the part of the criminal conviction?

Speaker Black: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "I'm not sure if that was more of an argument that Representative Lang was giving. At this time, I still submit it is not a flawed piece of legislation. Those lawyers that make their living practicing civil litigation, are well versed in what the timeliness would be."

Speaker Black: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Representative, when we passed the Tort Reform Bill, we were very careful to specify that in certain cases, if it accrued before the time the Governor signed it, it was...you could make the claim and if it...or if it filed before the Governor signed it, you could make the claim. Here you say nothing about when the cause of action has to be filed. Let's assume that there's something in the statute, there isn't, but let's assume there's something that covers the statute of limitation, you still must say in here when that cause of action accrues. Does it accrue on the date of the damage, does it accrue on the date that the owner finds out about the breakdown of the machine, when does it accrue?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson back in the Chair.

55th Legislative Day

- May 9, 1995
- Representative Murphy, in response? It's your second five minutes, nine seconds to respond, Representative Murphy. Proceed."
- Murphy: "Frankly, I disagree vehemently with you Representative,

  I don't believe I can give you an answer."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes...we have a brief announcement before we recognize Representative Monique Davis. Visiting from Champaign in the the Speaker's gallery, is the fifth grade class of Holy Cross School. These students are guests of Representative Rick Winkel. Welcome to the House of Representatives. The Chair...the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis. Proceed."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a lot of questions on this legislation and Representative Lang is asking those questions and I would yield my time to Representative Lang."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed. Your request is granted Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you and thank you Representative Davis, a great friend, thank you very much. Representative Murphy, continuing on the flaws in the Bill, let me ask you, are there any affirmative defenses to this civil cause of action?"
- Speaker Johnson: "Representative Murphy."
- Murphy: "We have...there's the two...there's the two prong out there with this legislation, the criminal and the civil cause. Recognizing the expense, particularly when these little gangbangers go on this spree of 20 machines in a night, can be quite costly. We wanted to have a methodology in their prolitigation, for civil lawyers to pursue recouping some of the money that this is costing."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang, further questions?"

Lang: "Well yes, you didn't answer my question. Are there affirmative defenses to this cause of action? Just about every civil case we have, as the lawyers stand around you know, have affirmative defenses. I'm wondering if there are any affirmative defenses to this cause of action?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "That would occur at the time that the civil action was brought forward."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, I didn't understand that answer, but let's go on.

Is there a cap here, Representative? Is there a \$500,000 cap? What if I damaged a thousand machines and with treble damages, we could go over a half a million dollars. Is there a half a million dollar cap here?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy on the Bill."

Murphy: "If you're talking about the Tort Reform Representative, because of the criminal component and because of the going after the damages, I believe that no cap would be relative to this piece of legislation or the cause of action you keep talking about."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "What about negligent damage to these machines, so leave the criminal aspect out, still talking about the civil aspect of it, let's assume that I have some change I put in one of these machines and the change accidentally has some corrosive chemical on it or some problem with it and it damages the machine, that would be negligent damage to the machine, is negligent damage covered under this? Good question, huh? Is negligent damage covered here?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "It's not."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "What about if I open my Coke or my Pepsi and it explodes into the opening, where the coins go in and that damages the machine, what about that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "As stated earlier in questioning, that accidents happen Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang, further questions?"

Lang: "Well, accidents sure do happen Representative. Let me ask you about the definition of the word, substance. How do you define the word substance in your Bill? You say you can't put certain substances into these machines, what is that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "I bring to your attention, line 26c, as used in this Section, substance means corrosive or acidic liquid or solid. It does not include items purchased through the coin-operated machine."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, if you sue under this...going back to the civil aspect of it, if you sue, isn't some insurance company going to get stuck with this? Aren't you going to drive up insurance rates for the business owners and consumers of the State of Illinois if this Bill passes?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy, on the Bill."

Murphy: "The intent of this legislation is not to drive up the cost of insurance, and more to the contrary, if there is an ability to recoup some of the losses that are incurred annually by these vending machine operators it would greatly reduce the incidents of crime and the cost of insuring such machinery."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang."

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Lang: "Well, apparently there are some exemptions in your Bill, it says it does not include items purchased through a coin-operated machine at the location or acquired as condiments at the location of the coin-operated machine. So, are you indicating to me that doing this with salt, pepper and ketchup is not as relevant as something that would come out of the machine?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "That's almost closely asked an answer and you can continue reading lines 29 and 30 and you'll have your answer, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lang if you'd bring your questions and comments to a close."

Lang: "Well, sure. Let me ask you, do the condiments have to be a certain distance from the machine so, that they can be exempt. If they're butted up right up against the machine, are they not exempt?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy, final response."

Murphy: "That is not contained within the language of the Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Murphy, the Lady from Cook to close."

Murphy: "Thank you. The answers to the questions indicate the intent of this legislation. This is the beginning of a life of crime, property crimes are often the very first goading that a gang member has. They're now giving points to see how many machines they can get in one night, and it seems to be one of anominity. It seems to be okay because some insurance company will pay for it, or maybe the profits from the well-known manufacturers should just cover this, but we can no longer turn our heads when this is turning to be so costly, and if we can at the very beginning of these young people stepping off into a life of

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

crime, come down hard, show them that this is serious, that's it's very cowardly and inappropriate to encourage or to go after property that belongs to other people. It's simply good legislation and I submit that I would ask for your approval."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 229, and the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 229 pass?'

  All those in favor, vote 'aye'; those opposed, vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', five voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative, Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 885. We'll get to you in a moment, Representative Hoffman. Mr Clerk, read Senate Bill 885."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 885, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge on the Bill."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 885, which would appropriate \$93,295 of general revenue funds to the State Comptroller, for the payment to the widow of Senator Kenneth Hall. I move for the passage of this Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 885 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye'; those opposed, vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'.

#### 55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1...Senate Bill 162. I'll get you in a moment, Representative. Read Senate Bill 162. What is the status of Senate Bill 162?"

- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 162, is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Please return this to the Order of Second Reading. Now the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Hoffman: "Yes Speaker, I would move to change the Order of
  Business to the Order of Motions. Motions to discharge
  Committee, please."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "We would ask that this Motion be reduced to writing in file. Just a moment Representative Hoffman, we'll get right to you. We'll entertain your Motion, but in following the rules, if you'd re-submit your request in writing today, since we didn't get to that, your written Motion yesterday, it became moot. That's the rule. We're willing to entertain the Motion, if you'd simply make your Motion, we'll have a brief recess, while you file your written Motion and entertain your Motion Representative. We'll be at ease for a moment while that Motion is filed. The written Motion is being filed now. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction First Reading of Senate Bills.

  Senate Bill 7, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act in relation to murder by terrorism. Senate Bill 161, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Passenger Protection Act. Senate Bill 189, offered by Representative Deuchler, a Bill for an

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 344, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Senate Bill 429, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act to creates the Illinois Manufactured Home Installment Act. Senate Bill 478, offered by Representative Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend the Airport Authority Act. Introduction First Reading of Senate Bills. Introduction of House Resolutions. House Resolution #45, offered by Representative Churchill, Rules Committee."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Mr. Status (sic-Clerk), what's the status
   of Senate Bill 158?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 158, is on the Order of Second Reading, having been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record.

  Any announcements? Hearing none, Representative Black now moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday May 10, 1995, the hour of 12:00 noon. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and allowing for Perfunctory Time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until Wednesday May 10, 1995, at the hour of 12:00 noon."
- Clerk McLennand: "Attention Members. The Insurance Committee scheduled for 12:00 p.m., is cancelled. The Insurance Committee, correction, the Insurance Committee is meeting, the Commerce Industry and Labor Committee is cancelled. Commerce Industry and Labor Committee is cancelled for 3:30 today. The House Perfunctory Session will be in order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 720, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act that amends the Illinois Housing Development Act. Senate

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Bill 788, offered by Representative Andrea Moore, a Bill for an Act that amends the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Introduction First Reading of these Senate Bills. Being no further business at the moment, the House Perfunctory Session will stand in recess till the hour of 2:30 p.m."

Speaker Durkin: "The House Perfunctory Session will stand at recess until the hour of 3:30. Representative Durkin in the Chair. House Perfunctory Session is in order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports please."

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman of Committee on Rules, to which the following Bills were referred and Resolutions were referred, action taken on May 9, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do adopt' House Resolution #45. Introduction First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 577, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Senate Bill 711, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Senate Bill 990, offered Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Act. Senate Bill 1017, offered Representative Pankau, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1195, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Introduction and First Reading of these Senate Bills. Continued Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bill. Senate Bill 964, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Introduction and First Reading of this Senate Bill. Committee Reports, Committee Report from Representative Balthis, Chairman of

55th Legislative Day

May 9, 1995

Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Bill was referred, action taken on May 9, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass short debate' Senate Bill 226. Committee Report from Representative Wait, Chairman from the Committee on Transportation and Motor Vehicles, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 9, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 539 and 1078; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 122 and 157 and 395. Committee Report from Representative Ackerman, Chairman from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on May 9, 1995, reported the back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bill 459; 'do pass as amended short debate' Senate 818. Committee Report from Representative Pedersen, Chairman from Committee on Insurance, to which following Bills were referred, action taken on May 9, 1995, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 533; 'do pass short debate' Senate Bill 1082, 1081, 736, 453; 'do pass as amended short debate' Senate Bill 977. No business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned, the House will reconvene on Wednesday, May 10, at the of 12:00 noon."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

96/07/12

10:38:10

# DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 09. 19	9	5
------------	---	---

SB-0007 FIRST READING SB-0111 THIRD READING SB-0161 FIRST READING SB-0162 RECALLED SB-0189 FIRST READING SB-0229 THIRD READING SB-0344 FIRST READING SB-0429 FIRST READING SB-0429 FIRST READING SB-0478 FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	2 30 30 30 14 31 31
SB-0577 FIRST READING SB-0711 FIRST READING SB-0720 FIRST READING SB-0788 FIRST READING SB-0885 THIRD READING SB-0864 FIRST READING SB-0964 FIRST READING SB-0990 FIRST READING SB-1017 FIRST READING SB-1195 FIRST READING HR-0045 FILED	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	32 32 31 32 29 32 32 32 32
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER JOHNSON, TIM PRAYER - PASTOR RALPH WINGATE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE ADJOURNED PERFUNCTORY SESSION COMMITTEE REPORTS PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNED	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	31 31 32