47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by our Doorkeeper, the Reverend Lee Arthur Crawford from The Victory Temple Church of God in Christ. Guests in the Gallery may wish to join us in the invocation."
- Reverend Crawford: "Let us pray. Almighty God our heavenly Creator, who has dominion over life and death. Grant to us the grace to remember, with love and reverence, that it takes the strength of God to sustain us, the power of God to preserve us, the hand of God to protect us and the way of God to direct us. So, may the love of God and the peace of God be with us this day and always. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of
 America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one
 nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for
 all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Happy Birthday. On the Democratic side of the aisle, Representative Gash and Representative Slone are excused."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect those excused absences.

 Mr. Cross. Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Well, good morning and Happy Birthday from the Republican side, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you."
- Cross: "Representative Lyons (sic-Eileen), wishes to be excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect that excused absence.

 Mr. Clerk, have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 114 Members responding to the

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports, Representative Ronen, Chairman from the Committee on Children and Youth, to which the following Amendment was referred, action taken on April 17, 1997, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment 2, to House Bill 62."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost, you're the Sponsor of House Bill 1318 on Third Reading. Would you like to call that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1318."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1318 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act amending the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1318 amends the Civil Administration Code of Illinois concerning the Department of Public Health and provides for the creation of an Aging Veterans Task Force to study the State's capability to provide health care to veterans after the year 2000. It provides that the task force shall make its recommendations to improve the capability to the Department by January 1, 1999. It's a very simple Bill. I would appreciate its passage."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Dart: "Representative, is the task force, will there be any cost
to it?"

Bost: "I'm sorry."

Dart: "Any cost?"

Bost: "The cost... if it is it will be minimal cost, and we don't have a Fiscal Note on it."

Dart: "Okay and neither the Department of Aging or the Department of Veterans Affairs could do this on their own right now without the task force."

Bost: "The Department of Veterans Affairs has requested this and is in support of it. Because as we're heading up into the year 2010 our veterans are going to peak, we believe, around 2010, and we need to know where we're at on that so that we can provide adequate services to them."

Dart: "Okay. So, the bottom line is they requested this because they don't feel as if they have the adequate resources to do it on their own right now."

Bost: "That's correct. So that way they can bring something to this House and to the Senate so that we know where we need to go in the future, with it."

Dart: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost, to close."

Bost: "I think it's a good Bill. I think we need it if we could just. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

declared passed. House Bill 1427, Representative Fantin.
Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act amending the Property Tax Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "Thank you. House Bill 1427 amends the Property Tax Extension Limitations Law in the Property Tax Code. Provides that any increase in assessed value resulting from the loss of Senior Citizen Homestead Exemption or the Senior Citizens Assessment Freeze Homestead Exemption shall be included in determining new property. And what this would do is a little bit like the Bill last evening, this would pick up the properties which have come off if a senior citizen would sell their home or pass on, the property then would go back on the roll for that first year so it would be included in the tax levy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "This one it seems to me is a little different than the one you had last night, that I understood."

Fantin: "This is similar, but it just adds the Senior Citizens Homestead Exemption and the Senior Citizen Tax Freeze when one of the seniors, if they pass away or if they would sell their property, as you know those exemptions would be no longer be on that property and it would just include that in the new property, so it is not lost for that year."

Skinner: "You're convinced it's conceptually the same as the other?"

Fantin: "Yes sir."

Skinner: "I wonder why he didn't put it in the other Bill. He didn't think of it. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Fantin, to close."

Fantin: "I just ask you, it's a very simple Bill, just a

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

correction. I ask you please for a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor for the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 'ayes'; 8 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1210, Mr. Meyer. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1210 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1210, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1210 was on the Consent Calendar and was taken off to run individually. It provides that the Secretary of State shall issue one set of registration plates for Gold Star recipients to one surviving sibling of the person who served in the Armed Forces if the parent no longer survives. For those of you that are concerned about the number of different license plates that are out there, this does not add to those, to that number of plates, it only allows for surviving sibling, once the parent who previously had owned the plate has passed on, that sibling can keep the memory of the loved one alive. I appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hartke."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Hartke: "Representative, this just adds a sticker to the plate like we do with the rest of the veterans' plates?"

Meyer: "No. Representative, at the current time, an actual plate is issued, and that's issued to the parent of the person that died in the war. Once that parent dies, it allows a sibling of the person who passed away, a brother or sister, to maintain that plate. So it doesn't add to the number of plates that out there. It only allows for that plate to be transferred to another surviving member of the family."

Hartke: "Okay and I guess the family decides which one has the honor of running the plate."

Meyer: "It's on a first come first serve basis similar if the parents were divorced, it's the same thing."

Hartke: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer, to close."

Meyer: "I would just appreciate a 'yes' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 781. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? (sic-House Bill) 781."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 781, is on the Order of House Bills Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 781, a Bill for an Act amending the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill is a compilation of a variety of other individual Bills that are intended to provide protection to clients of the Department of Public Aid who participate in health maintenance organizations for their health care. Including items, for example, requiring performance audits by the Auditor General of the Mediplan Plus Program, requiring the department to offer orientation and educational programs to recipients of Public Aid, establishing appropriate client responsibilities and the responsibilities of the HMO organizations. We've worked out the language with the Department of Public Aid. I know of no opposition. I would be happy to answer your questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, there are eight Bills rolled into this piece of legislation, and I know the underlying Bill, at one time, had some serious opposition from the Illinois Association of HMO's. Would you characterize this Bill, as it exists now, still being opposed by the managed care industry?"

Currie: "No, I would not. In committee, the HMO's were neutral on the Bill, and the Department of Public Aid supports the Bill."

Black: "One of the underlying Bills was your House Bill 785 on a performance Audit of Mediplan Plus. You have no intention of trying to render managed care impotent by any language in this Bill, do you?

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Currie: "No."

Black: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative Currie, is there any fiscal impact to the state and taxpayers for this Bill?"

Currie: "The Department of Public Aid's Fiscal Note represented that there will not be."

Parke: "Say it one more time please."

Currie: "According to the Department Aid's Fiscal Note, the answer is no."

Parke: "And can you, it looks like we have one, two, three, four, five, six, at least six other Bills or the thoughts of six other Bills in yours. Can you highlight maybe on each of those that you put in this morning, what is now included in your Bill?"

Currie: "Sure, that was an effort to clean up the Calendar, to roll those Bills together. The measures give preference to HMO's that have been accredited by National Organizations, make sure that the director of an HMO is a physician licensed in Illinois, insuring that the HMO's make good faith efforts to provide caretaker relatives or payees of an enrollee with an orientation to the operation and requirements of the plan. Performance standards, as I mentioned, no payment should made to a provider for withholding appropriate medical services from a client. The Auditor General's performance audit, I mentioned, gives the director of the department the opportunity to impose penalties or sanctions for violation of this whole area. I explained already about the education and orientation

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

programs that are the department's responsibilities. There also are responsibilities for the managed care entities to provide orientation and information. The department would be required to help an enrollee who isn't getting adequate service from the plan do so and we authorize the department's Inspector General to establish a special section to monitor what's happening with managed care in the Department of Public Aid's program."

Parke: "I've got to commend you on the concept of rolling Bills into it so we can move the Calendar along. Let me ask you, the Department of Public Aid is what, neutral?"

Currie: "I believe, in committee, the Department of Public Aid signed a slip in support after we had worked with the department on language in the Bill and responded to some of their concerns about the Bills as they were originally introduced."

Parke: "All right and the HMO industry is not opposed to any of these Bills that you have rolled in?"

Currie: "That's right."

Parke: "As far as you know, no one is opposed to this Bill as it's presented now?"

Currie: "Right."

Parke: "Then I see no problems with the Bill, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "I appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 114 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 829, Mr. Brady. Mr. Clerk,

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 829 is on the Order of House Bills - Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady. Mr. Clerk, have you read the Bill a third time? Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 829, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry to hold you up on your birthday. This is a Representative Woolard's Bill. I'm, in the effort of bipartisanship, I'm carrying this for him. It amends the Illinois Mine Subsidence Funds so that intergovernment cooperative agreements can be arranged. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Brady: "No, I won't. But I will yield to Mr. Woolard."

Speaker Madigan: "Right, so, Mr. Woolard. Mr. Lang, your question of Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Sure. Good morning."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "The file indicated that the Department of Insurance was opposed to the Bill. Are they still opposed to the Bill?"

Woolard: "No, one of the things that we were able to successfully do on this was the negotiations were to bring everybody to the table. Everyone is in support, especially after it became under the control of Representative Brady, they were all just anxious to support a good Bill."

Lang: "Well, I'm sure Mr. Brady being the Chief Sponsor of the Bill helped. Thank you."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "I think Mr. Brady wants me to close."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Sir."

Woolard: "A great piece of insurance legislation that will accommodate a need in an area that some of the schools were having difficulty getting Mine Subsidence Insurance. We believe that this clears that up and we would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 114 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 927, by Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 927, a Bill for an Act amending the Jury

Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Happy Birthday. This is a Bill that is designed to protect family members of jurors. It was amended and I'll explain it a little bit. Currently, defendants have access to the names, addresses and other personal information contained on petty juror cards. This measure is intended to protect those jurors by giving the court discretion to... The Amendment to the Bill prohibits the harassment of jurors and witnesses. It actually just changes the harassment statute by including 'family members' names'. And I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, the last time this Bill was up, it caused a little bit of a controversy because it was interpreted to allow an individual to petition the court to unseal the names of the jurors on all cases including criminal cases and capital cases. Is it your... have you changed the Bill so that language doesn't even imply that, in any way, shape, or form."

Feigenholtz: "Absolutely, we had... did the Amendment in committee the other night, Representative Durkin, and, basically what we did is, we went into the statute that talked about harassment. We didn't change anything about jurors' cards, we just expanded the definition of, that said 'just jurors' to also 'family members'. And if you would like for me to tell you who that list includes, it's actually based on the definition of... from the Domestic Violence Statute."

Durkin: "Thank you very much. With that change, I will support your Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz, to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate your support on this measure."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes'; 3 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 307, Representative Krause. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 307, the Bill has been read a second

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill comes off the Consent Calendar. that currently a municipality can have the Secretary of State suspend a drivers license for 10 or more unsatisfied municipal parking violations. What this Bill does is also provide that unsatisfied municipal wheel taxes, vehicle stickers or equipment violations can also count against a driver in determining whether his or her license can be revoked. Secondly, it provides municipalities and counties can enter into traffic control agreements, which they can at this time, but also with owners of commercial and industrial facilities located within the municipality, which would authorize them to enforce parking, or vehicle, or traffic within these parking lots. I ask for the support of the House and pleased to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "This Bill has been read a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 307, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Andrea Moore."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Moore: "Representative, does this, will this legislation apply to Cook County and the City of Chicago?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Krause: "Yes it does."

Moore: "So, after 10 parking tickets from the City of Chicago, the Secretary of State shall suspend?"

Krause: "There is currently, this is a provision already into law, that currently provides that after 10 parking violations there is then an administrative proceeding and then if in fact the holder of those tickets was found guilty, then the local municipality can give notice to the Secretary of State. That's the current law. What this legislation does is to also now include within parking violations if the resident fails to pay for a vehicle sticker or other type of violations as bad muffler as such, those have been added to the type of tickets that can be included in the ticket."

Moore: "So, it would be the vehicle sticker and like if your water bill weren't paid."

Krause: "No, no just it relates to parking. Say that you parked
in a zone that was two hour zone and you extended beyond
that, it's those type of parking violations that are
included within the current statute."

Moore: "Representative, could you explain what the genesis of the Bill was, where did this come from?"

Moore, Andrea: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Meyer: "Representative Krause, behind you over here. Carolyn."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Krause: "I'm sorry."

Meyer: "My question has to do with your statement concerning a ticket that's issued for staying too long in a, say a two hour zone. What about a ticket that's issued because you didn't get back to put a quarter in the meter?"

Krause: "I think it depends on how the local municipality ordinances are defined."

Meyer: "I guess my concern is in a lot of areas where they have parking meters and not enough parking, employees of the stores, even, sometimes have to park in them and it sometimes you just don't get out there in order to feed that meter or possibly a school area, you don't get out from a class to feed the meter during that time."

Krause: "Representative, I'm not changing that current part. The current state statute already provides for that procedure and then provides for an administrative procedure at the local level. What this specific House Bill 307 does is to add within the 10 parking violations the provisions about the vehicle stickers and the provisions about violations such as a muffler. It does not touch what's already in the states statute."

Meyer: "So, the other is already there?"

Krause: "Are already in the states statute."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to rise in opposition to this. You know a lot times people that move in and out of communities and live in areas, like plan unit developments, like I have. A lot of times they don't even know there is a city sticker necessary or village sticker and for them not to pay their village sticker and to have to lose their drivers license

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

is a little bit much. Now I understand the intent of what the Sponsor is trying to do, but I think every one of you that's going to vote for this Bill is going to have somebody come to you in the next two years and give you what they think about your decision on this. I just think that this has gone too far, that there is a common sense thing that has to be involved in this and I know we want, the government wants to get the money they're due. But I think we're going too far when we start saying that X number of parking tickets, so there's no justification for it. But when you got, as we've had the unfortunate experience and my mother got a parking ticket from the City of Chicago that's never driven in the city at one time, that they make mistakes, village governments make mistakes and I think this has gone too far, and I would say to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Krause, to close."

Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, again, would ask for support of the General Assembly. The current law provides that after ten parking tickets, there is an administrative hearing and if the individual is found guilty that, in fact, they can then be turned over to the Secretary of State. This legislation adds the failure to provide for the vehicle sticker, and I would ask for the support. It's a legitimate and reasonable piece of legislation for local municipalities. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor for the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 87 'ayes'; 20 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 Bill 1918, Mr. Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1918 was brought to me by the mayor's office in the City of Chicago."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey, one second please. Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment filed to this Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "So, did you wish to put that Amendment on the Bill?"
- Fritchey: "It was my understanding it already had been."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk advises us the Amendment has not yet been adopted. We can do that right now. So the Bill should be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Fritchey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey, on the Amendment."
- Fritchey: "Floor Amendment #2 is clarifying language that liens that would be that would result from the administrative adjudication that is contemplated under the Bill would be enforceable in a matter consistent with Article 12 of the Code of Civil Procedure. This was done at the request of the title companies who want to make sure that there was not a issue that the liens would been enforceable before they were recorded."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yield."

Black: "Representative, Amendment #2 deals only with liens. And my question is, is the lien put on as a result of the Administrative Hearing?"

Fritchey: "As opposed to, Representative, I'm not sure I understand the question. The Administrative Hearing, if it resulted in a finding of guilt and a fine that was not satisfied prior to exhaustion of the administrative remedies, would then be reduced to a lien and that lien could be recorded against the individual's property."

Black: "I understand that, but the lien in this Amendment, I assume, as relates to the underlying Bill, could be put on the property without a court hearing. It could be as a result of a Administrative Hearing, correct?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative, do you have any discussion with the real estate community on their feeling on this kind of approach?"

Fritchey: "I've spoken at length with the real estate community.

They have some concerns. They are willing to sit down with members of the City of Chicago and members from the real estate community and whoever else we deem appropriate and they deem appropriate in order to resolve those when this comes back over to the Senate. The Senate already passed a version of this Bill out unanimously. We put this lien

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

language in to clarify the Bill a little bit more and there will likely be some more work done to make the House version and the Senate version consistent with each other and to address the concerns of the real estate community."

Parke: "What happens if you don't come up with a conclusion that's acceptable to the real estate community? Are you going to proceed anyway?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "Well, then I guess I want a Roll Call on this, Mr.

Speaker and I don't believe that it should be moved forward at this time. I would rather have it worked out before we move it, so."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "I have a Verification of Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Fritchey to close on the Amendment. To close on the Amendment. Proceed, Sir."

Fritchey: "As I said, this Amendment simply clarifies language as to when the lien would be enforceable and provides that the lien would have to be recorded first so as not to prejudice a party or a title company that may ensure over some property that had a lien issue, but was not yet recorded. With that I ask for favorable consideration of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The question is on the Amendment, those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'; those against the Amendment vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 46 'ayes'; 64 'noes'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you wish to leave the Bill on Second Reading?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Leave the Bill on the Second Reading.

 House Bill 379, Mr. Roskam. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 379, this Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Roskam, I'm advised by the Clerk that this
 Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are
 there any Amendments? All right, so place the Bill on the
 Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 379, a Bill for an Act amending the Sex

 Offender Registration Act. Third Reading of this House

 Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Roskam."

- Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 379 is an initiative of the DuPage County State's Attorney. It simply includes in the definition of a child sex offense, child abduction committed by intentionally luring or attempting to lure a child under 16 years of age into a vehicle or dwelling place without parental consent for an unlawful purpose. I know of no opposition to the Bill and move its passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1176, Mr.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Boland. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill, 1176?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1176, is on the Order of House Bills,

Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1176, a Bill for an Act concerning forced labor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. House Bill 1176 creates the State Prohibition of Goods from Forced Labor Act. It's modeled after legislation in California and Massachusetts. There is no Fiscal Impact on it. It's supported by the AFL-CIO and has no known opponents. What it does is provide that each contract entered into by any state agency in Illinois for the procurement of equipment, material, or supplies shall specify that no foreign-made goods furnished to the state under the contract will be made by forced, convict, or indentured labor. Contractors who furnish goods to the state made by this forced labor shall to be subject to sanctions, which could include voiding of the contract, monetary penalties and prohibition against bidding on future state contracts for a specified period. Contractors who are accused by a state agency of violating this Act are entitled to an Administrative Hearing. I think it's very Speaker and Members, to note that this is important, Mr. only those who would knowingly, knowingly, acquire goods made in forced labor camps in places like China and Russia. These are not convicts that we think of as convicts, but are those who are there for political or religious reasons. Those who are opponents of the Communist Party in China, those prisoners can be held for three years without a hearing and even after release they are often forced to

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

work at other camps that they move around the, the country. This is a chance for Illinois to strike a blow for human rights and to strike a blow against unfair trade competition against our Illinois workers and Illinois business. I stand ready to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, good morning. Would it be fair to portray this as a strongly worded message to the People's Republic of China?"

Boland: "Yes, I think so."

Black: "All right. China produces an awful lot of electronic equipment. Would this Bill prohibit the purchase of electronic goods from China?"

Boland: "Not from China per se, only those goods that we know are made in these slave labor camps."

Black: "Okay. Good point. The Chicago Bulls wear a particular kind of tennis shoe, sneaker that I believe might be made in China. Does this mean his airness may have to put on a different brand of sneaker if this Bill passes and becomes law?"

Boland: "Well, we would like him to wear American made sneakers."

Black: "I'm all for that."

Boland: "But this wouldn't necessarily prohibit, just because it was made in China. But only if it was knowingly made in these camps with political and religious prisoners."

Black: "What if we, what if they buy it and don't know and we later find out that it was made in, under slave labor conditions? What do we do then?"

Boland: "There, all that they, we would know is that in future

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

purchases they could not do such a thing. But as long as they did not knowingly do this, you know, that would be okay. The crucial thing here is to stop those types of businesses that would undercut other Illinois business or other American business or other even Chinese business that is operating with legitimate labor."

Black: "Okay. Representative, our staff indicates that, let me ask you is there an enforcement provision in the Bill? If I purchase goods for resale and I have a reasonable expectation to know these were made under indentured conditions, or slave labor conditions, will I then be charged with any violation of law?"

Boland: "Only if you're dealing with the State of Illinois. This is not private purchases."

Black: "Okay."

Boland: "So I have to apologize on the last one about the Bulls, that would not be covered."

Black: "All right. Staff informs me that Beanie Babies are made in China, and there are members who have Beanie Babies in their possession on this floor, and they are employees of the State of Illinois. Are they felons or misdemeanors?"

Boland: "No, they're not."

Black: "Not what?"

Boland: "They may be a number of things, but they're not felons or misdemeanors."

Black: 'Okay. Well Representative, I ...you know the thing that concerns me about this Bill, did not the President of the United States recently again declare China a most favored nation under trade policy?"

Boland: "He did so and some of us might not agree with that."

Black: "So we might portray this as you're trying to send a message to the President of the United States."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Boland: "Well, I love Bill Clinton and I don't have my Bill Clinton tie on today but, yeah, you could interpret that."

Black: "Do you know whether or not China uses slave labor to print any of their money?"

Boland: "Let me look on the list of, not that I know of."

Black: "Well, we were kind of hoping that they did because then, if so, wouldn't that prohibit the donations of campaign funds to political candidates from the Country of China?"

Boland: "Only if they pay in cash."

Black: "Well, Representative, I have to hand it to you, you've done an outstanding job of answering questions. I think I'm going to stand and join with you in sending a strong message to the President of the United States, that he should be more careful in his most favored trading nation proclamation and so if he gets that message, make sure that your name is on the Bill. I want him to correspond with you and not me, but thank you for answering the questions."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Black."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boland, to close."

Boland: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. As I said in the beginning, this would deal only with those vendors and contractors who deal with the State of Illinois and who had knowingly purchase or sell goods that were made by forced labor, slaved labor, political prisoners, religious prisoners in places like China and Russia. It is a blow for human rights and it is also a blow against unfair trade competition against Illinois and American workers and Illinois business and American business. I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote
'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

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

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes'; 4 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 467, Mr. Kubik. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 467, the Bill been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 467, a Bill for an Act amending the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kubik."

- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 467 would do would extend waivers of tuition and fees at Illinois public colleges and universities to individuals who have served less than one year of military service but have served in a time of hostilities in a foreign country. What that essentially means are those, we extend waiver of fees to those individuals who may have served in Desert Storm or that sort of thing. We were going to add a provision for those who serve in Bosnia. We worked with the Department of Veterans' Affairs and came up with this language. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I think it's a good Bill for our Veterans and I would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all take

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1029, Mr. McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1029, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Happy Birthday to you."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Sir."

McGuire: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I bring you House Bill 1029 which is a fairly simple Bill but what I'll tell you it does in my plain language, it involves people who are convicted of stalking, aggravated battery, domestic battery, those types of offenses repeatedly against the same person. It's the same perpetrator and the same victim. And I would ask that you give this Bill favorable consideration and if there are any technical problems we have with it I would ask that you pass the Bill over to the upper Chamber and we will work those out in due time because we are under a deadline. And I will try to answer any questions you may have. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Turner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Turner, J.: "Representative, it's loud over here. I couldn't hear you. Could you explain that again, please?"

McGuire: "Yes, Sir. The Bill deals with aggravated domestic assaults, stalking, crimes of that nature and it deals with the same victim and the same perpetrator over and over again, and I'm asking that the prior convictions be introduced as these things go along. Because it's the same

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- person as we all read in the paper that does this over and over again and sometimes it ends up in a deadly situation and then it's too late."
- Turner, J.: "Okay, so you're going to change the rule of evidence where prior conviction will be presented in a subsequent trial. What type of subsequent trial are you talking about?"
- McGuire: "What type of trial did he say? I'm sorry, Sir, did you say what type of trial?"
- Turner, J.: "Yeah. Are you talking about changing a rule of evidence so that a prior conviction that does not have anything to do with honesty will be now be admissible in a subsequent trial? Is that what this Bill is about?"
- McGuire: "Mr. Turner, as you know I'm not an attorney and my Cosponsor, Mary K. O'Brien, could help me on that. But I don't see Mary K., I know she talked about hearsay. Evidence of hearsay. So I'm not quite sure that I can answer your question in a technical manner."
- Turner, J.: "Well I think, if my analysis is correct, what you're doing is changing a rule of evidence and I think what you're trying to say is if a person is convicted of certain offenses and you specified what those are and then that person is charged later on with another offense that the fact that they've had these prior convictions would become admissible evidence. Is that what your Bill does?"
- McGuire: "I believe that's what I'm trying to say."
- Turner, J.: "All right, if that's what it does, my question is, on that second trial, what type of charge is it that you are suggesting to the Body today that must be filed in order or could be filed in order for these prior convictions to be admissible?"
- McGuire: "The type of charge is stalking, aggravated stalking, or

- 47TH Legislative Day

 violating an order of protection, domestic violence,

 charges of that type, Sir... aggravated battery."
- McGuire: "Excuse me. Also I might add against a family member or household member. So in other words it's not against someone unknown. It's the same person repeatedly with the same victim."
- Turner, J.: "All right that's the list of convictions you intend to use at the subsequent trial. My question is, what is the offense at that subsequent trial where these prior convictions are going to be utilized?"
- McGuire: "I would say, similar offense."
- Turner, J.: "Have you checked with your staff on the constitutionality of this?"
- McGuire: "Yes, there's no problem there. I said, yes."
- Turner, J.: "All right. In the, so these prior convictions will be part of the case and chief for the prosecutor? Is that where this would come in, or would it only be for impeachment purposes?"
- McGuire: "No."
- Turner, J.: "It would be part of the case in chief and your staff says there is no problem with constitutionality?"
- McGuire: "Yes. Yes."
- Turner, J.: "Well, do you or your staff have an opinion of whether or not this a change of both common law and statutory law that's been developed over the last couple hundred years?"
- McGuire: "Yes, there's been proof of prior convictions in the past."
- Turner, J.: "Don't those prior convictions when admissible usually go to whether or not the credibility of the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

defendant is in question when they testify?"

- McGuire: "I didn't catch all that, did you? Mr. Turner, I'm advised that in the past, prior convictions have been introduced, and this is just an extension of that procedure."
- McGuire: "Could you repeat the last question, Mr. Turner?"
- Turner, J.: "Well, it's my understanding that a prior conviction, that's a misdemeanor, unless it's a crime of dishonesty, can't be used against the accused because it puts the accuser in an unfair light in front of the jury. The mere fact that they may have a prior conviction is normally deemed not relevant by a court unless it's a crime of dishonesty or a felony. I think you're changing a criminal procedural evidentiary law that's been around for a long time. I just really question whether it's constitutional to do this."
- McGuire: "Mr. Turner, my advisors tell me evidence of prior crimes have been used in the past for years, and we're trying to show evidence of prior convictions of the same offense against the same person by the same perpetrator, in cases of domestic violence."
- Turner, J.: "All right. Representative, I'm not going to belabor the point any further. I understand what you're trying to do, I appreciate it. My last question would be, unless it leads to something, to a subsequent question would be, did you hear from the Cook County Public Defender on this at all? Did they give you any input? They're down here and they usually, if they spot a deficiency concerning

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

evidence, if they spot a Bill that clearly is going to be violating an accused rights to a fair trial generally they put in a slip or at least contact the Sponsor. Have they done so in this case?"

McGuire: "No, no they didn't. No they did not, Sir."

Turner, J.: "Okay, thank you for answering my questions, Representative."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Turner."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker. First of all Happy Birthday to you."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Thank you."

Wojcik: "Now you are the lucky speed limit."

Speaker Madigan: "This is Freedom Day."

Wojcik: "That's right. I'd like to recognize Representative Phelps, if I may do that. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "This is a very special day, and I know that a special person has gotten a day older, a year older and I need a backup group. I'm used to singing with a group. We're going to make this something special for Speaker Madigan on his, whatever, birthday. Happy Birthday, Speaker. (Phelps sings a Happy Birthday song)."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you one and all. Thank you one and all, especially Representative Black for the candle and the bagel and the card, Representative Daniels. For those of you who don't know, for me this is Freedom Day. So I am now 55, fully vested in the pension. And maybe we'll make all of you very happy one day. So, Mr. McGuire do you still wish to proceed with your Bill?"

McGuire: "Mr. Speaker, I can't top that last performance. I'll just close by asking for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes'; 0 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 480, Representative Hughes. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 480 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendment."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. And read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 480, a Bill for an Act amending the Township Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hughes."
- Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 480 is from the Consent Calendar. This Bill passed committee unanimously. It provides that a question of the continuance of township organizations shall be certified and submitted to the voters upon the petition of at least 10% of the registered voters of each township. Happy to answer questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

 Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1724. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill, 1724."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1724, is on the Order of House Bills

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "This Bill is Sponsored by, Mr. Giglio. Mr.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Giglio. Mr. Giglio. Mr. Giglio, 1724."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1724, a Bill for an Act relating to education finance reform. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1724 is a Vehicle Bill for Education Finance Reform. We've had a lot of talk about it. I've been working on a couple of ideas, especially, for some unique problems within my district. It is an entirely empty Bill and I sure would appreciate the opportunity to carry this through to the Senate and continue working on this idea. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Cross: "I want to make sure I understand that everyone on our side of the aisle and everyone in the Chamber understands.

Representative, there is absolutely nothing in this Bill, is that correct?"

Giglio: "That is absolutely correct."

Cross: "We don't know what's coming back in this Bill do we?"

Giglio: "And neither do I. Again I said I'm working on some specific ideas. There has been a number of Vehicle Bills that have come through this Chamber that have been empty and with some pieces and such and again it's just a Vehicle Bill."

Cross: "Do you see this Bill as one that will be used ultimately as a Bill that will raise our taxes in this State?"

Giglio: "I really don't know."

Cross: "It could."

Giglio: "I'll be honest with you, it could, sure."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Cross: "All right. Mr. Speaker, we request a verification in case, in the event this Bill gets the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giglio, to close."

- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, the intention of this Bill is not to raise taxes. The intention of this Bill is not to slip anything past the House or past the Members of the Chamber. The intention of the Bill is this, a Vehicle to move it across and so that I can continue working on some ideas. This Chamber has moved a number of Shell Bills, Republican Bills. And a number of Democratic Bills have failed and I sure would appreciate your support. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 52 'ayes'; 59 'noes'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Giglio. Mr. Giglio."
- Giglio: "Can we pull this Bill out for postponement, due to the severe lack of cooperation?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 468, Representative Clayton. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 468?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 468, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997

Clayton: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative, one second please. Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a third time?"

Clerk Rossi: "No it has not been read a third time previously."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill a third time."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 468, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Representative Clayton."
- Clayton: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill amends the Illinois

 Municipal Code with regard to the telecommunications tax.

 It is permissive language to permit a municipality to waive the telecommunication tax for other governmental bodies within their jurisdiction. It also permits the municipality to waive or at a reduced rate for senior citizens."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Clayton has moved for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1900. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1900 is on the Order of House Bills,
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading,

 Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1757. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

 Representative Silva."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1757, a Bill for an Act amending the Human Resource Investment Council Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Silva."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Silva: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The only thing that this Bill does is that it adds four people to the Human Resource Investment Council, two from each of the Caucuses, and it expands it to two more community based organizations, which are directly involved in job training or work force development. I think that this Bill will add some oomph to it and since we are all concerned about welfare reform, it would seek to make and ensure that our Caucuses are aware of what's going on there and push for some programs that will promote a livable wage. And I would urge you to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

 There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1180, Mr. Wirsing. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1180, has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Place that Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1180 is a... takes care of an issue with the Community Colleges Board and the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Higher Education Board. Historically, the it is required that I.C.C.B. submits annually all of the audit paper work, which is very large in volume. And in recent years they have been submitting a uniform financial statement, which, in fact, is a summary of that audit. And all this legislation does is makes that the appropriate manner in which the Illinois Community College Board submits its annual financial statements to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. That's all the Bill does, and it comes from the Consent Calendar. I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Joe Lyons."
- Lyons, J.: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record reflect that I voted 'aye' for 1757. Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect that request. Mr. Wirsing moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1916, Mr. Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, 1916."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1916, a Bill for an Act amending the Local Records Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke, 1916."
- Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1916, would afford the City of Chicago the opportunity to garnish the wages of employees who do not pay their parking fees or water bills

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

and it also extends to the Chicago Park District. And I would ask for the consideration of the Body."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, the Amendment becomes the Bill, correct?"

And it has to do with wage, garnishing wages, to pay parking tickets, correct?"

Burke: "Parking tickets and water bills."

Black: "I'm sorry."

Burke: "Parking tickets and water bills."

Black: "Okay. Is it only impacting the City of Chicago?"

Burke: "Yes. Population, actually, population of 500 thousand or more."

Black: "So, it has no... you've exempted all other municipalities and or counties in the Amendment, correct?"

Burke: "By the language it talks about population, yes."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk advises me that the Gentleman is offering an Amendment. So, those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'; those, those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a second time previously?"

Clerk Rossi: "The Bill had not been read a second time previously."

Speaker Madigan: "So the Bill shall be placed on the Order of

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Third Reading. But to be considered on a later date. House Bill 1239, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1239, has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1239, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Hazardous Materials Transportation Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Happy Birthday."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, you said this was a technical Amendment."

Kosel: "It isn't."

Black: "I notice on my computer there is nothing about an Amendment on here. What are we doing?"

Kosel: "I apologize, it's a technical Bill."

Black: "A technical Bill."

Kosel: "Yes. Technical change in."

Black: "A technical change in a technical Bill. What is the technical change to the technical Bill?"

Kosel: "It is a technical change to the law."

Black: "It's a technical change to the law."

47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997

Kosel: "That's correct."

Black: "What is the technical change to the law?"

Kosel: "The technical change is defining the word 'knowingly'."

Black: "Defining the word 'knowingly'?"

Kosel: "That is correct, Sir."

Black: "Do you have a definition of the word 'knowingly'?"

Kosel: "Yes I do, Sir."

Black: "Could you share it with us?"

Kosel: "Yes I could, Sir. 'Knowingly', means a person that acts.
A person actual knowledge of a fact giving rise to a
violation, or to a reasonable person's action that acting
in the circumstances, and exercising do care, would have
such knowledge."

Black: "That was an excellent, technical definition of the word 'knowingly'. But can you tell me in just, you know I'm one of those downstaters, my school district didn't have a lot of money when I went through, and they did the best they could. But could you just kind of put it in plain English, what 'knowingly' means?"

Kosel: "It means that you have knowledge of the fact."

Black: "I have knowledge of the fact?"

Kosel: "Yes."

Black: "That's why I'm asking you. I have no knowledge of what you're trying to do."

Kosel: "It means that you have the knowledge of what you are carrying in this instance."

Black: "I have knowledge of what I'm carrying?"

Kosel: "In the incident, no."

Black: "That Bill was defeated on a parliamentary maneuver. I'm not carrying anything, how dare you."

Kosel: "That is correct."

Black: "Oh. So, you're just adding the word 'knowingly' to the

47TH Legislative Day

Bill?"

April 19, 1997

Kosel: "A definition of the word 'knowingly', to the Bill."

Black: "A definition of 'knowingly', and it's an I.D.O.T. Bill.

So does this mean if I knowingly drive my car over the speed limit, which I.D.O.T., you know wants the lowest possible rate, am I in trouble?"

Kosel: "Only if you're carrying hazardous material."

Black: "I'm carrying laundry home."

Kosel: "And you know it?"

Black: "I'm carrying laundry home today, from seven days down here. Would that, I noticed as I carried it out of the apartment this morning, it didn't smell very good, would that be classified as knowingly carrying hazardous material?"

Kosel: "It could be, Sir."

Black: "I think it probably is. What's the penalty if I knowingly carry hazardous material?"

Kosel: "This Bill does not, this technical correction does not address penalties, only the definition."

Black: "So, if I knowingly carry. If we pass your Bill and I knowingly, if I knowingly carry hazardous materials, I can't be charged with anything? I mean cause it doesn't, it's just a technical Amendment. So, Mr. Finley could say, ha ha. He knowingly carried hazardous materials, but what's he going to do to me if that's true?"

Kosel: "This just deals with the definition, not the penalties.

The penalties in the Bill do not change. It just deals with whether you know whether you're carrying hazardous materials or not."

Black: "But how do I even know what a hazardous material is? Is that defined elsewhere in the code?"

Kosel: "Yes it is, Sir."

47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997

Black: "Would gasoline be a hazardous material?"

Kosel: "I'm told it would be."

Black: "Well, now wait just a minute. My car, I just filled up this morning. My car has 19 gallons of gasoline. I know it has gasoline, I'm driving home. Does that mean I'm knowingly transporting a hazardous material?"

Kosel: "I believe that that is probably contained correctly within the regulations of the law within your car."

Black: "How about motor oil and/or antifreeze?"

Kosel: "Hazardous material is defined in the law in lines 15
through 20."

Black: "And is gasoline part of that?"

Kosel: "No, it does not."

Black: "How about motor oil?"

Kosel: "Does not appear to be also, Sir."

Black: "All right. Well, thank you very much for answering the questions, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This appears to me to be another of the nefarious, underhanded means and methodology of the Illinois Department of Transportation. If we knowingly transport hazardous materials and that may include gasoline, it may include motor oil, it possibly could include antifreeze or other elements in a car, in fact if you have seen Art Tenhouse's car, the car may be classified as a hazardous material. I think what we're up to here is we're mandating, I know where they're coming from, they're mandating mass transit in all areas of the state and then they will raise the fees, I don't know that I can 'knowingly' support this Bill. Because I don't really know what they want me to know and it appears to me that I don't know what 'knowingly' means and therefore, a 'no' vote may be the most knowing vote I can give."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel, to close."

Kosel: "Thank you very much. I would ask your support on my second Bill, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 85 'ayes'; 29 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1354, Mr. Arthur Turner. (sic-House Bill) 1354. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1354, is on the Order of House Bills,

Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act amending the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetics, and Nail Technology Act.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner, A.: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an Amendment I think
Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment filed?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner, the Clerk advises that there was a Floor Amendment already adopted to the Bill."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. This Bill provides that within the Department of Registration and Regulation that there be a provision, which allow clinic teachers to be licensed to provide clinical instruction in the practice of cosmetology, esthetics, and nail technology. The requirements of this Licensure Act would be outlined as it currently stands and

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- what it would do is provide another class of teachers for the profession. And I move for the favorable adoption of House Bill 1354."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes'; 2 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1257, Mr. Black. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1257, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1257, expands the offense of deceptive practices to include paying your fee to a Circuit Clerk of the Court and knowing, or knowingly I'm not sure, that the check is bad."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."
- Fritchey: "Representative, isn't it already against the law to

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

knowingly pass a bad check?"

Black: "It provides that when a person pays a fee to the Clerk of the Circuit Court, knowing that such check shall not be paid by depository, that it becomes an offense of deceptive practice. Evidently, the Clerks of the Circuit Court don't think the current law is clear enough. So, they want them specifically added to the statute."

Fritchey: "I'm asking this in all sincerity though. I believe the way it reads right now, and I haven't looked at the Act in awhile, but that it is defined to be a deceptive practice to knowingly pass a check that you know the funds aren't there for it to anybody, and I don't know why the Clerks feel that that wouldn't apply to them."

Black: "Well, the Clerks of the Court have written me and said the following, for example, the Clerk of the Court issues a check to a custodial parent, receiving a check from the non-custodial parent. If the non-custodial parent has given the Clerk of the Court a bad check, then the check can civilly sue, the Clerk can civilly sue the non-custodial parent. But the non-custodial parent can not be charged with deceptive practice, because he is not trying to obtain control of any property, labor or services and that was a loophole at the Clerks of the County Courts wanted to close."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Sir."

Black: "Thank you, Representative. Please don't kill my Bill. I need this Bill. I want this Bill to go to the Senate.

This is probably, well, please don't kill my Bill? It's a very important Bill, and I don't have that many."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, to close."

Black: "Thank you. This is a very good Bill and I want you all to vote for it."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Madigan: "You've heard that impassioned plea. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? For what purpose does Mr. Winters seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 442, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 442, the Bill's on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 442, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Public Aid Code, and it would require the department to extend coverage for certain pregnant women and their newborn and their infant children and by July 1, 1997. And it would also require the Department of Public Aid and the Governor to issue a revised Medicaid Plan of coverage that expands coverage from under income eligibility, from income eligibility standards that is 185% of the Federal Poverty Law. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have, in regards to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Black: "Representative, I'm not sure I understand the intent of this law. Let me go over a couple of questions with you. Is the intent just to expand medical coverage for pregnant women and children, is that the only intent?"
- Flowers: "The intent of the Bill is to expand the medical coverage, as well as the eligibility standards. Right now..."
- Black: "Okay. The last time I went through this file and I don't see my notes, bear with me. It appeared to me that what the Bill might do is to eliminate, well, eliminate is not the right word, slow down, or postpone a certain group of people who would have to be moved off of welfare into various work programs, and now I can't find my notes."
- Flowers: "No, this has nothing to do with slowing down or postponing. As a matter of fact, what it's doing, in my opinion, is increasing the opportunities."
- Black: "The fiscal note is substantial on this Bill. Are you in reasonable agreement with the fiscal note of \$123 million?"
- Flowers: "Well, it is my understanding that the state portion is half of that, because some of it will be coming from the Federal Government."
- Black: "Right, and I think that's why the Department of Public Aid has expressed some serious concerns with the Bill. They indicate, I was hoping they would be here to give us an update this morning but I don't see them. They indicate that about \$98 million, the way this Bill is drafted that about 98 million of the 123 would not be eligible for matching federal funds, and I don't see them here, so I don't know, but if that is the case, I wonder if the... could you wait just a minute, Representative? Okay, you're right Representative, the department indicates that about half of that 121 million would be covered by Federal Funds.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

So it... As Mr. Leonas points out, their concern is that we have to spend a 123 million first to get half of it back from the Federal Government, their concern is it is not included in their budget and so they just don't know where they would get the 123 million, even though they would get half of it back they have to spend the money first."

Flowers: "Representative Black, the only thing that I can say is that, in my opinion, this is a very good modest investment into the future of our children and so when you think about where they don't know where they are going to get the money from, they're going to have to expand or expend those dollars one way or the other."

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hannig in the Chair."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Yes."

Flowers: "Representative Black, I want to say also that last year on the same Bill the Fiscal Note was only \$9 million. So there must be an error someplace."

Black: "I think it was all those Federal Mandates that were passed down by President Clinton and his Welfare Reform Package."

Flowers: "It is my understanding, Sir, that it can't cost that much money."

Black: "Well, I absolutely do not question your sincerity in wanting to pass this Bill. But in light of the cost and I don't know if anybody else has any questions, but it appears to be a front loaded cost and I have some concerns with that. But as always, Representative, you do an excellent job of answering the questions and I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Hannig: "She will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative Flowers, there is some discussion among some of us over here, if you mean a plan because of the total cost that we're speaking about as in an insurance plan that will provide the coverage, or if you mean a plan as in a study to decide if this would be feasible."

Flowers: "Representative Mulligan, this is not a new plan. This is expanding the existing plan, expanding the existing Medicaid Plan."

Mulligan: "All right, so what you mean is expanding the coverage that exists, not doing a study to see if it would be feasible to do that?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we're going to be concerned about anything, we ought to be concerned about the high infant mortality rate here in Illinois. It's really shameful, Illinois has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the nation, and the intention of this Legislation which has been introduced into the last two Congresses, has been in the last two Sessions of the Illinois General Assembly has tried to deal with this by expanding the coverage of Medicaid eligibility. This is for pregnant women and their infant children to 185% of the poverty level. So, this seems to be a sensible way, we're just expanding insurance coverage for some people who would otherwise be uninsured and therefore their children and themselves in terms of prenatal care would be ineligible for any kind of coverage. We want to make sure that the babies in the state are born healthy. That they're not low weight and that we care for

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

them when they're newborns and that's what this Bill would do. This will help lower the infant mortality rate which we should all be ashamed of and all be addressing and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers, to close."

- Flowers: "I would just urge for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 442.

 This Bill is, again, a modest investment in our future.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting 'yes'; and 53 voting 'no'. Does the Lady request Postponed? The Lady requests Postponed, so ordered. House Bill 1369. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1369, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill deals with hit and run penalties. It is a little bit better than Mr. Scully's yesterday, because the questions that were asked in his are addressed in mine. It does make the penalties permissive, and we will be able to offer probation. I would move for its passage, please. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none...

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Representative Dart, the Gentleman from Cook, is recognized."

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

Kosel: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "She will."

Dart: "Representative, how is this one better than Representative Scully's?"

Kosel: "Because it allows probation."

Dart: "So that individuals who... I'm sorry I haven't read the Bill. So individuals who have killed somebody and fled the scene, now can get probation under this one?"

Kosel: "If a Judge should deem that penalty appropriate only.

It's a Class II Felony."

Dart: it's obviously... I mean that's obvious, Representative, I mean there is only one way to be sentenced, and that's through a judge. So it always depends on how a judge deems to do anything. I was in the court rooms a long time, I understand that very well. what my point is, you're saying it's better than Representative Scully's, and I'm trying to distinguish how it better and it's better because it allows probation for these people?"

Kosel: "Excuse me, I said it addressed the concern, Sir. There were some concerns addressed on the Floor yesterday about certain instances and whether those, whether those could be addressed within the Bill. This particular Bill that was passed out unanimously under Jud. in March addresses those concerns."

Dart: "Okay. Obviously, there are situations where we don't want these folks to have probation. There's obviously, situations where you might want to. Does your Bill distinguish particular cases that can get probation, or

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

does it just say that probation is an option for all of them?"

Kosel: "It's discretionary with the court, Sir."

Dart: "So, is it discretionary with the court in all situations then under this?"

Kosel: "The court will determine."

Dart: "Well, Representative, I mean I'm not trying to play games here but, as I say, from someone who has been in the court rooms, the court always determines that, I mean that's sort of silly, I mean they always determine that. So, in all situations here under this legislation, the courts will have that option of allowing probation for individuals who... Is it, is it individuals who hit somebody and leave, or is it individuals who kill somebody and leave?"

Kosel: "It is a hit and run Bill, Sir."

Dart: "Okay. Then you've made this clarify for me. So, it's individuals who hit and run, it's not necessarily they hit and killed somebody and took off, correct?"

Kosel: "Correct."

Dart: "Okay and it is going to be a Class II Felony with the normal penalties for Class II and probation allowed?"

Kosel: "It's an extended term, its three to 14."

Dart: "Three to 14 or probation, whatever the Judge determines."

Kosel: "It's a maybe, yes correct."

Dart: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Kosel: "You're welcome."

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

Lang: "Representative, I'm sorry I have to tell you. First of all, will the Sponsor yield? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Good. I only heard part of the debate, and I'm sorry, but

I may have to have you go through part of this again. Do I

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

understand this Bill to be one that potentially could lower penalties for hit and run?"

Kosel: "No, Sir."

Lang: "Well, then do I understand it's less severe penalties than a Bill we have already passed?"

Kosel: "No, Sir."

Lang: "Well, compare this to Representative Scully's Bill then, if you would?"

Kosel: "My Bill allows probation. His Bill does not."

Lang: "Well why we want to allow probation for someone in a hit and run situation?"

Kosel: "If you would have an elderly person as described on the
 Floor yesterday who hit someone, panicked, left the scene
 and then went and reported it. You might want to give that
 person probation."

Lang: "So, Mr. Scully's Bill would not allow that particular person probation and your Bill would?"

Kosel: "That is correct."

Lang: "What other kind of example can you give about someone who we would want to give probation to?"

Kosel: "There would be a lot of different cases where someone would panic and maybe not report it right away but get there as quickly as they possibly could."

Lang: "Well, do you think it's good public policy to forgive hit and run drivers? You can't think that, I know you don't think that."

Kosel: "The example I gave you of the elderly person is a good enough example I think to illustrate the point, Sir."

Lang: "Well then why don't you just amend the law to allow for someone over 60 years old who can prove, who has proven to a court that they have panicked because they didn't know what else to do, why don't we limit it to that? I don't

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

understand why we want to make it easier for hit and run incidents to to leave us with people walking the streets that may do it again."

Kosel: "I'm not interested in taking away the discretion of the Judge, Sir."

Lang: "Well, what are you interested in doing?"

Kosel: "I'm interested in increasing the penalties for hit and run and looking for justice."

Lang: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we're looking for justice and we're looking for safe streets, I don't know why we would want to soften the penalties for hit and run. It seems to me that's one of the most outrageous things someone can do in our society, to hit someone with their vehicle and then leave the scene of the accident and not report it. In my view, this is not a Bill we ought to be voting for, we already have a Bill that takes care of these issues. If the only issue is making sure court has the discretion in the case that somebody can prove that they've panicked and maybe made a mistake. I'm not talking about the accident, I'm talking about leaving the scene. Then we should have a Bill that deals specifically with that situation. We should have a Bill that specifically says if the defendant can prove they panicked, if they can prove they're not such a bad guy or person, they maybe we'll, we'll do these kinds of things. But to just simply have a blanket law that does this seems to me, it goes too far, I think we want to tell the citizens of Illinois that we will not tolerate hit and run. I would suggest 'no' or 'present' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scott."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She will."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Scott: "You said in your remarks, this is a better Bill than the one we passed yesterday because it allows for probation.

That's your story and you're sticking with it, right?"

Kosel: "Yes, Sir."

Scott: "How did you vote on the Bill, yesterday?"

Kosel: "I voted out for it, Sir."

Scott: "Even though you thought that was a bad Bill because it didn't allow probation?"

Kosel: "Because there was a promise made to amend it in the Senate."

Scott: "Just, specifically, to allow probation?"

Kosel: "Yes."

Scott: "In all instances."

Kosel: "In case by case basis."

Scott: "So, in your Bill, if I understand this correctly, if I'm driving a car and I run over several people, make it really bad, make it children, I can get probation under your Bill now?"

Kosel: "If you haven't left the scene of an accident you may be
 charged with other offenses but if you have left the scene
 of an accident."

Scott: "Yeah, I took off as soon as I did."

Kosel: "Then it becomes a Class II Felony and it would go through the court process as any other piece of legislation would."

Scott: "And you think in that particular case that that should be probationable?"

Kosel: "I'm saying that it should be a Class II Felony with the increased penalties of three to 14 years."

Scott: "That wasn't my question. You also think it should be a probationable offense. If you don't, why does your Bill say that?"

Kosel: "It says it may be sentenced, Sir. And a court could

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 sentence you to 14 years in prison, Sir."
- Scott: "That, that's not what I'm asking. I'm saying that your Bill says that what I just described is a probationable offense. Isn't that correct?"
- Kosel: "And the court would make a decision as to send you to jail for three to 14 years or it may give you probation."
- Scott: "And you think it's a... I assume that your introduction of this Bill was maybe not based on the same incident that the Bill we saw yesterday or the Bill we had last Session was based on but I don't know, was it?"
- Kosel: "This is the same Bill that you saw last Session that you voted for."
- Scott: "Right. But I saying is is... was it based on the same incident?"
- Kosel: "This is the same Bill, based on the same incident, Sir."
- Scott: "Okay. Your personal opinion is that offense that you're basing this Bill on. Should that be probationable?"
- Kosel: "This is, this is the last, this is the same Bill that was passed last year, Sir."
- Scott: "No, but I'm saying the incident that's the underlying reason for bringing this Bill up. Your personal opinion is that a probationable? Should that be a probationable offense?"
- Kosel: "It's up to the discretion of the courts, Sir."
- Scott: "So I guess your answer is yes."
- Kosel: "That is not my answer, Sir."
- Scott: "I didn't say the person should have gotten probation. I said that this should be a probationable offense. I mean the answer is yes, just go ahead and say it. I mean, if you don't like the fact that in that particular. Here's what I'm getting at, if you don't like the fact that in that particular."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Kosel: "The court has the ability to give someone a three to 14 year sentence for this offense. The court also has the ability to use probation."
- Scott: "If you don't like the fact that the person in that particular case, that's the reason for having this Bill in the first place. If you don't like the fact that that person could get probation, why don't you amend the particular Bills, this particular Bill and make the probation discretionary based on aggravating factors. In other words, so it's not probationable in every offense."
- Kosel: "The court always looks at aggravating factors to determine what kind of sentence they impose."
- Scott: "Yeah, but we could do that too, couldn't we? I mean, couldn't we add aggravated factors to the statute? We do it in other places."
- Kosel: "There is no way that I would expect this august Body to come up with every possible reason and so, therefore, we are leaving it to the discretion of our fine Judges."
- Scott: "Now isn't it true that in numerous, numerous criminal cases Judges don't have any discretion at all?"
- Kosel: "I am told that that is correct. I am not a lawyer,
 so..."
- Scott: "For example in a Class X Felony a Judge doesn't have any discretion. I mean the minimum sentence is the minimum sentence, there's no probation allowed, right?"
- Kosel: "They've got all kinds of discretions six to 30 years."
- Scott: "But, but it's not probation, that's not part of the Judge's discretion in that case."
- Kosel: "But they have discretion, Sir."
- Scott: "Well, they've got discretion here too."
- Kosel: "That's right, Sir."
- Scott: "It's three to 14, right. What's the difference?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Kosel: "There's no different. Can we focus on the Bill, please?

Can we please focus on this Bill?"

Scott: "I am."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Scott: "What's the difference between the three to 14 here and the six to 30 in a Class X case?"

Kosel: "Two different sets of figures."

Scott: "Okay, I'll give you that one. But what's the difference in one case in the Class X case the Judge doesn't have any discretion with respect to probation. In this case you're saying that they should, even for the one instance that most of us could probably agree the person shouldn't get probation."

Kosel: "I'm saying they both have discretions, Sir."

Scott: "But one doesn't have probationary discretion, right?"

Kosel: "Difference, difference in the amount of discretion.

Discretion is in both cases, Sir."

Scott: "Right, which is exactly my point. Which is why we're saying in a case like this, you could write in aggravating factors. For example age of the children, number of people involved, perhaps they're senior citizens that are hit, people that are otherwise less able to defend themselves, you could do all kinds of things with respect to aggravating factors and I'm just wondering why you didn't do it in this particular case."

Kosel: "It would be my point, Sir, that the court always has the discretion to look at aggravating factors."

Scott: "Well, I'm not sure you answered anything we had, but I appreciate it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wojcik is recognized."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I Move the Previous Question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has Moved the Previous Question. The

- 47TH Legislative Day

 question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the main question is put. Representative Kosel, to
- Kosel: "Thank you. This came out of committee on a unanimous vote. It was passed by unanimous vote in this House a year ago. I would look for it's positive passage now. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; oppose 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes'; 21 voting 'no'; 13 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1242."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1242, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg."

close."

- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1242 amends the Water Reclamation District Act. It repeals a provision concerning an audit by the Auditor General, reverts it back to its original audit function to be conducted by the Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago and I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of the Bill and on that question, Representative Zickus is recognized."
- Zickus: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When this Bill was passed, it required that the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District's audit would be

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

done by the Auditor General in place of the one that they normally do, the regular audit and a compliance audit for a period of three years. We received the first audit. We're part way into the second year. There's only one more year to go after that and I ask that you vote against this Bill so that the audit can stay in place for just the three years. There is no reason to make this change in the law right now and I urge your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. The Auditor General just released his audit of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District and it was a very favorable audit and I commend the district. They found very little to criticize in this first ever audit of that district. But that does not mean that the Auditor General should not go back and review it again. I think that the Auditor General regularly audits agencies all over this state of ours and they should continue to audit this. I noticed one of the proponents of this idea is the Illinois CPA Society. Why don't they work with the Auditor General and maybe the Auditor General will hire some CPA's to help him. But don't stop the public from finding out from a governmental source what the condition is of a major tax paying entity in our state. So I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. The Auditor General's Office is known for it's ability to function in a nonpartisan manner. The Auditor General had a distinguished career here, as Chief of Staff to Senator Phil Rock, I think he is a man of great integrity. It makes no sense to repeal this audit requirement, midway in the process. If the first audit was

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

good, I'm sure the second will be equally as good. But I think these are the kinds of things that not only the citizens need to make up their minds about whether or not the services at rendered are worth their taxes, but there shouldn't be any agency in the state seeking to eliminate an Auditor General's audit. If there's no problem, then the audit certainly isn't going to hurt anything, the office is known for it's integrity. I rise in opposition to this repealer and Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I will seek a verification."

Speaker Hannig: "You're acknowledged on that point, Representative Black. Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He will."

Mulligan: "Representative, don't you feel the audit would show if there is any discrepancy in the way funds or bonds are applied to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District?"

Schoenberg: "Representative Mulligan, as Representative Biggins pointed out, the initial audit which was done, addressed some financial irregularities. It was also, frankly this repeals a measure which was passed during a very, what was perceived as a very partisan attempt to set precedent over the Auditor Generals conducting audits over certain local jurisdictions, and that was the basis of the Illinois CPA Society's opposition at that time."

Mulligan: "It was in opposition to doing a double audit."

Schoenberg: "The Illinois CPA Society was opposed to what had been done at the time because it set precedent as far as certain local governmental entities being done by the... being put under the State Auditing Act. The State Auditing Act, specifically authorizes audits of the Metropolitan Pier and Expedition Authority, the Regional Transportation

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Authority and specific divisions of the Chicago Transit Authority when authorized by the Legislative This is, this really brings the statute Commission. consistent with how the Auditor General, how the Auditor General's Office treats local governmental units, and that was the primary basis at the time for the Illinois CPA I certainly am understanding how, at the time, Society. many of us on both sides of the aisle were concerned about financial irregularities which were taking place at the Water Reclamation District. Those areas have been addressed. The individuals who were involved are no longer at the Water Reclamation District. So what I'd really like to do, as one who is a proponent of greater accountability, have it be done in a uniform fashion and it's not a reflection on how I feel about the Auditor General's I feel very strongly about the good job that the Auditor General is doing. But I believe we should have some consistency in the statute."

Mulligan: "Well, Representative, yesterday we had a hard time passing bonding authority for the district, and I personally would support that because of the detunnel project and what's happening in your area, my area and so if it would take this Body to have a double audit so they would feel more comfortable with the district, I would probably vote against your Bill. Not because I disagree necessarily with what your saying, but I want the Body to have as many audits of that district as they can so that perhaps next time they can back a situation in bonds that would help out my district."

Schoenberg: "Actually, Representative Mulligan, I didn't hear your initial question clearly enough. This would not result in a double audit. This would be a single audit.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

The audit had been prior to the... in action of House Bill 197, the audit was authorized by the Water Reclamation District. What House Bill 197 did was revert that function to the Auditor General's Office, which as I indicated, set a precedent and an inconsistency as far as how the statute applies the Auditor General's oversight to governmental units. So we would not have a double audit. We're talking about a single audit, but merely reverting the audit to its original function and it's no reflection on the Auditor General, if anything, it's a reflection of having... desiring greater consistency with how the statute Auditor General's oversight treats t.he of local governmental units."

Mulligan: "Representative, isn't the district also obligated to have an audit by a Public Accounting Firm at least once a year and publish that?"

Schoenberg: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Would this suffice?"

Schoenberg: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So they don't have to go out on their own to a public firm and have that done then?"

Schoenberg: "As I indicated, the net result would be there would be one audit done. The issue is, who would be the authorizing governmental entity? Two years ago when we passed House Bill 197, we broke new ground and set a new precedent as far as how the Auditor General treats the auditing of local governmental units and this way we're making some consistency in the statute. As I said before, I think it was initially a response at a time when many of us, myself included, felt that the Water Reclamation District was not being as responsive as they should have been. As Mr. Biggins pointed out, there was a glowing audit

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

done which indicates that the irregularities which were sighted and which many of us were unhappy about have been remedied and if you look at the bond ratings of the district you look at their overall financial condition, I think they get a very clean bill of health and get a very strong rating. What I want to do with this is apply some consistency to the statute and accommodate that this Water Reclamation District's request to do so."

Mulligan: "All right, Representative, but I still will probably not vote for you because anything that would make my side of the aisle a little more comfortable with the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District would make me very happy, because I would like to see them support the Bonding Authority. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He will."

Deering: "Representative, is the Metropolitan Water and Sewer

District are they a public entity? Are they a public entity?"

Schoenberg: "Yes, Sir."

Deering: "How are the board members chosen? How are the board members chosen?"

Schoenberg: "The board members are chosen by election from the public in that regional jurisdiction."

Deering: "So there is a district where they hold an election they, run for public office and voted by...."

Schoenberg: "Yes Sir, and that's the Metropolitan... that is the Metropolitan Chicago area, and I wish to point out that some of the financial irregularities which many of us were concerned about that that occurred under the leadership of the former president who is no longer, not only the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

president, but is no longer a member of the board."

Deering: "Is this a precedent of the State of Illinois auditing a private entity?"

Schoenberg: "Well this... the Illinois Auditing Act sets about how the Auditor General would treat local governmental units, such as those that I sighted, the R.T.A., the C.T.A., the McPier Authority. But this really deviates significantly from that part of the statute, and what I want to do is make it uniform. I think we all made our point to the Water Reclamation District that they needed to bring their house into greater fiscal order. They've done so and I don't think we should be singling them out for any special negative treatment because they got the point already."

Deering: "Does the Auditor General have statutory authority to go in to audit any municipality, say the City of Chicago, Glen Ellyn, Springfield."

Schoenberg: "If the Legislative Audit Commission authorizes the Auditor General to conduct an audit of a local governmental unit such as those which I sighted, then he will be authorized to do so and that's exactly the glaring exception in the statute that we're seeking to correct with this Bill."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Deering: "As Co-chairman of the Audit Commission, we had the Auditor General give a report on the audit of the Metropolitan Water and Reclamation District. The audit came back very clean, and we were very pleased with it, we adopted it. I think this is bad precedent, even though the Metropolitan Sewer District paid for the covered the cost of the audit through their existing funds. Here it is

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

another duplicative service the fiscal conservatives that are talking about how we need to cut back on government, cut back on taxes and spending they're just demanding that we continue to do this because they may have a pet peeve with it. I think this is a bad precedent, the audit has been clean. The Auditor General has enough problems keeping up with audits of the State Agencies, and we can't even keep our own Fiscal House in order much less going out and looking at everybody else. I would recommend opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Move Previous Question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman Moves the Previous Question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Schoenberg, to close."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge support for this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 37 voting 'yes'; 73 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1494. Representative Turner (sic Art), for what purpose do you rise?"

Turner, A.: "I in inadvertently hit the wrong switch. I meant to vote green on that last Bill. I would like the record to reflect it."

Speaker Hannig: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1494."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1494, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1494, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a refugee from the sinking ship of the Consent Calendar. It had been previously approved. It provides that the Secretary of State may not terminate the suspension or registration of an uninsured motor vehicle involved in an accident until the tow truck has been reimbursed for towing. There was a provision concerning farm trucks which has been removed. I would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1027."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1027, a Bill for an Act concerning the news media. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

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

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Amendment... the underlying Bill would make accessible to the press, to the media, when they're interested in disseminating information in their media role as it were, information that is held by the Secretary of State's Office. The Bill is introduced in the view of the Secretary of State's Office may have enabled the media to free wheeling fishing expeditions engage Representative Kubik and I agreed with the Secretary of State that that was perhaps too broad an authority. Amendment we offer gives discretion to the Secretary of State to offer information requested by the media when it's engaged in its news gathering and disseminating role at no charge but does not require them to do so in every instance. I would appreciate your support for Amendment."

- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. A Fiscal Note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk read House Bill 1374."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Reclamation District Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Capparelli. Representative Capparelli, I just saw the Gentleman in the Chamber. Out of the record. Okay, we'll return to this at a later time.

 Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 960. Representative Lang."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 960, a Bill for an Act concerning state collection of debts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 960 is the compilation of a long period of study regarding the collection of debt in the State of Illinois. I'm sure you know, I was the chair of a task force that studied this for a good deal of time. Today, Ladies and Gentlemen, while we are in all sorts of fiscal problems in the State of Illinois, we have over \$6 billion owed to us by our own taxpayers, over \$6 billion. Under the current law of the State of Illinois, each state agency is responsible to collect their own debt. However, very few of the state agencies have experts on board that know how to collect debt. Accordingly, it was appropriate that we figure out a way in the law to centralize this. said that we should privatize all of this but to do that creates two problems. First, it creates the problem of who is going to give out \$6 billion in contracts without the concern that they be political or unethical. Second and more important, why should we hire someone to do what we might be able to do ourselves. We should at least take a crack at this. If there is \$6 billion owing, and only take \$2 million to set up a state office to do this, and that's only start up cost, because future payments would be made out of collections, why should we pay millions and millions of dollars to private debt collectors who will charge us fees to do that? And so this Bill would abolish the State Debt Collection Board, which is a board that since 1990 has the abysmal record of collecting only 2% of the outstanding debt owed to the State of Illinois by its taxpayers, only 2%. Almost all of the experts that testified before the task force indicated we should do substantially better than that. We should be able to collect billions of dollars that are due in owing us in all

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

sorts of different areas that have not been collected because we have not paid attention to this area. Debt Collection Board hasn't gotten it done. Someone suggested we give this power to a Constitutional Officer and I said, 'Well, that would be fine, except if we do that, we have the concern about that Constitutional Officer perhaps using this \$6 billion in private contracts to create a new fiefdom.' We cannot allow that to happen and so, I look for someone in State Government who knows about State funds, who knows about how to deal with the money and the taxpayers fund to the State of Illinois, and I settled on the Auditor General. This would create an office in the Auditor General's Office to collect debt. It would require that state agencies send the debt there, professional unit be set up to collect this \$6 billion of debt owed to our taxpayers. If we do this, we'll be far ahead of the game and the Auditor General's Office would set up rules and procedures to later privatize what they could not collect. This is a well thought out piece of legislation that will get the burden of this debt collection off of our individual agencies, who are not doing it very well anyway, and place it in the hands of knowledgeable unit in State Government that can move forward to collect these funds. If we collect even half of the money that's due and owed the state, it would put a great dent in our lack of ability to fund education and do many of the other things we do in the State of Illinois today. I urge your support."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Lady from DuPage,

Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Pankau: "Representative Lang, how, how is the Auditor General to know that all these debts are indeed owed? In other words, if the department itself that you owe it to says that this debt is owing and so it gives it over to the Auditor General's Department and you the employer of the Auditor General's Department call me and say, 'Carole, you owe \$17.95' and I say 'no, I don't' and you say 'yes, you do because according to the records of... whatever department it is, you owe \$17.95' and I say 'no, I paid that' and you say 'well, the computer says that you owe this money.' Where is a real human being involved in this process that says well maybe we did make a mistake? And one part of this department says you owe \$17.95, but indeed you did pay it over here and maybe it is just a paper work shuffle within departments, and whether we like to admit it or not, that does happen. One part of our department does not necessarily know what the other side is doing. Where is the protection for that person out there?"

Lang: "Protection is no different than if we authorize these state agencies to hire private debt collectors to collect these funds. So the department, the agency involved would be under a duty to transmit all the information. If they made a mistake, it would be no different mistake than if they tried to collect it themselves and it was paid. So they would transfer the documents, the computer records, the payment records to this new central unit who would be responsible to collect it. The other alternative would be to pass a Bill requiring all debt collection in the State of Illinois to be privatized. But if you did that you would have the same potential problem that you're discussing now. So, if we're to collect this money, since

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

the individual agencies in State Government or almost all of them, fail to have an expert within those departments that know how to collect debt, that's the problem. We need to be turning these over to someone who is an expert. Some people said to me, 'well let's privatize it all,' but we don't want to give up 25 or 30 or 33 or 50% of the money we're going to collect in fees if we can do it ourself."

Pankau: "I guess, Representative Lang, I'm not suggesting that we go private. I'm saying why don't we put some incentives into the department themselves to collect their own debt. That way, if you, from the Department of XYZ, call me up and say you owe me \$19.25, I can say 'no, no, no, Sam, in... sub department X of ABC Department told me,' 'no that's collected and I pay that in such and such a time.'"

Lang: "Representative."

Pankau: "Why are we having to make another whole area of... why don't we just put incentives into the department themselves to collect their own debt?"

Lang: "These are state agencies, Representative, they don't need incentives. The law requires them today to collect it.

The law requires them to collect it, and they're not collecting it. So..."

Pankau: "Why not?"

Lang: "Why not, because the state agencies...."

Pankau: "Well, you say there is a problem, why not?"

Lang: "The state agencies don't want to spend the time to hire people who are experts. If one of the... let's take a small agency of the State of Illinois, Veterans' Affairs. They have a small budget. They have a small personnel account. They don't want to hire a person to do debt collection, and because they don't want to use the scarce dollars they have to hire a person to do that, they aren't

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

hiring a person to do that and it goes to the bottom of the stack, your \$17 bill that you owe them, it goes to the bottom of the stack. The law requires them to do it, but they aren't. This collection process in the State of Illinois is a step child. We don't deal with it. We ignore it and these kinds of pieces of legislation that Representative Scully and Currie and I and others have advanced are all a package of Bills designed to get us to the understanding that when we're dealing with \$6 billion of taxpayer money, we have a responsibility to collect it. The current program is broken, so we have to fix it."

Pankau: "But, Representative Lang, wouldn't it be better if we as the Legislature, when those departments came up for their appropriations said to them, 'oh wait a minute, how are you guys doing on collecting n number of dollars of debt that you have out there?' Or why don't we take your \$2 million and give that department, distribute it among the departments for those that start collecting your debt? Why are we building another layer, more computers, more people that don't talk to real people to collect debt that they should be collecting themselves?"

Lang: "The answer to your question is that state agencies don't exist to collect money. DCCA exists to help small business. Veterans' Affairs exists to help veterans. The Department of Transportation exists to make commerce move smoothly through the State of Illinois. If we want to properly collect this, we have to create a unit that has an expertise in doing this job in State Government."

Pankau: "But, Representative Lang, you don't think that this Body could start emphasizing to the departments that yes, they are a tree in the big forest of State Government, but that big forest needs to have its debts collected? You don't

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

think we could do this ourselves?"

Lang: "No."

Pankau: "I do, I think we could."

Lang: "The Comptroller's Office has been trying for years to make this happen. But the Comptroller's Office can't make it happen, and we haven't been able to make it happen and that's why we need to make this change."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Pankau: "I honestly don't see why we need to take something and move it another area. I think we as the General Assembly could say to these departments, 'hey guys wake up. There's some money out there. Will you guys start collecting the debt that's in your own departments?' I urge my fellow Representatives to vote 'no' on this. I Representative Lang has sighted a problem. There is a problem there, but let's do it with existing things that are in place. Let's us as State Representatives say, 'by the way, how much money did your department collect this year?' And if we started doing this we wouldn't need another department. We wouldn't need another area where people don't talk to people they talk to computers, they talk to papers. I'm afraid this would become another Chicago parking ticket type thing where you would just have one on top of the other, one department says this, another department says something else. We don't need this, let's clean up our own ship. I urge a 'negative' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Chair would like to announce that there is birthday cake here on the Democratic side of the aisle on the front row and invite all Members to participate in the Speaker's birthday cake. Representative Rutherford is recognized."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Rutherford: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

- Rutherford: "Representative Lang, is it very simply your intent to have all debt collection... take all responsibility for debt collection to be transferred to this new entity?"
- Lang: "Only after 90 days. So, after one of our state agencies would have a bad debt for 90 days, they would be obligated to turn it over to this new unit. There's an exemption for the Department of Revenue and for state universities."
- Rutherford: "Okay, I also, Representative Lang, I assume you like to pass legislation that is clean, cleans up the statutes, does it correctly and accurately, is that correct?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

- Rutherford: "And I know that you've been very good at pointing out flaws in peoples' Bills and suggest they put it back to Second Reading, so they can amend them, is that correct?"
- Lang: "And sometimes people take my advice and sometimes they don't."
- Rutherford: "Well let's talk about yours then. As you look to go and try to create this new entity, it would seem that you would also want to eliminate responsibility that's already vested with certain State Constitutional Officers out there. And so for example, Act 205, the Uncollected State Claims Act (205-2) coming down to number B where it talks about the Attorney General having a claim or account receivables of a \$1 thousand. If your Bill became law, you would not be removing that from the statutes. So, you have got some problem or duplicative language in there. Also, Act 210 (210-3) under public policy, also (210-4) under Comptroller Rules and Reports. My point that I am making, Representative Lang, is that if your Bill became law,

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

transferring these responsibilities, it would seem efficient that you would go back into the Illinois Statutes, remove the provisions that would not be necessary if this did become law. Recognizing this, would you be willing to move your Bill back to Second Reading, amend it so it could become a correct Bill?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, I don't see anything wrong with the Bill as drafted. We pass different pieces of legislation here all the time and then they get enrolled and engrossed and then there's revisory Bills. Every statute that has been amended under this Bill, House Bill 960, is necessary to be amended."

Rutherford: "Well then if you did... if this Bill became law you would be leaving in language that is going to be in conflict with this underlying Bill. I'm just and I realize, you know, some Members don't want to make their Bills right and cleanup the statutes appropriately and the recommendations that you have made to other Members, to move it to second and amend it so that it can be done correctly, they have not taken. And I just... and obviously you have that purgative as well, and I just wanted to be sure that we had it highlighted."

Lang: "Well, just as some of the other Members said, Sir, if there is cleanup language that's necessary, we can do that in the Senate."

Rutherford: "I can appreciate that. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Rutherford: "Last year, last year and the year before, there were a number of individuals on both sides of the aisle, particularly from the lead of certain Democrat Members who are now running for statewide office had gone out and, very aggressively, worked with the Comptroller, worked with the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Auditor General, I'm sorry, with the Attorney General to tighten up the debt collection for the State of Illinois. Comptroller Didrickson did a remarkable job in bringing some of these things into law, which did pass this General Assembly, such as moving the time of... for the debt, moving from the state agency to go to the Debt Collection Board from one year up to six months. The other thing that we passed into law this year, which we have not had the opportunity to let it run its course fully to know that it is workable, is a pilot program in regards to putting our state debt out to efficient, private collectors, at a more cost efficient means to the State of Illinois. I mean what we're about to do here is create another state bureaucracy. We have something that is piloted out there, is working, it was done under bipartisan reasons without any type of initiative for any statewide political purposes. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do stand in opposition to this legislation and hope that we can have a resounding 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I Move Previous Question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has Moved the Previous Question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the main question is put. Representative Lang, to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the previous speakers words were exactly the point. We don't, there may be a point at which our state debt should be privatized, but we should not start by privatizing it. Because when we do, we give up 25 to 50% of everything we collect to someone who is going to charge the State of Illinois a fee. This Bill would require the Auditor General to set up guidelines to

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

determine when a debt should be sent out for private Why should we give up millions of dollars in collection. fees to private lawyers, private subcontractors, private collection agencies, if we can collect it ourself. current plan we have in the State of Illinois is not In fact, although the Comptroller would prefer working. that I not send this to the Auditor General, think, believes that Comptroller, I we should compartmentalize and unify our plan for collection of debt in the State of Illinois. We just have a disagreement as to who should do it. We don't have a disagreement that it should be consolidated into one place, accordingly, we have find a place that is free from politics to put these debts into. I think this is a good thing to do. current laws in the State of Illinois do not work, our agencies are not collecting the money, our State Debt Collection Board is not collecting the money and while we sit here and talk about what we can do to enhance revenue in the State of Illinois here is \$6 billion. This Bill will help collect that money. I recommend 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 'yes'; 56 'no', and the Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration. So ordered. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1547."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act regarding diseased animals. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act regarding diseased animals. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1547, simply takes what is known as the Illinois Animal Disease Act that has been in place since the early, shortly after the turn of the century and over the past year plus we've been reviewing that and looking at some of the terminology, some of the procedures that are being done today and tried to update the Act so it reflected better the current circumstances today relative to the animal industry here in the State of Illinois. And that's clearly what it does is to address some changes, some wording, some readdressing of some procedures so that we are doing things correctly and actually strengthens the Animal Disease Act itself. I would ask for its passage and answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He will."

Black: "Representative, in your Bill referencing diseased animals, is there any treatment provision that could be offered to diseased animals by the state veterinarian?"

Wirsing: "No, all this Act does is allows a just of categories of contagious and diseases. Historically, there's been some diseases back... relatively, to back in the 1940's, to livestock that was became a part of this Act and identified those as designated for the Act through the Illinois Department of Agriculture. Since then, there has been some other diseases that have come forth within all of the animal industry in the state, and we needed to address that

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

so that it gave the state veterinarian the opportunity to more quickly deal with the situation when it's contagious disease. Under the current status a part of that there is a great deal of time can go by when it may be a very critical issue. So, that's basically what it does, it doesn't deal with medications or that aspect of it."

Black: "Well, Representative, is there any, is there any reference to the underlying Bill to the disease of airitis or loser pseudo rabies? If not, could you amend the Bill on its face so that we might have the state veterinarian declare the Cubs a diseased animal under loser pseudo rabies and airitis and recommend a course of treatment?"

Wirsing: "You bring up a very good point and that actually at one point, at one of our meetings over the past about a year and half, this issue did come up, because during that period in time we were into the Cub contagious season and felt that the could we amend something or do something within this Act. But after a great deal of discussion by everyone from across the livestock and animal industry decided that the Cubs didn't fit into this, and we really weren't sure where to put them."

Black: "Well, it's always worth a try. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Let's give one for the diseased animals."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Skinner is recognized."

Skinner: "I Move the Previous Question."

Speaker Hannig: "There are no further Legislators seeking recognition. So the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

this question, there are 114 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1375. Excuse me, Representative Noland, for what reason do you rise?"

Noland: "Speaker, I, I reluctantly, arise to bring this to your attention, but the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Poe, well intentioned but inadvertently yesterday by serving chicken has offended every other livestock group in the State of Illinois, and I've had several phone calls today and I'm telling you that if we don't give equal opportunity to the cattle farmer, the pork producer, the sheep herder and the ratite raiser, we are going to have a fire storm of controversy in this Capitol, and I'm telling you people will leave this State, agriculture will dry up and blow The only thing we can do, I'm telling you the only away. thing we can do is, from this Calendar I see we'll be here Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. Mr. Poe, the Gentleman from Sangamon, must barbecue pork chops for us on Wednesday. He must grill ribeye steaks on Thursday and I'm telling you Friday should be ratite day, in the State Capitol and should we be here on Saturday, lamb chops for all. Now, now I had one other phone call at my home last night after these others, it was from the animal pound in Macon County of Macon in Decatur, I thought, oh, no, are they suggesting that we barbecue fluffy and fido. As it turned out, Mr. Speaker, it actually we need to renew our license for our So, I'm telling you, we must have equal opportunity for beef, pork, ratite and sheep, or we will lose agriculture as a main stay of this State, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "I think your point is well taken, Representative. Representative Poe, to respond. You look

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

like you have your work cut out for you."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that challenge if Mr. Noland will buy the meat."

Noland: "Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Noland."

Noland: "Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Noland."

Noland: "Have you seen today's State Journal Register? The man from Sangamon, Mr. Poe, on page five is using this stunt for political gain and I read, enter Representative Raymond Poe our Springfield. Poe cooks a lot of fried chicken for our church dinners throughout the district and it says that he fired up and cooked chicken for 250 of his closest friends and if those were all bipartisan chickens, reference page five, I will not treat people that way."

Speaker Hannig: "But will you buy, Representative Noland? Mr.

Clerk on House Bill 1375. Representative Pugh, do you have
a...?"

Pugh: "Speaker, on that note I think, if I can have some attention please. I don't know how long we're going to suffer this kind of abuse and neglect. This kind of discrimination, blatant and open discrimination. We have vegetarians in the House of Representatives who get no consideration in regards to their meals. We talk about sheep, we talk about ratites, we talk about chicken and pork chops, but we... nobody talks about the corn, and the beans and the cauliflower, broccoli."

Speaker Hannig: "Your prayers are answered, Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "And just because George Bush doesn't like broccoli doesn't mean that nobody else does."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Noland."

Noland: "In response to the right Reverend Pugh, Representative

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- Larry Woolard and I are Co-sponsoring House Bill 1680, the Wheat Check-off Program, which I think will answer your concerns."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, thank you, Representative Noland and Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1375."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act amending the Metropolitan Reclamation District Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. (sic-House Bill) 1375
 amends the Water Reclamation District to use modern
 terminology in the section concerning classification. The
 Amendment substitutes the term classification for grades of
 positions, and it also changes the word similarly for
 office and place of employment. I don't know of anybody
 that opposes this Bill. I ask for a reclamation due pass."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye'; 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1876."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1876, this Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act amending the Open Meetings Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kubik."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Bill amends the Open Meetings Act and would allow a public body to hold a closed meeting to consider the operation by a municipality of a municipal utility or the operation of a municipal power agency or municipal gas agency when the discussion involves contracts relating to the purchase, sale, or delivery of electricity or natural gas or the results or conclusions of load forecast studies. This Bill is an agreed Bill between the Press Association and these municipal utilities and I would be happy to respond to questions and would appreciate your support of House Bill 1876."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He will."

Giglio: "Representative Kubik, why do, why do we, why do we want to make this exception?"

Kubik: "Representative, these are municipally owned utilities operations. Springfield, for example, has one for their electrical. They are bound by the Open Meetings Act, at this point, because they are a governmental entity. So as a result, when they're discussing rates or they're discussing business plans or their competitors in this era of deregulation can come into the meeting and know exactly what's going on. So the point, is when you've got Com Ed and you've got all of these other places, they can discuss issues that may be contract issues that should not be subject to the public. At least they should be able to have a discussion before they bring it out into public. they're arguing that, and I agree with them in this instance, they're arguing that there should be some ability

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

to discuss some of these things in private before they go to the public meeting. Like an executive session, so to speak."

Giglio: "Yeah, I understand that, the only thing, the buzz word that made me rise and speak was 'contracts' because they could be limiting the ability for competition."

Kubik: "Well, no because ultimately what would happen is they would have to vote on the contract in public. But it would allow them to discuss the terms of the contract in private. But ultimately they would have to, any action that they took privately would ultimately have to go public. See when they're competing with a private entity, that private entity has complete confidentiality. They don't need to... their competitors are not sitting in their boardroom while they're discussing certain types of issues. publicly owned utility their competitors are sitting in a boardroom and they're forced to react to those kinds of issues. So this was a... I understand your concern, we worked with the Press Association to make sure that all of the Open Meeting Act activities would be properly served I think we have come up with a good compromise and I understand your concern. I think they are addressed in this Bill in so far as preserving that right for the citizens to be able to participate in the process and know what's going on and there would be no action taken unless it was done in a public meeting, open to the public."

Giglio: "Is there any opposition, that you know of, to the Bill?"

Kubik: "Not that I know of."

Giglio: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Representative, if I understand your... Oh, will the Sponsor yield?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Hannig: "He will yield."

Schakowsky: "If I understand your Bill, you're saying that this would put municipal owned utilities in the same category in terms of discussing the details of their business arrangements as the current public... investor owned utility companies are, is that true?"

Kubik: "Not necessarily, Representative, because the public utility companies will always have a more open process, simply because they have to meet a different standard, which is they have to meet the Open Meetings Act standards. And this still makes them apply that standard. What it does allow is certain exceptions so that they can discuss issues privately. But they still have to go out and actually enact policies in public. Private companies don't have to do that. You know the first time there's any real discussion is when they go to the Commerce Commission. So I think they're subject to greater amount of scrutiny than a, than a privately owned or publicly owned company."

Schakowsky: "Well I, I certainly want to have legislation that protects the integrity of municipally owned utilities. Let me ask you this though, what if a consumer in that town wanted to know that the utility... that the electricity that was being purchased was, in fact, at the lowest rate and that had been taken into consideration, would there be some mechanism for the consumer to understand what that decision making process had been? Or is that not an issue that's subject to closed meetings?"

Schakowsky: "Well, if I'm lucky enough to be a consumer in a town that has a municipal electric company which generally has

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

rates about 40% below Commonwealth Edison for example, but in the new environment I might want to be sure that my municipal which may be purchasing electricity is purchasing the lowest cost electricity. I'm just wondering if I would be able to find that out?"

Kubik: "My understanding of the law, Representative, is that under this Bill, if one went into a private session and there were some... or executive session let me use that term that is more appropriate, went into executive session and discussed certain matters, as I understand it, Final Action on this particular action would be proceeded by a public recital, the way it's pronounced is public recital of the nature of the matter being considered and other information that will inform the public of the business that's being conducted. So, while they may not have access to the dialogue that occurred in the executive session, they would be... when the action goes public, they would have access to the information surrounding that decision."

Schakowsky: "Well then, Representative, with that understanding of the legislation, I wholeheartedly support it as long as the consumers can understand what was taken into consideration, even if it's at the time that the contract is finally being voted upon, that would satisfy my concerns and I favor that."

Kubik: "Let me suggest to you, Representative, that the reason that this is being done at this point in time was under the old system there was no competition. There really was no, there weren't competitors sitting there and in that environment. The environment has changed, and I think in order to allow these companies to continue to be competitive, we have to allow them to develop some sorts of activities and strategies and be able to act on them, like

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

any other utility would."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Schakowsky: "I would just like to say that I think in this new environment of utility competition that we need to consider how we can protect the existence of municipal electric companies, which have in fact been delivering electricity at a much lower rate than the investor owned utility companies and I would support this legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1114."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1114, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1114, as amended will create a Museum Education Programs Fund in the Illinois State Treasury. I think all of us can agree that the 600 and some museums around this state, not-for-profit museums, contribute a significant amount to educational programs throughout our state. House Bill 1114 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Museums. I was actually amazed to learn that outside of Chicago and the immediate suburbs there are actually 630 institutions in Illinois' Directory of Museums. Three fourth of these institutions have organized school programs. Programs that really enhance and support the educational programs for all of the school

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

districts in this state and indeed have programs and exhibits that a school district could not in any way replicate. In addition to on-sight programs at museums, most of these museums also have traveling programs that go into, into the classrooms, as well as, and I think importantly, conduct many teacher training programs so that our teachers are in a much better position to add to their own curriculum inside the classroom. Out of all of these institutions, we learn that most of them receive no financial support from the State of Illinois, specifically for the educational programs. So in lieu of that and I think that in a year when we are looking to reform education, as well as, reform the way we finance it, this initiative I think brings into focus the critical importance of the larger educational program for our children. It is not today in this world just what goes on inside a classroom. Indeed it is the entire community. So, House Bill 1114, will create the Museum Educational Program Fund. This Bill, as amended, suggests that 1% of the state gaming proceeds, this is the state only, does not interfere in any way with local taxes... local revenues that are collected from gaming but from the state proceeds just 1% would go into the Museum Educational Program Fund. Those funds would be used and distributed by the State Board of Education subject of course to our appropriation to not-for-profit museums throughout the state for the purpose of supporting educational programs for elementary and secondary education. I am advised that we collect from the state's gaming proceeds \$173 million. One percent of that then would be \$1.7 million that clearly is used for education, but in this instance particularly for the educational programs that are supported from one end of

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

this State to the other by not-for-profit museums. I would just like to in closing mention a few of those that would In Bloomington, Illinois, the McLean County benefit. Historical Society, in Carbondale, the SIU Museum, in Danville, the Vermilion County Historical Society, Decatur, the Macon County Historical Museum, Edwardsville, the Madison County Historical Society, Rockford, the Tinker Swiss Cottage, in Mahomet, the Early American Museum, in Mt. Carmel, the Wabash County Historical Society, in Moline, the Deer Wyman House, in Wauconda, the Lake County Museum. It's also important to know that the historical sites in this state including our Old State Capitol, which actually has nearly 55 school children go through our Old State Capitol right here in Springfield and learn as we can only imagine a lot about the life of Abraham Lincoln and his importance. Eighty thousand school children, in this state, go through Lincoln's New Salem. Fifty one thousand school children go to the Cahokia Mounds. You know, when you think about these numbers and the significance that these historic sights and museums have in terms of enhancing, supporting and promoting the educational programs, I think that this one percentage allocation is a very reasonable figure in terms of supporting public education in this state, and I would urge your support."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, you don't make my job any easier when you reference the museums in my home district, it was a nice

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

touch. The Amendment that you adopted in committee becomes the Bill and all of the Floor Amendments have not been adopted to the Bill, is that correct?"

Erwin: "That is correct."

Black: "All right now. In the Committee Amendment #1, it is my understanding that you deleted the graduated wagering tax.

That's no longer in the Bill?"

Erwin: "That is correct."

Black: "So, in effect, what you're doing out of the current wagering tax revenues, you're asking to transfer 1% to various non-profit museums throughout the state?"

Erwin: "Representative, that's correct. One percent would be transferred to a new fund entitled the Museum Educational Program Fund. It's a special fund in the treasury. The use and distribution would be determined by the State Board of Education subject to appropriations."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative, as always you've given very concise answers to the questions. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, if I might. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know on its face, this is a very difficult Bill to oppose, and yet I feel compelled to do so, simply because with time running out, we have yet to really grapple with the problem of school funding and the possible reform of that funding mechanism. If you vote for this, you take a 1% of the wagering tax which the Gaming Board estimates to be about \$2.1 million a year and you take it out of the Education Assistance Fund which goes to your schools and you transfer it to another fund, albeit a tremendous idea and something that I wish we could do. But I'm not comfortable at this point in the process, going back home explaining to schools who are very concerned about educational funding and hopefully the reform of that

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

process as to why I voted to take \$2.1 million out of money that currently goes to education and put it somewhere else, no matter how worthy or noble the cause and it is for that reason, I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Interesting ploy to mention all the programs that would benefit and how society just couldn't advance without furthering those various causes in our local legislative districts. I would remind the Sponsor that those programs that she referenced are all doing quite well. Society will not come to a standstill without this tax increase. fact is that some people may look at this as a favorable Bill but there is no doubt about it, let's think about two This is a tax increase and this giving to the State Board of Eduction, an agency with a stellar record in developing public policy, the right or the responsibility to develop and monitor this program and the distribution of funds according to appropriations by the General Assembly. I just don't think that it is appropriate that we do that. I don't think that this vote, which is going to be a 'no' vote for me, should be interpreted as anything other than an anti-tax, anti-bureaucracy vote. Those on the other side of the issue would like to characterize this in some manner as being against advancing society and discussing the finer points of western civilization and the arts, simply not the case. This is a good solid 'no' vote if you believe in limited bureaucracy, limited intervention and limited tax increases."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She will."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Lang: "Representative, I'm wondering why you took the graduated tax out of your Bill."

Just Erwin: "Thank you, Representative. to also clarify Representative Stephens, this is not a tax increase. I repeat, Representative Stephens, this is not a tax increase of any kind. As introduced, the Bill did permit a graduated gaming tax. That was deleted from the Bill. This does not raise one scintilla of additional pennies, dimes, or nickels in terms of the gaming tax. That was taken out, Representative Lang, because the Executive Committee had considered other legislation that dealt with that issue."

Lang: "All right. On page 3, of the Amendment. The Amendment...Amendment #1, is the Bill now, is that correct?"

Erwin: "I'm having difficulty hearing or seeing."

Lang: "Mr. Scott and Mr. Dart, could we clear a path here? Thank you very much. Thank you, Gentlemen, nice tie, nice tie. Thank you very much. So, Amendment #1 is the Bill now?"

Erwin: "Correct."

Lang: "All right, on page 3, sub-section (c-1) where you talk about transferring 1%. You talk about transferring 1% of the monies generated under Section 13. Section 13 talks about a 20% tax on adjusted gross receipts. In your comments, you indicated that you wanted your 1% to come out of the state's share, but the way that this is written, this talks about 1% of the total, and I'm wondering if you can clear that up for me."

Erwin: "Representative Lang, there were...I asked the same question and I've re-asked the same question to the Reference Bureau on several occasions. They have assured me that this language impacts only the state portion. I

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

mean, they have, you know, reiterated that several times. So, it does not touch any portion of the local, of the local share."

Lang: "Well, once in a while I think LRB is wrong."

Erwin: "Well...there were more opinions than just LRB, Representative Lang."

Lang: "All right, and I'm not arguing with you. Honest, I'm not arguing with you, but to me this says 1% of the monies generated under Section 13. It doesn't say the state share of monies generated under Section 13, it says, the monies. That's all the monies, and I think that the 10 cities in Illinois now that have riverboats would not like to see any portion of their money deleted. I know what you're trying to do, but I'm not sure your Bill does it. I know you've been assured by many, but can you assure us that when the Bill goes to the Senate, you will revisit this issue?"

Erwin: "Thank you, Representative, I would be delighted to because it is clearly not the intention of the Illinois Association of Museums or myself, and it's one of the reasons why I had sought opinions from multiple sources. I have been assured by all of them that not only is this not again a tax increase but it only impacts the state portion that goes towards education anyway. So, it really is not distributing the dollars in a grossly different way but it certainly is not my intent to impact locals."

Lang: "Well, I wanted to help you get that legislative intent on the record. I know you will revisit it. I will tell you that I will not be able to vote for this because, because I believe that we need to address education funding in full first, as Mr. Black indicated. But, I think you're on to a good program. I just don't think it's the right time for it. But if this does get to the Senate, I hope you will

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

revisit this language. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to draw attention to the fact that museums really provide an educational enrichment, and we're talking about education funding, and we focus on the dollars but I think we also have to focus on the program and the academic part of education and the museums provide this enrichment that I think our children in the State of Illinois can gain in no other way and I think that...for children to have the opportunity to have the hands on trip to a museum is part of their education that is absolutely necessary. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Move the Previous Question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman Moves the Previous Question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and Representative Erwin to close."

Erwin: "Thank you. I would just like to suggest to the Body that we clearly are focused this year on education reform and education finance reform. Representative Black, we are surely not that close to the final decision in terms of school financing. I would strongly urge you to consider making the contributions that are made by museums a mix or in the mix as we precede. Representative Black, surely the House passes a number of Bills that we know the Senate has to consider as well. I'm only asking that we keep this issue on the table. That as we move forward on, which I hope we will increase the amount of dollars that we will be using for school funding to each of our districts. That the \$10 of millions that museums spend on the the hundreds

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

of thousands of school children in this state and in teacher training be credited with the very very significant part of the educational program that they indeed undertake. We know from the dollars we're spending on the internet, Ladies and Gentlemen, that education is not only what happens in a contained four walls of a classroom. fact, many of the museums are putting their collections on the internet as well as the training of teachers and bringing students to their exhibits as well as creating traveling exhibits. So, this, I think modest percentage, it's a little more than \$1 million. This is just a proposal. I would be delighted to work with not only this Chamber but the Senate as we move forward on school funding, which I intend to vote to increase. I would just urge you to help us keep this in the mix as we move forward and I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 18 voting 'yes', and 83 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost.

 Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 107."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 107, a Bill for an Act concerning medical coverage for mastectomies. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm just gathering my papers. I'm so shocked that it's called.

 Thank you, Ladies and Gentleman. House Bill 107 provides that health care benefits under all organizations in the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

state that provide insurance coverage, must provide a minimum of 96 hours of inpatient care following a mastectomy. It also allows for a shorter stay if the doctor decides that the patient does not need to be there It prohibits penalizing physicians for for 96 hours. authorizing inpatient care and it also discusses, by Floor Amendment #2, different definitions of attending physicians managed care plan and talks about how an insurer shall inform the insured of the coverage of this policy, of their policies. This Bill in a very similar form was passed overwhelmingly during the Veto Session. It was not. addressed in the Senate because they adjourned before they could do that. We have discussed this several times, think the genesis of the Bill came from women around the state who are now being asked to have a mastectomy on an basis. This is a particularly difficult outpatient operation to have on an outpatient basis even though HMO's have testified, the association, that no HMO in state requires that, and Ann Vaughn, from the Springfield area, after sitting in on the testimony the first time around, went back to her HMO and received a letter from them stating that, yes, indeed they did require it as outpatient surgery, unless the doctor changed their position on that, and I would ask for your favorable vote and be ready to answer questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has move for passage of House Bill 107 and on that question, Representative Schakowsky is recognized."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want underscore the fact that no one has to stay in the hospital for 96 hours, but we're talking about very serious surgery, serious in a lot of ways. Not the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

least of which is the enormous psychological effect that it has on women that may need a couple of days to understand how to take care of the wound, may need some instruction on how to handle it, may need a couple of days to recoup from what is clearly major, major surgery. By allowing 96 hours, we make sure that no one is sent home too early and we make sure that no one has to have this traumatic surgery on an outpatient basis. You know, the HMO's did continue to say that they don't have any policies, Representative Mulligan says that she found an instance where they actually do. Even where they don't obviously something is going on where HMO's have been sending home women on occasion on the same day. That is absolutely unacceptable and we do clearly need some legislative protection for the many women unfortunately in Illinois who have mastectomies. So I urge a strong 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes'; 11 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1784."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act concerning community care. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The intention of this legislation is to make sure that low income and low wage earning home care workers do not get displaced as we take on the difficult task of welfare reform and moving people into low wage jobs. This

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

legislation really does three things. One, it says that we will not discriminate against welfare recipients who want to move into home care worker jobs. Two, that those workers, though can not displace existing workers there and we have made language changes to accommodate the Department on Aging, who wants to be sure that we don't say that people can't be fired for cause. Of course they can, and that language says it clearly now. And the Department of Rehabilitation Services which wanted language that said that they will have no policy that allows for the displacement of home care of personal attendance. I believe that we've met all the objections that were raised. I am not aware of any opponents to the legislation, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She will yield."

Black: "Representative, is Floor Amendment #2 on the Bill?"

Schakowsky: "Yes, it is."

Black: "And with the addition of Floor Amendment #2, I believe the Department of Rehabilitation Services removed their objection to the Bill?"

Schakowsky: "That is correct."

Black: "So, we are not establishing in law any inherent right of a current home care worker that would prevent someone on welfare from easing into...or transitioning into that care. You are just simply establishing a policy that we should not simply displace people so that we can place people on welfare into transitional work programs, right?"

Schakowsky: "That is exactly correct, Representative."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Black: "Okay. I think as amended, I'm not aware of any opposition."

Schakowsky: "Correct."

Black: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Lawfer is recognized."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question of the Sponsor, if she will yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Lawfer: "As I understand the Amendment, Representative. Then it puts into statute a statement that the Department of Rehabilitation Services will not, shall not establish a policy displacing persons with...persons who have exhausted their federal or state public assistance benefits. Is that correct?"

Schakowsky: "That is correct."

Lawfer: "What is the reason for this Bill? What is the necessity of this Bill?"

Schakowsky: "I think the concern was that in our...that we don't want people who may go onto work fare programs or if we create some tax incentives for employers to hire people on welfare, that we start displacing what are already low wage earners from those jobs, creating more welfare recipients. I think we want to be careful as we move from welfare to work that we don't put more people out of work and create another problem inadvertently. So, while this says, we certainly don't want to discriminate in any way against people who are on welfare, you know my history and that certainly is not my intention. But, on the other hand we don't want to displace low wage earners from their jobs."

Lawfer: "Are we telling them, some of the venders, that they can only hire a certain category of people?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Schakowsky: "Oh, no. Not at all. What we're saying is, that they can not willfully fire somebody. Now they can do it for cause, and that's why we added that language. If someone is not performing their job, the employer, the Department on Aging can absolutely terminate that employee for any...good cause. But they are not...being told not who they have to hire but who may not be fired."
- Lawfer: "Had they developed a policy that requires this statute to be put in place? Are you aware of any policy or any action that either agency or any of the venders had taken that would call for the necessity of this?"
- Schakowsky: "Fortunately not, Representative. But, in fact, other states have, and so, as we maneuver through this welfare reform issue, we want to make sure that our laws are in place to protect workers."
- Lawfer: "But this could have been done by policy, rules and regulations, without statute?"
- Schakowsky: "I'm not certain of that, Representative, I think what we're doing is instructing the Department of Rehabilitation Services about this policy, and we're stating in statute that it is not our intention. It certainly makes that much stronger by doing it in statute form."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "There being no further discussion on this issue, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2215."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2215, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pawnbroker Regulation Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman form Kendall, Representative Cross is recognized."
- Cross: "I think most everybody knows what this Bill does. It was on the Agreed Bill List. It passed out of committee unanimously. I appreciate Representative Saviano's help and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. Representative Black.

 Representative Black is seeking recognition."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

- Black: "That was the weakest explanation of a Bill that I have ever heard. I have many many pawnbrokers in my district and I would like to know what this Bill does to them or for them."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black. The Sponsor will yield."
- Cross: "I don't recall yielding. Representative, let me give you a succinct and quick an explanation as I can, just kind of off the top of my head. If I recall correctly without looking at my notes, it revises and updates those Sections of the Act which deal with the keeping and dissimulation of anti-theft records. The purpose of anti-theft records are to make local law enforcement officials aware at all times of what is being pawned and to enable them to compare those records ...recorded pawnbroker intake with the police records of goods recently stolen. I don't think I could give you a better explanation."

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- Black: "Do the pawnbrokers, are they requesting this legislation?

 They're in agreement with this?"
- Cross: "Actually, I'm doing this on the behalf of pawnbrokers.

 And as far as I know, they are, I'm not aware of any pawnbroker opposition. In all honesty, I'm not."
- Black: "Would that be where your sport coat and tie is today?

 Did you pawn it?"
- Cross: "As a matter of fact, it looks like I got this shirt at a pawnbroker's store, the more I'm looking at it."
- Black: "I think you pawned your sport coat and got your shirt out of hock, but whatever. Are you sure the pawn...I can't imagine...most of these are very small business people down in my end of the state and I...computer records, a lot of pawnbrokers in my area don't even have a computer."
- Cross: "Actually, Bill, one of the reasons for this Bill is to keep pawnbrokers from taking in stolen goods, and it is somewhat of a regulation of being able to check out what comes in and what goes out. It did come to me from some pawnbrokers' groups. A former Representative of this House works on behalf of the pawnbrokers and asked me to Sponsor this Bill."
- Black: "Well, now that you have explained it, that's different.

 Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Tenhouse. The Gentleman does not wish to speak. Representative Cross, do you wish to close? The question is, 'Shall..."
- Cross: "I think my explanation was so good, I don't really need to close. I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'; and 4 voting 'present.' And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 409."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 409, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code and State Mandates Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Santiago. The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1377."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act to amend the Community Services Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

 Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. House Bill 1377, amends the Community Service Act to require the annual appropriation to the Department of Human Services. As a successor of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to fund community services to be adjusted annually to reflect the changes in inflation. Quite simply, this Bill is what I called or referred to as the COLA Bill for community service organizations. I move for the favorable adoption of House Bill 1377."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1377. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes'; 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1027."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1027, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. The Fiscal Note that has been requested on the Bill has been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Kubik indicates that he does not wish to call the Bill at this time. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1000."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1000, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dart."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1000, is in its present form is a Shell Bill. Representative Cross, myself and numerous other people have worked for over about two and a half years now with a group to try to work on their Delinquency Code in the Juvenile Court Act. There was a commission set up that Dale Singmenson was the Chairman of that we worked for over a year and a half to come up with recommendations. They are about done recommendations, the draft has been put out and some people are...it's been circulated. We need another week or so to do it. Senator Hawkinson and myself have been working on this as well and he has sent over a Bill, a Shell Bill over here that we've picked up to put it on. He's asked if we could send a Shell Bill over there so he can put it on over in the Senate and I told him I would comply with that. And I would move for the passage of House Bill 1000."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, Representative Cross is recognized."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill,

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

even though it's a Shell Bill. This is an issue that we've been working on, as Representative Dart said, for the last two years. Senator Hawkinson and former Senator Dunn were both on this commission as well, along with various agency heads, like Jess McDonald, Howard Peters, and others that have a great deal of knowledge in the area of juvenile justice. It's a long time coming, and I think we're finally getting to a point where we can have some significant substantive legislation. I support a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Turner, is recognized."

Turner, J.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Dart: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, he will."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I have some concerns about the Vehicle Bill. As you know, in the 89th General Assembly, we worked very hard to provide a provision where in certain instances juveniles could be housed in local jail facilities. And my question, therefore, becomes whether or not you intend to change any of the laws or the law, I should say, we passed in the 89th General Assembly with regard to the ability for juveniles to be housed in a jail, if indeed they can be separated by sight and sound from the adult population?"

Dart: "Yeah, as of this time, there is no provisions that I'm aware of in there. There's been no desire by anybody that I've been working with on this commission to change that. It has not been a topic that has come up. This is more in regards to how we are going to deal with the most violent juveniles that we have out there and then the other ones, how it is that we can intervene as soon as we can with them

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

because the problem is so many of them are getting station adjustment, we never get to them. There's no intent there and I can give you my word that if there is stuff in there, I will meet with you and do what I can to pull it out. Because I don't really want to tamper with that, I know how hard you worked with that."

Turner, J.: "All right. So, as I understand it, you don't believe that there is any language in there that does that and if it is in there you will work to pull that out of the Bill."

Dart: "Yeah, I'll work with you to get it out because I really...it's something that as I said, you've spent a lot of time working on that particular issue, it's very controversial. What we're attempting to put together is a Bill that frankly, is going to be relatively noncontroversial. That in itself would sink a Bill. I really don't want that in here because we've worked, as I said, Tom has mentioned, we worked for over two years on this thing and I would want that out of there then."

Turner, J.: "Do you have a Sponsor in the Senate for this Vehicle Bill?"

Dart: "Senator Hawkinson, is the Sponsor in the Senate on this."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 55 voting 'yes'; and 50 voting 'no', and the Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration. The Chair is now going to the Order of moving Bills from Third Reading to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 484?"

- 47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 484 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return this Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,

 House Bill 602. What is the status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 602 is on the Order of House Bills,
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return this Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,
 733. House Bill 733, what is the status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 733 is on the Order of House Bills,
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,

 House Bill 785. What is the status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 785 is on the Order of House Bills,
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. House Bill 1099. Mr. Clerk, what is the status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1099 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,

 House Bill 1200. What is the status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1200 is on the Order of House Bills, Second Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Remains on Second Reading. House Bill 1208. Mr. Clerk, what is the status? Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1210. What is its status?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1210."
- Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is passed so, out of the record.

 House Bill 1329."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1329 is on the Order of House Bills, Second Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. What is the status of House Bill 1435?"

- 47TH Legislative Day April 19, 1997
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1435 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1436. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1493?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1493 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. House Bill 1732. Mr. Clerk, what is the status? Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1732 is on the Order of House Bills, Second Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1746. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1809."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1809 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk,

 House Bill 1811."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1811 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. House Bill 2201."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2201 is on the Order of House Bills,
 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. We are going to...we're going to read some Bills that are on Second Reading, give the Sponsors an opportunity...excuse me. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Shirley Jones, Chairman from the Committee on Public Utilities to which the following Amendments were referred, action taken on April 19, 1997, reported the same back with the following recommendations:

 'Be adopted' Floor Amendment #2, to House Bill 1103, and

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Floor Amendment 2, to House Bill 1915."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Chair will now go through the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, looking for Sponsors who are in the Chamber that wish to move their Bill to Third Reading. Representative Dart...Representative Dart, do you wish to move House Bill 47, from second to third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 47, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dart, has been approved for consideration."

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

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor
Amendment 2 narrows the scope of the Bill and removes the
developmental disability homes from it. I move for its
adoption."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates that he will."

Black: "Representative, I thought Floor Amendment #2 became the Bill. That's not the case, this just adds to the Bill?"

Dart: "Well, actually it subtracts from it, Representative. It adds to it, but what it does is it just narrows the scope of the Bill dramatically."

Black: "Okay. We can discuss it on Third Reading."

Dart: "Sure."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Dart on House Bill 61.
 Okay, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 61, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1, was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4, and 5, have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Dart on House Bill 63? Out of the record. On 64, Representative Dart.

 No. (House Bill) 92, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 92, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1, 2, and 3, were adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Dart, has been approved for consideration."

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

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill...Amendment 4, becomes the Bill. What it does is it cleaned up the provisions that were in the Bill dealing with visitation rights for grandparents and godparents in the...for children who are in foster care, and it provides language that the Department of Children and Family Services asked, that responds to a court case. The other provisions in here, that are probably the most important are, it tries to cleanup the Putative Father Registry statue that we put into effect with the Baby Richard law about two or three years ago. There was a case in Southern Illinois where an individual was raped and the defendant in the case was aware of the Putative Father Registry. He

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

then filed as a Putative Father and even though he is presently in the criminal process of being charged with criminal sexual assault, he has now stopped the ability of this woman to put the baby up for adoption. And so we're trying to clear up that part of the statute, and I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, is there any discussion?

Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Dart, 104. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 104, a Bill for an Act regarding liens.

Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Dart, has been approved for consideration."

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

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 removed a provision of the Bill to narrow the scope of it. It removed the second portion of the Bill, so this Bill now only deals now with demolition, sale, and errors, liens. It was suggested by Representative Pugh, to ask to have that provision removed, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

Black: "I thought we had an agreement early in the Session that when we went to the Order of Dart, which evidently we are

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

on, since this is the fifth consecutive Bill sponsored by the esteemed Representative. We ask you for advanced notice so we could hire temporary workers to help us analyze the overload of Bills in the esteemed Representative's name. And you didn't do that, now this is five in a row. How many more of these are you planning to call so that we can call temporary services and get sufficient staff to help us with this overload."

Dart: "Representative, I'm pleased to inform you that's it."

Black: "Well, I hope we don't run these today because it's very hard to get temporary people to come in and help us on a Saturday. We have an entire floor file full of Representative Dart's Bills, and we're only about half way through analyzing them. I mean thousands and thousands of pages. It's your intent to wait until we come back next week to get to this?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative."

Black: "Thank you, by that time I'm sure we can find sufficient temporary staff to help us analyze this re-write of the entire Illinois Code. So, we appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Black. And on the Amendment, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Dart, on 165. No. On 168, Representative Mulligan. He did not wish to call it. Representative Mulligan on House Bill 168. Do you want to move that Bill to third? No. Representative Lang, House Bill 169. No. Representative Saviano. Representative Schakowsky, do you wish to move House Bill 194? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 194, a Bill for an Act in relation to

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 privatization of government services. Second Reading of
 this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor
 Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Brunsvold. I don't see the Gentleman in the Chamber. Representative Scott, on House Bill 289. Do you wish to move the Bill. The Gentleman indicates he does?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 289 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Scott, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scott."
- Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 is the result of some negotiation between the State Bar Association and some of the Insurance Companies who had a problem with it. It actually clarifies and makes some changes recommended by the Insurance Companies. I would move for approval of Floor Amendment 2."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. House Bill 379. Is

 Representative Roskam in the Chamber? Representative

 Cross, on 425. Do you wish to move the Bill,

 Representative? (House Bill) 425, do you wish us to move

 the Bill to Third Reading, Representative Cross?"
- Cross: "I think there is an Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Pardon me."
- Speaker Hannig: "Do you want us to move the Bill or is there an Amendment you're waiting for?"
- Cross: "I need to adopt the Amendment, I think it guts the Bill."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment? The Clerk indicates there is an Amendment at the Well. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 425 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 guts the Bill. I'm not sure that this is a Bill that we're going to ever be able to come to any agreement on, but I would like to keep working on it. As a result, if we can move it out of here and when it gets to Third Reading, depending on who votes for it, we may be able to but I would like, at least at this point, to adopt Amendment #2."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment, say 'aye';

 opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is

 adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Scott, on House Bill 588. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 588, a Bill for an Act concerning unemployment insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. A Balance Budget Note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, this Bill will remain on Second Reading.

 Representative Flowers, on House Bill 621. Representative

 Flowers, do you wish to move the Bill from second to third?

 She indicates that she does, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 621 has been read a second time,

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2, to House Bill 621 makes some technical changes, and it made some changes in regards to the Illinois Franchise Trust Fund. It created a new fund outside the Treasurer's Office, and I'll be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have in regards to House Bill 621."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, Representative Parke is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Parke: "Representative Flowers, why is this necessary?"

Flowers: "Well, Representative, as you know, again, we have what you call the welfare reform, and this particular issue is going to mostly affect minorities and women, and there are a lot of people out there who are capable of running a franchise and want a franchise but do not have the start-up funds. So, as a result, we have DCCA, and part of the nature of DCCA is to help businesses or help people start businesses or maintain businesses and it's just a fantastic idea, and it would be great for the state, add more dollars to the state, create more jobs."

Parke: "But why are you going to set up this Illinois Franchise

Trust Fund? Why set up a new fund? I thought you said

DCCA is doing this already."

Flowers: "No, I didn't say DCCA...DCCA is doing something similar

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

but because we are targeting this specifically for minorities and women and we want the...this particular fund will run the program."

Parke: "Representative, yesterday Representative Fantin presented a Bill to us to set up incubators which DCCA provides money. We'd agreed to set up money to...through this incubator system to even allow the building, helping part of the payment of infrastructure. Quite frankly, that system is there for anybody to use it, what we do not need is an increased growth of bureaucracy, though you may see this as an additional vehicle, we already have the vehicles out there. This is unnecessary. We have commissions, we have other commissions that will deal with women and minority Bills. We have a commission on that. I think that this is just an increase in the bureaucracy. I don't think this is necessary, you know, it's just another idea that we're throwing out to the Body that is not necessary. I would ask the Body not to accept this...we don't need this. Mr. Speaker, I would like a Verified Roll Call and I would like to..."

Flowers: "Speaker, this is the Amendment."

Parke: "This is the Amendment, we don't like the Amendment on top of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman is within his rights, Representative."

Parke: "So, I would ask for that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She will."

Lindner: "We already have the MAFBE program, Minority and Female Business...what...Assistance Act, I believe."

Flowers: "Franchise."

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- Lindner: "Franchise. How is this different in...how is this different and why do we need your program if we already have that?"
- Flowers: "Representative, this particular Amendment or Bill would create funds specifically for this particular program, and MAFBE does not do that."
- Lindner: "But doesn't MAFBE include this program in their agenda now, isn't this one of the things that they would look at, also?"
- Flowers: "This is a new Act and I'm not familiar with the fact that they do that."
- Lindner: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers to close."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Amendment, and I urge for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 621."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 54 voting 'aye', and 54 voting 'no' and the Amendment fails. Does the lady wish to verify the affirmative votes? Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "I would like to verify the negatives."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, read the names of those that are voting in the negative."
- Clerk Rossi: "Poll of those voting negative. Ackerman.

 Beaubien. Bergman. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost.

 Bradford. Brady. Churchill. Clayton. Coulson.

 Cowlishaw. Cross. Daniels. Davis, Steve. Deuchler.

 Durkin. Hassert. Hoeft. Holbrook. Hughes. Johnson, Tim.

 Jones, John. Klingler. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea.

Mulligan. Myers. Noland. Pankau. Parke. Persico. Poe.

Rutherford. Ryder. Saviano. Skinner. Stephens.

Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing.

Wojcik. Wood, and Zickus."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers, do you have questions of those voting in the negative?"

Flowers: "Representative Steve Davis?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Steve Davis. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Mr. Davis is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Representative Saviano?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Saviano. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Mr. Saviano is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Flowers: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? The Gentleman is in the Chamber."

Flowers: "Representative Mitchell?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mitchell is in the rear."

Flowers: "Representative Kubik?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kubik. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? The Gentleman is not in the Chamber, remove him, but return Representative Saviano to the Roll Call. Pardon me."

Flowers: "Representative Leitch?"

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, for a second. Mr. Clerk, have you removed Representative Kubik? Okay, he was not voting.

Not voting. And return Representative Saviano to the Roll Call. Okay, and Representative Flowers now. Further

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

questions of those voting in the negative."

Flowers: "Representative Holbrook?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded? Holbrook.

Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Mr. Holbrook is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Flowers: "Representative Ann Hughes?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ann Hughes is in the rear."

Flowers: "Representative Ackerman?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jay Ackerman is in his seat."

Flowers: "Representative Tim Johnson?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tim Johnson. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Mr. Johnson, Mr. Tim Johnson, is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him. Anything further?"

Flowers: "Representative Wait."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ron Wait. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "Mr. Wait is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Flowers: "Representative Tom Johnson?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tom Johnson. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? He is not recorded as voting, Representative. Representative."

Flowers: "Representative Bergman?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bergman. The Gentleman is in his seat."

Flowers: "No further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke now wishes to verify those

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

voting in the affirmative. Mr. Clerk."

Parke: "Thank you very much. I would like to ask Representative Burke?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Parke..."

Parke: "Thank you, I see him. Representative Capparelli?"

- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Parke, do you wish to dispense with the reading of those voting in the affirmative? Do you wish to dispense with reading of those voting in the affirmative and get right to the calling of the names? Or would you wish the Clerk to call those. Mr. Clerk, read those voting in the affirmative."
- Clerk Rossi: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative. Representatives Acevedo. Boland. Bradley. Brosnahan. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Crotty. Barbara Currie. Julie Curry. Dart. Davis, Monique. Erwin. Fantin. Feigenholtz. Flowers. Fritchey. Giglio. Giles. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Howard. Kenner. Kosel. Krause. Lang. Lopez. Lyons, Joseph. McCarthy. McGuire. McKeon. Moore, Eugene. Morrow. Harold Murphy. Novak. O'Brien. Phelps. Pugh. Ronen. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Scott. Scully. Silva. Smith. Stroger. Turner, Arthur. Weaver. Woolard. Younge, and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Now, Representative Parke, questions of those voting in the affirmative."
- Parke: "Yes, again I would like to have Representative Capparelli?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Capparelli. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Capparelli is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Parke: "Representative Fritchey?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Fritchey is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Parke: "Representative Crotty?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crotty is in her seat."

Parke: "I'm sorry. Sorry Representative, I didn't mean to do that. Representative McCarthy?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy, there he is, the Gentleman is in his seat."

Parke: "He is in his seat?"

Speaker Hannig: "In a seat."

Parke: "Representative Ronen?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Carol Ronen is in her seat."

Parke: "Hi, Carol. Representative Younge?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Parke: "Thank you. Hi, Wyvetter. I see her."

Speaker Hannig: "Is the Lady in the Chamber?"

Parke: "Representative...she is right there."

Speaker Hannig: "Oh, okay."

Parke: "Representative Kenner?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard Kenner. The Gentleman is at his seat."

Parke: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Phil Novak, is in the rear."

Parke: "Hi, Phil. Representative Deering?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Terry Deering. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? He is not recorded as voting, Representative."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative O'Brien?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Hannig: "Representative O'Brien, is at her seat. And Representative Capparelli has returned, Mr. Clerk. Add him to the Roll Call."

Parke: "Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Granberg is at the Well."

Parke: "Okay. Representative Scott?"

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Parke. Representative Wait has returned, Mr. Clerk. Return him to the Roll Call as voting 'no'. I'm sorry, Representative Parke, what was your next challenge?"

Parke: "Representative Giles?"

Speaker Hannig: "Giles. Representative Giles is in his seat."

Parke: "Representative Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady is..."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative L. Jones?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lou Jones."

Parke: "Lou Jones."

Speaker Hannig: "How is the Lady recorded? The Lady is not recorded as voting, Representative."

Parke: "Thank you, for helping me. Let's see, I'm looking for Representative McKeon? There he is, I see him."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman is in the middle aisle."

Parke: "I'm not doing well? Sorry. Representative Steve Davis?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Parke, he was verified off as a 'no' vote."

Parke: "Okay. I would like to ask the...no, I told Lang, he could go off. Then I would like to ask for Representative Krause?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Krause. Is the Lady in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is she recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Krause is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove her."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Parke: "Representative Weaver?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Weaver. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Representative Weaver. Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Weaver is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Parke: "Representative Kosel?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kosel. Is the Lady in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is she recorded?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Kosel is recorded as voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove her."

Parke: "I'm finished with my verification."

Speaker Hannig: "On that question, there are 50 voting 'yes'; 51 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "I would like for my Bill to be moved to Third Reading as is."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Granberg in the Chair."

Speaker Granberg: "House Bill 626, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 626, a Bill for an Act relating to delivery of Health Care Services. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 and 2, were adopted in committee. Floor #3, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady from Cook."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

House. House Bill...Amendment #3 to House Bill 626 makes some technical changes, and I'll be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have in regards to the Amendment."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Lady from Lake, Representative Moore."

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

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed Ma'am."

Moore, A.: "Representative, in committee, though the hour was late and I think it was Representative Phelps that pretty much expressed most people's opinion. There were a couple of questions that were pretty key to what we're doing here with this legislation, and one was the definition on page 4, of the primary care provider. And at that time there was much discussion about understanding who exactly could be designated as the primary care provider, and I would like a further clarification of that, please."

Flowers: "Representative, any licensed physician in this state may be a primary care provider."

Moore, A.: "But that would provide for any kind of a physician, so it almost guts the idea of a managed care system, if you have someone such as a cardiologist designated as the primary care physician. How do you, as an example, if you break your arm and you go to your primary care physician or if you just need sutures, the cardiologist is not in a position to be able to provide that immediate care for most circumstances. The whole HMO managed care concept is that you've got family practice and general practice physicians that will take care of much of the need for health care and then when specialists are required, they are able to refer on through the network. If anyone can be designated as a primary care provider, I fail to understand how this will

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

be...how this will work efficiently."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, you are absolutely right. And it is for that reason, you mentioned the cardiologist and it is for that reason that we have a definition for specialist."

Moore, A.: "But the definition for primary care provider would allow for a broad range of physicians, who are not in the practice of general practice medicine, to be designated as primary care providers and so I'm finding some difficulty with the current way the term is being defined."

Flowers: "Representative..."

Moore, A.: "I know your intent isn't that. That's not your intent. Do I understand that right?"

Flowers: "The HMO...no, the HMO is the one that created the gate keeper, so they will be the one to make that determination, as to who the primary care provider is. And I'm sure that they will not do anything..."

Moore, A.: "Are you saying the practical side of this will dictate how it will work?"

Flowers: "I would hope so, yes."

Moore, A.: "I'm not...I know that your intent is straightforward, but I'm just having some difficult with that one paragraph.

And then there is one other question on..."

Speaker Granberg: "Excuse me, Representative. Mr. Clerk."

Moore, A.: "The emergency care definition."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Clerk, you have an announcement."

Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Representative."

Flowers: "Representative..."

Moore, A.: "The definition of emergency care?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative. I'm sorry."

Moore, A.: "On page 2, emergency services. Under emergency services on line 28, to believe that urgent or unscheduled medical care is required. I think that that's a technical thing."

Flowers: "Representative, unscheduled...that's going to be taken out in another technical Amendment."

Moore, A.: "You are going to make that change?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Moore, A.: "When?"

Flowers: "Well, next week. I'm not going to do it today."

Moore, A.: "You're not calling this Bill today then, you're just amending it?"

Flowers: "Right."

Moore, A.: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed."

Mulligan: "Representative Flowers, I certainly applaud overall concept and want to support it. So, as long as we're discussing the Amendment and you have indicated to Representative Moore that you're planning one more Amendment at least next week, I also would like to discuss primary care physician which we brought up in committee I was concerned with the discussion in last night. committee because as you know, a Bill that you supported last year was a Bill that passed and signed into law that would allow an obstetrician gynecologist to be a primary care or gate keeper physician. So, I want to make it clear through your Bill that you would not gut that process through the way your Bill would be and either by specifically stating or designating it through your legal

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

intent to the Bill that you would not want to change that?"

Flowers: "Representative, that has never been my intention and will never be my intention."

Mulligan: "Well, I felt that was the case, I just felt that it was a little unclear and I wanted to make sure, because not that you might have that intention, but someone that might interpret this Bill should it become law."

Flowers: "That is not the intent, absolutely."

Mulligan: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Sir."

Parke: "Representative, most of the time when we've seen

Amendments that affect the insurance, health insurance,

normally these apply to those that have insurance that they

buy on the open market. Does this apply to self insurance

also?"

Flowers: "Representative, self insured plans are under ARISA..."

Parke: "Well, my understanding is that this affects ARISA."

Flowers: "Representative, we...ARISA preempts state law and we don't have the authority to do that."

Parke: "I understand that this affects all HMO's, all managed care entirely. That's the way our staff has said this Amendment affects. Do you have any idea how much money we're talking about influencing with this Amendment?"

Flowers: "I don't understand your question in regards to the money influence."

Parke: "Do you have any sense to what the increased cost of business will be with this Amendment? If we were to put

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

this Amendment on this Bill today and it became law, do you have any estimate of what it would cost Illinois business to apply your Amendment to their health insurance?"

- Flowers: "Representative, we do not have in this Act any specific mandates, health care mandates. So, therefore, we do not anticipate an increase in cost. We view this as regulatory reform."
- Parke: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment 3 that she would like to put on this Bill is estimated by the business community to increase the cost to your businesses, your small businesses and large businesses, approximately 10% increase in doing business in this state. If this Amendment was to go on, it would have an adverse affect on the business community. I know that she wants to try and help people who have needs. This is not the way to do it, this is overkill, this is a mistake. Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification of the Roll Call, and I would ask my colleagues to vote 'no' on this very expensive Amendment."
- Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Park has requested a verification. He is within his rights, that request has been acknowledged.

 Anything further? The Lady from McHenry, Representative Hughes."
- Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Flowers: "Speaker. Speaker, I would like to take this Amendment out of the record for now, please."
- Speaker Granberg: "Out of the record. Out of the record, ma'am.

 Representative Flowers, do you wish to take the Bill out of
 the record as well? Mr. Clerk, out of the record.

 Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Bills and Resolutions were

- 47TH Legislative Day

 referred, action taken April 19, 1997, reported the same
 back with the following recommendations: 'Be adopted'

 Floor Amendments #2 and 3, to House Bill 1730. Floor
 Amendment #1, to House Bill 2152. Refer to Third Reading
- Speaker Granberg: "Thank you. House Bill 1437. What is the status?"

House Bill 489."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1437 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Granberg: "Return it to Second. House Bill 1451. What is the status?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1451 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Granberg: "Return it to Second. House Bill 922. What is the status?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 922 is on the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Granberg: "Return it to Second. Any Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "Out of the record. House Bill 644, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 644, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Giles, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giles."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1, to House Bill 644 is basically a technical Amendment. It has some correct language in the Amendment to add on to the Bill. And I ask for your 'do adopt'."

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Black. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Granberg: "House Bill 687. Read the Bill. Third Reading. House Bill 687, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 687, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Floor Amendments have been approved...Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brunsvold, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "Representative Brunsvold. Floor Amendment #1,
 to House Bill 687. The Amendment is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Brunsvold, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "This Amendment would simply put in the proper dates as requested by the Department of Revenue."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption. Any further discussion? There being none, all in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 712. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 712, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. A Fiscal Note has been

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

requested on the Bill and has not been filed."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I would just like to leave it here for now."

- Speaker Granberg: "Out of the record. House Bill 724. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 724, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "This Amendment adds line locators and was brought to me by Representative Giglio. Appreciate adoption of this Amendment."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?'
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "If I could yield to Representative Mautino, he I think can help a little...provide help on..."
- Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Representative Cross's Amendment removes the opposition and clears up some problems that the home builders had with this Bill and takes it out of residential construction, returns the Bill to its original intent.

 Appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further

- 47TH Legislative Day

 Amendments?"

 April 19, 1997
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. A Home Rule Note has been requested on the Bill as amended and has not been filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Leave the Bill on Second. House Bill 762."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 762, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 788. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 788, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stroger, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stroger."
- Stroger: "Floor Amendment #1...changes the Bill to say that a physician may include a TB test as part of a health examination, instead of saying there will be no TB test at all."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? No one seeking recognition. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 932. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 932, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No

- 47TH Legislative Day

 Motions filed."

 April 19, 1997
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 932. Read the Bill. (House Bill) 933."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 933, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of this House
 Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No
 Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 957. Mr. Giles, do you wish to have that Bill called and moved to Third Reading? Out of the record. House Bill 974, Representative Moore. Representative Moore, do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading. Just indicate whether you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading."
- Moore, A.: "There's an Amendment, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Granberg: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 974, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #2, would become the Bill. It addresses the subject of the training of CPR and first aid in the states' grade schools and I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration. I'm available for any questions."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of this Amendment yield?"
- Speaker Granberg: "Proceed."
- Parke: "Representative Burke, I'm not sure...Amendment 2, now becomes the Bill and you have a Bill now that does what?"

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Burke: "It would address the subject of the training of CPR and first aid in grade schools. The elementary schools."

Parke: "Who's going to do the training in the grade schools?"

Burke: "We are identifying a couple of agencies such as the Save a Life Foundation and the American Red Cross, and we're going to eliminate the American Red Cross in a further Amendment."

Parke: "Is this a voluntary program?"

Burke: "Yes."

Parke: "There will be no fiscal impact to the state as far as you're concerned?"

Burke: "None."

Parke: "So, this is sort of feel good Bill now trying to help...'

Burke: "As you might know, Representative, in your community, you might very well find that your paramedics and police departments assist in the public grade schools and offer these programs currently. We have identified..."

Parke: "Why do we have to do this by state law? Why don't we do that voluntarily?"

Burke: "We have identified a program which is being sponsored by the Save a Life Foundation that has developed a curriculum that is specifically designed for elementary school children through grades K through 8."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Moffitt.

Proceed."

Moffitt: "Representative, initially, I mean the Bill is totally changed now. Is that correct? Because initially the business community, the chamber was opposed, I assume there is no opposition now. Is that correct?"

Burke: "There is no opposition that I'm aware of. The original Bill would have identified a funding source which would

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

have been a dollar surcharge on rental vehicles in the State of Illinois. We no longer have identified a funding source, we have discovered that there are some federal funds that might be available for this particular program. So there would be no impact on the state."

Moffitt: "Okay. None on the state, but I assume, will there be any impact on the local school districts since that is where the training is going to take place?"

Burke: "No."

Moffitt: "Okay. I have certainly felt that this was needed for a long time, supported a Bill, I think in my first term down here. I think to be trained and responsible members of society we..."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment."

Moffitt: "We need more, I am very much in support of it."

Burke: "Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1012. Mr. Scott.

Out of the record. House Bill 1018, Mr. Holbrook. Read
the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1019. Mr. Holbrook. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1019, the Bill has been read a second

- 47TH Legislative Day

 April 19, 1997

 time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor

 Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1012.

 Representative Feigenholtz. The Lady in the Chamber? Lady in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1021...House Bill 1020, Representative Feigenholtz. Do you wish to move the Bill to Third? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1021. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1021. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1027, Representative Currie. Representative Currie, do you wish to move your Bill to Third? House Bill 1067, Mr. Phelps. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1067, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this Amendment was technical in nature, it moved the months for the levy hearing for, I think for correct from April to October, it was just incorrect in the original Bill."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Sir."

Black: "Representative, does the Amendment in any way open this up to a statewide issue, or is it specifically limited to your county?"

Phelps: "Very specifically focused, just for Saline County."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 1076,
Representative Ronen. Representative Carol Ronen. Out of
the record. House Bill 1087. Out of the record. House
Bill 1088. Representative Schakowsky. Is the Lady in the
Chamber? Lady in the Chamber? Out of the record. House
Bill 1106, Representative Saviano. Is Mr. Saviano in the
Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1111. Mr. Leitch.
David, do you wish to move this Bill to Third?"

Leitch: "What is the status of Floor Amendment #1?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."

Leitch: "May I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1?"

Speaker Granberg: "House Bill 1111. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1111, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Leitch, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "I would simply ask that it be adopted. It represents an agreement between the parties who were in contention, ICIC and the home builders, and the mechanical specialties were all in disagreement and this Amendment..."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. Just a quick question, Dave. There were some people that had come to me and said that there was supposed to be an agreement worked out that originally this was written there was only one company that was...that there were suppose to be more involved. Is this Amendment that

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

agreement?"

Leitch: "Yes."

Dart: "Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1181. Mr. Wirsing.

 Mr. Wirsing, do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading?

 Out of the record. (House Bill) 1271. Mr. Smith. Out of the record. House Bill 1292. Mr. Morrow. Charles, do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading? Out of the record. House Bill 1407. Mr. Brosnahan. Mr. Brosnahan, do you wish to...Out of the record. House Bill 1408. Ms. O'Brien. Representative O'Brien, do you wish to move the Bill to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1408, a Bill for an Act in relation to sex offenders. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 1424, Mr. Brosnahan. Out of the record. House Bill 1496, Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy, 1496, Harold. Do you wish to move the Bill? Out of the record. House Bill 1103, Mr. Murphy. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. (House Bill) 1103."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1103, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Harold Murphy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy, H.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill of House Bill

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

1103 and this Amendment simply, simply says that the retail rate law would no longer subsidize land-fills service by gas by methane gas. You know, last week, the other night, Thursday night, I had a lot of Members say we should not be subsidizing any of them and so we came with this Amendment. And that's all it says."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Sir."

Black: "Representative, staff notes in our file indicate that Floor Amendment #2, becomes the Bill, is that correct?"

Murphy, H.: "That's right."

Black: "It goes on to say that this Amendment restores the incinerator subsidy known as the retail rate law. Is that accurate portrayal?"

Murphy, H.: "That's not right."

Black: "I'm sorry, Representative, we had the wrong Amendment.

So, what you're doing is to remove, you're removing the state subsidy for methane gas land-fills."

Murphy, H.: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. So, in effect there would be no subsidy for any land-fill in the State of Illinois."

Murphy, H.: "That's correct."

Black: "That's an interesting...interesting concept. Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "Anything further? The Gentleman from Cook,
Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll wait until the Bill gets to Third Reading, before I make my remarks."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Speaker Granberg: "Thank you. Mr. Skinner."

- Skinner: "Representative, could you tell us how this could possibly work? That is, how continuing to force Com Ed to pay a subsidy could work after deregulation? I mean, all these competing electric companies, wouldn't this be an undue burden on Com Ed?"
- Murphy, H.: "Yes. First of all, first of all we haven't finished dereg. That's number one, and we don't know what it's going to be like. Number two, what we're doing, many people voted against the Bill for Robins, remember, because we didn't want to do the subsidy. All this is doing is making the playing field much more level by removing it from all land-fills. That's all."
- Skinner: "Well, Representative that is indeed the reason that I voted against the subsidy for Robins, and I think this is a very good Amendment. When we repealed the retail rate law, whenever it was two years ago, I read the Bill and found this subsidy was still in, I did not understand why it remained in. And I thank you for bringing this forth."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1499, Mr. Ryder.

 Does Mr. Ryder wish to move his Bill to Third? We will
 take that out of the record momentarily. House Bill 1501.

 Mr. Black. Mr. Black, do you wish to move your Bill to
 Third? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1513. Mr.

 Holbrook. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1513, a Bill for an Act to amend the Property Tax Code. Second Reading of this House Bill.

47TH Legislative Day

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor

Amendments. No Motions filed."

- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1543,
 Representative Monique Davis. Do you wish to move the Bill
 to Third Reading, Monique? Do you wish to move the Bill to
 Third Reading? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1543, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed. A State Mandates Note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Leave it on. The Bill shall remain on Second Reading. House Bill 1610. Representative Currie. Barbara, do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading, 1610? Mr. Clerk, are the Amendments filed? The Amendments have been filed and approved for consideration. Do you wish to call the Amendments? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1610, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendment does two things, this is the Bill that deals with safety belt, seat belt safety in the State of Illinois for children and for all the rest of us. The Bill originally introduced said that failure for front seat driver and passenger to wear a safety belt would be a reason for the police to stop the motorist. As you know, this is probably the only law in the State of Illinois, the law on the books that we do not enforce. What this Amendment does is say, 'yes, you can stop the car if the motorist and/or passenger

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

are not wearing safety belts but that, that stop does not give an arresting officer the opportunity to search the vehicle for example, or to look for other offenses.' Second, the Bill originally introduced, required children 12 and under to sit in the back seat of a car, the Amendment provides that that back seat requirement applies only to children four and under. Those are children who are already required to be in infant seats and the evidence shows that they are a whole lot safer in the those infant seats if they are in the back seat of the car. So, that's what the Amendment does. I would be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, an Inquiry of the Chair. If you would ask the Clerk, we want to make certain that Floor Amendment #2 and 3, have been withdrawn from the Bill?"

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments #2 and 3 were never approved for consideration."

Black: "Well, you know, I've heard the Rules Committee does things like that. So, we're on Floor Amendment #4 then, correct? Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Sir."

Black: "Representative, there are some interesting concepts in your Amendment. One of them, the mandatory back seat transportation for children under the age of four, what if I have a vehicle that doesn't have a back seat?"

Currie: "Then that provision doesn't apply."

Black: "What if it had a back seat but I took it out?"

Currie: "Don't know."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Black: "What if all I own is a pickup truck?"

Currie: "A pickup truck doesn't have a back seat, then the requirement does not apply."

Black: "So, if I own a Chevrolet Corvette and I have an 11 year-old child, all I have to do is make sure that child is in a safety belt, not necessarily in a back seat."

Currie: "No, under this Bill you're not required to put the 11 year-old in a safety belt unless the 11 year-old is sitting in the front seat."

Black: "Well, our staff tells us that that section was added back into the Bill. That provides each driver of a motor vehicle transporting a child six years and older but less than 16, shall be secured in the vehicle and properly fastened in a seat safety belt."

Currie: "Then that is current law."

Black: "That's current law."

Currie: "Right. The change in this Amendment, Representative, is that instead of saying as the original Bill did, that children 12 and under must sit in the back seat. It says children four and under must sit in the back seat. The issue here is safety and while it would be a good idea for parents to transport their six, eight, and 10 year-old and 12 year-old children in the back seat, this Amendment would not apply to children over the age of four but merely say that those kids who already have to be in infant seats and car carriers, will be a whole lot safer if they are in the back seat. That's particularly true if there are passenger side air bags, but it's true even if there aren't. So, we're narrowing the scope of the Bill, Representative."

Black: "Okay. If... sport utility vehicles are very popular today and vans and many of the passenger vans on the market today have two bucket seats in the front, they might then have

47TH Legislative Day

- April 19, 1997
- two captain chairs in the middle and they may have a bench seat in the back. In a van like that what is the back seat?"
- Currie: "Anything that isn't the front seat. I can check that out, Representative. I would imagine that the car carrier is safest on the bench seat but I will check that with the safety experts."
- Black: "That would be good information to have because that could be very confusing. The Chevrolet Suburban, for example, may have three bench seats behind the drivers section."
- Currie: "Well, if there are bench seats, that would be good."
- Black: "What if you've been one of those couples that have...let's say that you have quintuplets, so you have five children under the age of four, how are you going to get them all in the back seat?"
- Currie: "With difficulty."
- Black: "I would think so. Does that mean you have to leave two kids home when you go somewhere? They have to have a raffle, two kids stay home and three kids go."
- Currie: "Remember that each of those quintuplets must be in a child car carrier. I don't think that there is room, even taking into account the front seat passenger. I don't think there is room for five of them in your vehicle and perhaps what you might want to consider is buying a suburban."
- Black: "Yeah, but then I don't know what the back seat is. We have to get that defined."
- Currie: "I think that won't be tough. I think we can figure that one out."
- Black: "Okay. You said it didn't change current law so if all I have is a pickup truck and I have an infant, that infant can be in the front in the safety seat and if I have a

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

child under the age of 12, is it okay for that child to ride in the back of the pickup truck?"

Currie: "I don't know the answer but I will check it out for you."

Black: "I think I know in light of, I haven't been able to watch much television in the last couple of weeks but I do remember seeing an old news show. I think it was Dateline, and it dealt with this. Is the intent of your Bill to get children out of the road of air bags?"

Currie: "It is the intent of the Bill to make sure the children in passenger vehicles are treated safely. They are particularly at risk in the front seat when the car has air bags but the national consumer groups point out that the children are safer in any car if they are in the back seat. But this revision to 1610(sic-House Bill), as I say, narrows the scope of the requirement so that it would apply to much younger children than the Bill did as originally introduced."

Black: "One last question, and maybe you could get this answer for us as well. There are a number of cars on the road that were manufactured in the '60's, that don't have seat belts. So, what do we do then?"

Currie: "I assume that there is an exception for cars that are not equipped with seat belts. But the seat belt issue doesn't, is not addressed in this Bill."

Black: "Okay. Very interesting Amendment, Representative. Thank you very much."

Currie: "Creative, we thought. Creative."

Black: "Yes, very."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Biggins."

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

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Biggins: "What is the penalty for the driver if a child does not their seat belt on in the back seat?"

Currie: "That's current law and I don't know the answer. I'm not...nothing in the Bill as introduced or the Amendment deals with that issue. I don't know the answer."

Biggins: "How is the driver supposed to know if the child has the seat belt on?"

Currie: "Representative, you're talking about some other legislation. This Bill does not deal with children in seat belts. This Bill deals with children in the back seat and the effect of the Amendment is to lower from 12 to four, those children who must be seated in the back seat of an automobile. Those are the children that are required to be transported in infant carriers."

Biggins: "Thank you."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the most intense person at the Crystal Lake Expo that I was at two week-ends ago. At least I think it was two week-ends ago, maybe it was a month ago. The most intense lady that came up to me was attacking Representative Currie's Bill and the basic...her basic message was get out of my car. I'm capable of making the decision of where to put my kid. I've had my air bag disabled and I'm going to put my kid in the front seat and don't you dare vote to put..."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Skinner, to the Amendment, Mr. Skinner.

To the Amendment."

Skinner: "I thought this Amendment was about putting kids in back seats. Isn't it? It's not."

Speaker Granberg: "You can debate the Bill on Third, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I was going to pass up the opportunity to debate

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

the Bill on Third by debating it on Second."

Speaker Granberg: "Only if you promise you won't speak on Third."

Skinner: "I promise. I promise I won't speak on Third. So, the point I'm making is, while this may sound good, the Federal Government is about to open up the flood gates to allow people to unhook their air bags on the passenger side. There is a tremendous amount of pressure and once that happens, if this law is in effect, you will have a lot of intense people coming up to you the way this intense woman came up to me. So, I don't think the general idea is a good idea. Perhaps it's a good idea to lower it from 12 to four."

Currie: "Thank you. That of course is the point of the Amendment. If you don't like the Bill as it was originally introduced, you probably want to support this Amendment because it does narrow the scope of the..."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Turner, for what reason do you rise?"

Turner, J.: "Call the previous question."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the previous question.

All in favor say 'aye'; 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the previous question is moved. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. Mr. Myers, Rich Myers. Are you ready, do you want to move your Bill to Third Reading, Sir? Mr. Myers, what was that Bill number?"

Myers, R.: "House Bill 1329."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act to create the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Address Confidentiality for Victims of Domestic Violence

Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Myers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Myers."

- Myers, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1, basically changes the home of this program from the Secretary of State's Office to the Attorney General's Office. And it also adds one little clause in there that requests the Attorney General to write and promulgate rules dealing with the voter registration and absentee balloting of..."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1620. Mr. Kenner.

 Is the Gentlemen in the Chamber? Mr. Kenner. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1646, Mr. Schoenberg. Mr. Schoenberg. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1670, Ms. Zickus. Ann, do you wish to move your Bill to Third Reading? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1670, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zickus, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Representative Zickus."

- Zickus: "I'm sorry, I have Floor Amendment #2, I thought that was
 what we were going to be putting on it today. It's been
 filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Clerk, is there Floor Amendment #2?

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Withdraw Floor Amendment #1. Floor Amendment #2."

Zickus: "No, we need to keep Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Granberg: "You want to adopt Floor Amendment, you want to adopt both Amendments?"

Zickus: "Yes."

Speaker Granberg: "Floor Amendment #1."

Zickus: "Floor Amendment..."

Speaker Granberg: "I'm trying to help."

Zickus: "I thought we adopted Floor Amendment #1 the other day.

Floor Amendment...this Bill makes it a Class IV Felony for a person to represent that they are acting on behalf of any police, fire, emergency organization when soliciting funds."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Zickus."

Zickus: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2, just tightens up Floor

Amendment #1 and it says that they must knowingly perform
the..."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. House Bill 1679. Mr. Woolard, do you wish to move your Bill? (House Bill) 1679, Larry, do you wish to move the Bill? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1684, Mr. Scott. Doug Scott, do you wish to move your Bill, Sir? Read the Bill."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1684, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted on the Floor.

No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Scott, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Scott."

Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 cleans up a couple of things that came up in committee and to try and do some things that are...trying to meet some of the needs of the contractors involved."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 1685, Mr. Scott.

Doug, do you wish...1685, out of the record. (House Bill)

1699, John Jones. Mr. Jones. Out of the record. (House Bill)

1730, Mr. Lopez. Mr. Lopez, wish to move that Bill?

Out of the record. House Bill 1732. Mr. Dart. Mr. Dart,

do you wish to move that Bill to Third? Out of the record.

(House Bill) 1734. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1746,

Mr. Acevedo. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of this House Bill.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Acevedo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Take that out the record, yeah."

Speaker Granberg: "You want the Amendment out of the record or the Bill."

Acevedo: "The Bill."

Speaker Granberg: "Out of the record. (House Bill) 1755, Mr.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

Pugh. Mr. Coy Pugh. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1761, Joe Lyons. Out of the record. (House Bill) 1822. Barbara Currie. Does the Lady wish to move the Bill? Barbara in the Chamber? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1824, Mr. Stroger. Is Mr. Stroger in the Chamber? Does Mr. Stroger wish to move the Bill? Out of the record. (House Bill) 1912, Mr. Burke. Do you wish to move the Bill to Third Reading, Dan? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 1913. Do you wish to move that Bill? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1913, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Police Training Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 1915.

 Representative Ronen, do you wish to move the Bill to

 Third? Carol, do you wish to move your Bill to Third?

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1915 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ronen, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "The Lady from Cook."

Ronen: "We approved this Amendment in committee this morning."

Speaker Granberg: "Could you describe the Amendment?"

Ronen: "I'm going to, and I'm wondering if we could take this out of the record now, and move to this later? This is..."

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

- Speaker Granberg: "Out of the record. (House Bill) 2047. Mr. Murphy. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Does Harold wish to move his Bill? Out of the record. (House Bill) 2060. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2068, Mr. Turner. John. John, do you wish to move your Bill to Third? Out of the record. (House Bill) 2079, Representative Younge. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2120, Saviano. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2123, Brosnahan. Mr. Brosnahan, out of the record. (House Bill) 2131, Mr. Burke. Dan, do you want to move this Bill as well? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 2152,

 Representative Feigenholtz. Do you wish to move the Bill?

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2152, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment is actually just some cleanup language referring to non-custodial parent being subject to attachment or other provisional remedy in accordance with a procedure prescribed by the code."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We evidently had some erroneous information, so we're going to ask some

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

questions. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Granberg: "Proceed, Sir."

Black: "Representative, this is a very interesting Amendment. It says that assets determined to be those of the non-custodial parent, although not held in the name of the non-custodial parent shall be subject to attachment in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the Code of Civil Procedure. Who determines whether or not the assets of a non-custodial parent, although not in the name of the non-custodial parent? Who's going to determine the ownership of that asset?"

Feigenholtz: "The court, the judge will, Mr. Black."

Black: "What are you trying to get at here?"

Feigenholtz: "Mr. Black, the original intent of the Bill had to do with what the courts are already doing. And what we're trying to do...what the State's Attorney and Aurelia Pucinski are trying to do here is determine..."

Black: "That wasn't a very clear answer, Representative."

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, I'm working on it, Mr. Black. I'm trying to figure out what the score is too."

Black: "Well, let me just as you a question..."

Feigenholtz: "Let me read you my analysis, okay. The original Bill stated that any assets determined to be those of a non-custodial parent, although not held in the name of non-custodial parent, shall be subject to enforcement of the child support judgement as assets of the non-custodial parent."

Black: "Now let me give you a scenario and tell me if you think this would be covered under your Amendment. I go through a divorce and I remarry. I do not have custody of my children. I marry a women who owns a very expensive home, a \$1 million home. My ex-wife goes back to court for an

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

increase in the child support payments. Is there any scenario where the judge would say, oh, Mr. non-custodial parent, you own a \$1 million home and I'm going to attach that?"

Feigenholtz: "If you've married someone else, that's still not considered your assets. The title is still in the woman's name."

Black: "I think I understand, Representative, but my fear is, is that you are opening the door, I think what you're after is the transference of assets and that can get very tricky. For example, in the scenario that I described to you, my wife may also own, my second wife may also own a very expensive car and rather than put me on the title or any document that would say, joint custody, she keeps her name on the title and there is no right of survivorship. Again, would there be a methodology by which that vehicle could be attached?"

Feigenholtz: "If the car is truly your wife's, and it's not subject to attachment."

Black: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "We've narrowed the language from the original Bill."

Black: "Okay, I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll make a bargain with you. On Third Reading, if you will be able to answer these questions, because there is legitimate and justifiable fear as to how far a court may go in ruling assets that are not in the name of the non-custodial parent might be attached."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Black, that's why there's notice."

Black: "Okay, well, if we could just have a thorough understanding of your Bill on Third Reading debate so that we're...that everybody would be comfortable as to what

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

we're doing, that's fine. I have no further questions and I won't ask for any Roll Call on your Amendment, but hopefully you'll have this nailed down for us so that the fears may be unfounded, but they're no less legitimate."

- Feigenholtz: "Actually, the original language of the Bill was very broad. We've moved it back and what we're trying to do is codify..."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. (House Bill) 2197, Ms. Fantin.

 Is Arline in the Chamber? Does the Lady wish to have her Bill moved? Out of the record. (House Bill) 2224, Mr. Meyer. Jim, do you wish to move your Bill to Third Reading? Out of the record. (House Bill) 2239, Mr. Holbrook. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2251. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2251. Out of the record. (House Bill) 2282, Mr. Brady. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2282, this Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Mautino, explain the Amendment briefly."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this

 Amendment will allow government reciprocals to comply with

 our...or to get into our regulatory Act. Currently there's

 a grey area that's been put forward by the Department of

 Insurance. It is an agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentlemen moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, announcements. When the House reconvenes next Wednesday for purposes of your scheduling, it is the intent to have committees at 12:30, 12:30 Wednesday. And the House will convene at 1 o'clock. There will be just a few brief minutes, we're drafting a Motion to recommit certain Bills to the Calendar to the Rules Committee at the Member's request. House Bill 2107. Mr. Clerk, read that Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2107, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment makes some of the corrections in the original Bill. We took out a provision that the Department of Revenue didn't smile on. So I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Any discussion? All in favor shall say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Granberg: "Third Reading. The Lady from St. Clair,

 Representative Younge, for what reason do you rise?"
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Appropriation Education Committee will meet at 11:00 a.m., on Wednesday, in Room 118."
- Speaker Granberg: "Representative Currie now moves that the

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

following Bills be recommitted to the Rules Committee. House Bill 1732...Lisa, do you want to track these? (House Bill) 1732, 1734, 1200, 785, and 2239. All in favor of the Motion. All opposed. Motion adopted, the Bills are recommitted to Rules. We're waiting on one last request by Mr. Weaver. Not that request. Mr. Weaver, we're checking on one item, if we can do that. If we can do it, we will. Everyone can get ready to pack. We will be leaving very very shortly. It's Mr. Weaver that's holding us here. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 489, Mr. Weaver. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 489..."

Speaker Granberg: "Return the Bill to Second Reading."

Clerk Rossi: "No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Woolard, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Woolard."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Woolard, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Granberg: "Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2, actually addresses all of the concerns of those people who were in some dilemma as to whether or not they should support. Number 1 should have already been adopted, should it not?"

Speaker Granberg: "No."

Woolard: "Okay. Withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Granberg: "The Amendment is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Amendment #2 deletes all the concerns of those various

47TH Legislative Day

April 19, 1997

groups of Farm Bureau, Trail Lawyers, Department of State Police, Transportation, Natural Resources. Makes a good Bill great, and I think it deserves everyone's consideration."

- Speaker Granberg: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, to House Bill 489. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Out of the record. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, no. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

 Johnson, Tim: "I would like to...the record to reflect that it is
- Johnson, Tim: "I would like to...the record to reflect that it is my intention to vote 'no' on House Amendment #2, to...yeah,

 Floor Amendment #2, to House Bill 621 and I would ask the Journal to so reflect."
- Speaker Granberg: "Reflect in the Journal. The Lady from Cook, now moves that the House stand adjourned, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, until Wednesday, April 23, at 12:00 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the House is adjourned."
- Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Resolutions. Resolution 114, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 115, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 116, offered by Representative Stephens. House Resolution 117, offered by Representative Ronen. House Resolution 118, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 119, offered by Representative Giles, and House Resolution 120, offered by Representative Ronen. Resolutions are assigned to the Rules Committee. being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."