53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Speaker Hartke: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. Members will be at their chairs. We'll be led in prayer today by Representative Wanda Sharp with the Progressive Life Giving Word Cathedral in Maywood. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and stay standing for the Pledge. Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Gracious and Heavenly Father, we come before You just to say thank You, God. God, we thank You for the sun that shines, God. God, we thank You for waking us up this And God, we thank You for this Assembly morning, God. today, God. God, we ask You to be in this place, God. among us, God. God, we thank You for everything You've done in our lives, God. But God, we ask You to put Your arms around our families, God, for as we come to do Your will for the State of Illinois, God, we ask You to protect our children, God. Protect our homes, God. God, be there with them as they go to and fro, God. And God, we ask a special blessing this morning for Representative Hartke's mother, God. God, we ask You to touch her in a mighty way, God. God, You said by Your stripes we are healed, God. God, we walk today by faith, God. We ask You to heal cancer, God. We ask You to heal arthritis, God. We ask You to heal rheumatism, God. We ask You to heal high blood pressure, God. God, we ask You to heal everything that's not like You, God. Now God, we thank You for the Assembly. We thank You for every Representative that stands before We thank You for our leaders, God. We ask You to gird them up, God. Give them strength and knowledge to do what You have ordained them to do, God. And God, we will be so ever grateful to give You all the praise, for You are king of kings. God, we give You all the glory. In Jesus

- 53rd Legislative Day May 18, 1999 name and for His sake. Amen."
- Speaker Hartke: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Ryder."
- Ryder et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hartke: "Roll Call for Attendance. A report from the Republican side. Representative Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please, let the record show that we have no indication that any House Democrats have excused absences today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. (118) Members answering the quorum call. There's a quorum present and the House is in Session. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Lauren Beth Gash, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary-II Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May Reported the same back with the following 18, 1999. recommendations, Motion to concur, be approved consideration, 'short debate' Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 376, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 720, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1195, and Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1365. Representative Carol Ronen, Chairperson from the Committee on Children and Youth, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May 18, 1999 reported the same back with the following recommendations. Motion to concur, be approved for consideration, 'short debate', Senate Amendment #1 to House

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Bill 1399. Representative Calvin Giles, Chairperson on the Committee of Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May 18, reported the same back with the following recommendations. Motion to concur be approved for consideration, debate', Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1366. Representative Robert Bugielski, Chairperson from Committee on Registration and Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May 18, 1999 reported the same back with the following recommendations. Motion to concur be approved for consideration, 'short debate'. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2194. Representative Judy Erwin, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May 18, 1999 reported the same back with the following recommendations. Motion to concur, be approved for consideration, 'short debate' Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1657. Representative Sara Feigenholtz, Chairperson the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. Action taken on May 18, 1999 recorded the same back with the following recommendations. Motion to concur, be approved for consideration, 'short debate', Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 631. Representative Larry Woolard, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred. taken on May 18, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'do pass as amended short debate', Senate Bill 652. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following..."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair would like to announce that Chuck Vaughn is furnishing some desserts behind the chamber. So any Member that would like to have a snack, they are available. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "The House Rules Committee will meet at 12:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet at 12:15 in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "...recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."
- Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. There is a very small, little display in the front of the chamber that I would like to call your attention to. It is information regarding industrial hemp and products that are used in, where industrial hemp is used in the production. Representative Lawfer and myself, as well as the Senate, have sponsored a Resolution asking for a task force to study the possibility of Illinois being among the states growing industrial hemp. We're not on the Resolution now, but I just wanted you to be aware that we'll be referring to those products when we get to it. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair is preparing to go to Concurrence

 Motions on Senate Amendments. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1399.

 Representative Silva."
- Silva: "Thank you, Speaker. I concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1399. Essentially, the only change in it, is that it becomes the Bill. It's related to the 'Kid Care' and the Department of Human Services is to develop procedures to allow youth service agencies, employers, labor unions, local chambers of commerce, and religious organizations to assist in enrolling children in the program. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

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

Speaker Hartke: "She indicates she will."

- Durkin: "Representative, due to some of the chaos in here, could you just go over again a little bit what the Senate amended and why and what are you seeking concurrence on?"
- Silva: "What we're seeking concurrence on is, essentially, to have the Department of Human Services to develop procedures allowing other groups, religious organizations, youth service agencies, employers, and labor unions to help in assisting enrollment in the 'Kid Care' program throughout the State of Illinois. As you know, one of the, one of the priorities for Governor Ryan is to do outreach. This would simply allow the department to develop those procedures."
- Durkin: "How does that change from the original format of the Bill when we voted on this, originally voted on House Bill 1399?"
- Silva: "The original Bill, essentially, has been gutted. The, this particular Amendment becomes the Bill. The original Bill sought to include state at income eligible employees to enroll in 'Kid Care'. That's no longer a factor in this Bill."
- Durkin: "Now, is the Department of Public Aid, are they going to be sending out money to these different groups to develop procedures, or is there any money which is going to change hands from the state to these local agencies or local groups?"
- Silva: "No. Currently, the... as an example, the City of Chicago on report card day has actually worked on enrolling kids."
- Durkin: "Okay. Now, the way I read it, it says that would require public aid to develop produces allow youth service agencies, employers, local chambers, religious

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

organizations to assist them enrolling into the children's end of the CHIP Program. About a week ago, it was a big discussion about the intermingling of a... of religion and state. Now, if we're going to be allowing, if we're going to have encouraging religious organizations to participate in this type of procedure, do you anticipate that there will be any type of challenge under the Establishment Clause for violating a church and state separation?"

Silva: "No. It's just a... a service. It's a civic service that any group can engage in. In fact, there are, currently, for example, Lutheran Welfare."

Durkin: "Okay."

Silva: "In part they, they do the same thing anyway."

Durkin: "Sure. What I'm, I'm just trying to make, make sure that if they're going to develop procedures and somehow money is going to be funneled from the state to these different agencies."

Silva: "No."

Durkin: "Then why are we, why are they, what's the purpose of them developing procedures, then, if they're not going to receive anything from them?"

Silva: "I think that one of the purposes in developing the procedures is so that, in fact, perhaps, they can get some training on how to fill out these applications, who they need to direct people to, what departments, or what... just different kinds of resources."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you very much. I have no further questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you very much. I rise in, I rise in support of this Bill, as amended by the Senate. The original Bill I

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

had opposed, and it was to provide 'Kid Care' options to state employees, that already had health insurance, and I felt that this was not a wise use of dollars. But this Bill directs the agencies and directs a number of community organizations to get information out to the community on 'Kid Care' and I would ask for everyone's support."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Lady could tell us if any of these people are going to be paid to sign people up?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Silva."

Silva: "The department does have an incentive program that they've just started up."

Skinner: "Yes, and what is it?"

Silva: "It's, I believe, \$50 per application that's completed.

We know that, for example, the Chicago Public Schools are

not going to be asking for that. They're doing it as a

matter of public service."

Skinner: "Well, some of, some of us think that public service may not be enough of an incentive. Why aren't not insurance agents included in your Bill? Actually, they do this for a living. They know how to get people signed up."

Silva: "They're not excluded."

Skinner: "They're not included, either. I mean, most of them don't work, I mean, some of them work for religious organizations. I guess you could argue that Aid Association of Lutherans is a... a religious organization. But, where, where in your Bill does it say that insurance agent can get paid \$50 for signing someone up for this subsidy program?"

Silva: "Maybe that's a Bill you might want to introduce."

Skinner: "Maybe, if you want this program to succeed you should

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

include it in your Bill. The reason it hasn't succeeded is because nobody, personally, has a stake in signing these kids up."

Silva: "The Department of Public Aid could actually do that without contracting it... through contracting."

Skinner: "And where is that authorized?"

Silva: "Within the Federal Law."

Skinner: "Within the what?"

Silva: "The CHIP Federal Law."

Skinner: "I'm sorry. You're, you're either..."

Silva: "They can contact for doing outreach."

Skinner: "So, currently, the Department of Public Aid can contract with insurance agents, give them \$50 for every client that they sign up on this state subsidy program. Is that what you're saying?"

Silva: "No. That's not what I'm saying. If the depart...

depart... the department has that ability and I can't speak

for the department wanting to do that with insurance

companies."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I'm sure that you're intentions are good..."

Silva: "But they do have the authority."

Skinner: "I'm sure that you're intentions are good, but like most Democrats, you seem not to understand what the profit motive is all about. If you pay an insurance agent \$50, that's not much, but that's some incentive to get somebody out on the street to sign people up. I have no confidence that this is going to work."

Silva: "It's not just the matter of signing people up.

Applications have to be completed and processed. Not everyone has the ability to do that on the street."

Skinner: "Well, every insurance agent does. I can guarantee you

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

that or they don't have a license. Certainly, you can't guarantee every member of a religious organization has the ability to do that or every member of a school district. I mean, you know I didn't vote for this program to start with, but I certainly know that it can be run better than the way it's being run now. How many people have been signed up so far?"

Silva: "I, I don't have any idea. I believe it's around 30,000 under the new program, which the..."

Skinner: "How many were estimated... How many were estimated to be eligible last year when this program passed?"

Silva: "I, I didn't hear you."

Skinner: "How many eligible children are there in the state?"

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Skinner: "Two hundred and fifty thousand?"

Silva: "The... yeah. The original number, I believe was over 200,000 that are eligible."

Skinner: "So, we've signed up..."

Silva: "There's a new study that's coming out that will be putting forth those statistics."

Skinner: "So, we've signed 14 or 15% of the total in the first year. This program then, is a dismal failure. You're trying to make it better, but why haven't you taken the next logical step, which is get insurance agents involved?

Do you have a..."

Silva: "Well, if you're interested in that, maybe we could discuss that later and vote on this Bill now."

Skinner: "We're, we're discussing it right now. Why did you decide not to allow the private sector to be involved?"

Silva: "Well, it... it seems that you have a good handle on that and if you think that that's something that's viable, maybe you ought to introduce that legislation next time around."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Skinner: "Well... well, Representative, if you would move to nonconcur we could do this year."

Silva: "I'm voting to concur."

Skinner: "What a surprise."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "She indicates she will."

Osmond: "Ma'am, Representative, I agree with Representative Skinner, in that the professional insurance agents should be included in this. We're licensed to understand the product. We're licensed and have the ability to explain the product. And I think that that is a fault in here by not having that available. But I think the Department of Insurance should have an opinion on this, if we're going to open it up to any members that you're listed here and then pay a commission to do so. And I would like to see an opinion from the Department of Insurance on this."

Silva: "Well, I would encourage you to talk to the Department of
Public Aid and work on that. It doesn't prohibit them from
doing that. I want to be able to pass this Bill and I
concur with the Senate Amendment, as it is right now."

Osmond: "Is there anything in here that, that, that would proclude (sic-preclude) a professional insurance agent from receiving the \$50?"

Silva: "No. Not this legislation."

Osmond: "Is it only limited to the organizations that you're... that you have on the Amendment?"

Silva: "I don't think so. I think that if there are other groups that want to do that civic duty, they're more than welcome to do it. If..."

Osmond: "If a person is a member of a Chamber of Commerce would

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

that make that eligible?"

Silva: "I didn't hear you."

Osmond: "If a person is a member of a local Chamber of Commerce, which is listed in the Amendment, would that make it eligible then to... to have that?"

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

Osmond: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clarify for some people the reason there was a low... low number of applicants. One of the reasons was a 13 page application. This new and current administration has reduced the application process to 2 pages. So, we're sure that those who are eligible will now come forward and complete a 2 page, rather than a 13 page application. I think it's a good Bill and I vote to concur with the... with the Sponsor."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Silva to close."

Silva: "I would encourage you to remember that this is a priority of Governor Ryan. He seeks to do that outreach that we have failed to do in the last year and I would encourage you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1399?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? There are two people that have not recorded themselves. Please, record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 Members voting

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

'yes', 2 persons voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1399. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules to which the following items were referred. Action taken on May 18, 1999 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'motions to concur' Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 90, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 107, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 227, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 379, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 734, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 806, Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 842, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 943, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1762, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1809, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1893, Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1959, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1987, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2013, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2217, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2527, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2721, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2792. To the floor for consideration, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 595, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 602, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 605, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 607, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 610, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 611, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 612, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 629, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 630, and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

632."

- Speaker Hartke: "On page 14 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 720. Representative Lyons. Joe Lyons."
- Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 720. Most of you are very familiar with this Bill. We've run it out of here twice with over 100 votes both times. The Senate Transportation Committee recommended that we take the issue of the excessive speeding Bill for 40 miles over the speed limit, take it out of the reckless driving part of the code and make it as a stand alone Class A misdemeanor. So, that is what they passed out of the Senate, 59 to 0. We passed out of Judicial this morning. I would ask for your favorable consideration in concurrence with this Amendment."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 720?' This is final action. All those in favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this... and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 720. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2194. Representative Tenhouse. Out of the record. On page 16 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1365. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in... in Senate Amendments to 1365. This is the Bill that would allow for

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

decertification of police officers if they commit certain including felonies and certain enumerated crimes. misdemeanors. Essentially, what they Amendment does, is it just indicates that the State Police shall provide to the Local Government Law Enforcement Training Board, the information regarding criminal charges, convictions, and their dispositions of applicants, academy applicants, law enforcement applicants, or law enforcement officers whose fingerprints, identification cards, are on file with the department. I believe that the State Police is okay with this, as are all of the police groups, as well as the FOP, and others. I ask that we concur and send this to the Governor."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1365?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1365. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk Bolin: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Hartke: "On page 13 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 376. Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. On page 16, appears House Bill 1195. Representative O'Connor. Representative O'Connor."

O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1195 has Senate... Sen... Senate

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Amendment 1. I'd respectfully request concurrence. Senate Amendment #1 in substan... in... contains the language of House Bill 1196, which the Senate added. That legislation passed out of this Body with a vote of 116 to 1. part of the Illinois Attorney General Safe to Learn In pertinent part, it increases the penalties for the unlawful sale of a firearm from a Class III... to a Class III from a Class IV Felony, where the sale occurs to a 20... an individual who's 21 years or younger and it was also misdemeanored, or to a person under the age of 18 that does not have a FOID card. It also enhances the penalties for the sale of a firearms on a school ground, making it a Class I Felony. In the event of a second offense of sale on the school ground, it... it increases the It makes it a Class I Felony, but for a minimum penalty. of a five-year period. As I mentioned, this is part of the Illinois Attorney General's Safe to Learn Program. underlying legislation made it a... increased the penalties for the discharge of a firearm on a school property or into a school ground. So, it is consist... the Amendment is consistent with the... the underlying legislation. happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1195? This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1195. And this Bill

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1657. Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1657. The underlying Bill passed the House unanimously. It made a minor change to the Illinois Veteran Grant Program that's administered the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. by legislation, simply, was necessary to reflect the new lapse period spending that rules and regulations. Amendment #1 incorporates into the underlying Bill the language that was in House Bill 1722, that was sponsored and passed the House. It was sponsored by Representative Cowlishaw. This is a technical rewrite of the Special Education Teacher Tuition Scholarship Program. It makes no substantive changes. Ιt just simply brings that scholarship into current language with the statute in practice. I'd be glad to answer any questions you have."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1657?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1657. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 20 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2194. Representative Tenhouse."

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

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

House. I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2194. This is exactly the same language that was on House Amendment #1, that was recommended out of committee earlier, and actually was not adopted, only because the Bill got down on the Consent Calendar before we had an opportunity to attach it to the Bill. And all this does is agreed language with a permanent professional regulation, relation to CPAs that puts us in... in a movement toward uniformity, as far as national standards is part of the requirements that's coming down, as far as American Institute of CPAs. And I would ask concurrence of the House to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2194."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2194?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this... on this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2194. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page Calendar, appears of the House Bill 1366. Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1366, Senate Amendment 1, simply, strikes the words 'our employee'. It allows more flexibility for small water commissions to allow them, it... it's strictly permissive to allow the appointing authority to pay someone if they are an employee of, of one of the towns or counties that are part of the water system."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Since no on is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1366?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2527, Representative Ryder. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. On behalf of Leader Daniels, I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment 1. This is the supplemental appropriation. It includes some clarifying language for Member initiatives. It also includes some of the various dollars that the state uses. It is the supplemental, not the budget, and there are a number of miscellaneous items. The total is 44,000,000 GRF, about 33 other funds, for a total of \$77,000,000. I would be happy to answer specific questions, or if you wish to have a more detailed description of the various items contained herein, I'd be happy to answer."

Speaker Hartke; "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2527?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those 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 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment

53rd Legislative Day

- May 18, 1999
- #1 to House Bill 2527. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Repre... Representative Lopez."
- Lopez: "Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker. I'd like to announce there will be an immediate caucus, Democratic Caucus in Room 114.

 There will be an immediate caucus for all Democrats at Room 114."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There will also be a Republican Caucus, immediately, in Room 118."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Democrats will caucus in Room 114, immediately. Republicans will caucus in Room 118. And the House will reconvene at 2 p.m."
- Speaker Hartke: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 349? Representative Moore."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 349 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 376. Representative O'Brien."
- O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. What this Bill, as drafted in the House, established a... the offense of tampering with anhydrous ammonia tank or its apparatuses, which would be the hoses or... or anything involved in it. It also, eliminated civil liability for the owner of the property that the tanks sits on and the distributor and the chemical fertilizer dealer and we were concerned, although that Bill passes with unanimously, here in the House. We were

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

concerned because of the single subject rule issue that we have. So, Senate Amendment #1 strips everything, except for the criminal portions and it establishes, again, the offense of tampering and it makes it a Class A misdemeanor. And the civil portion of that Bill is contained in Senate Bill 105. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

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

Speaker Hartke: "She indicates she will."

Durkin: "Representative, you indicated that there was some concern that Senate Amendment 1 had a single subject matter concern. What was the concern?"

O'Brien: "No."

Durkin: "No?"

O'Brien: "As amended... What the Amendment does is take away that issue. It had a civil and a criminal aspect in the Bill as drafted. Senate Amendment #1 strips out the civil part and just leaves the criminal portion."

Durkin: "What do you plan on doing with the civil... portions?"

O'Brien: "It is... it is contained in Senate Bill 105, is the... is now the civil portion."

Durkin: "Okay. Is Senate Bill 105 an Amendment to the Civil Code of Procedure?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Durkin: "Do you anticipate that there will be a problem with merging that with that Bill, so we can avoid any type of Constitutional problems in the future?"

O'Brien: "I don't believe that there's going to be any problems with it."

Durkin: "Okay. Briefly, what exactly are we doing with this Amendment again? Can you just give me a <u>Cliff Note</u> version

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

of what you're doing with the Amendment?"

O'Brien: "I'm just seeking a concurrence, because what it does is as amended the Bill will only have the criminal portions.

It establishes the... creates the offense of tampering with an anhydrous ammonia tank or any apparatuses, only of the, the hoses or anything for..."

Durkin: "Just kind of curious, what, what has brought this... what motivated you to bring this Bill? Is this a problem that's going on in your district or...?"

O'Brien: "A... Actually, it's just starting now to creep north.

It started a few years ago in Missouri. It has crossed over the border. Anhydrous ammonia is a very wonderful chemical that's used in the farming industry, but it's also a very dangerous chemical, and it's also used by criminals to make methamphetamine. And... because of that, there's been a lot of, of theft and, and stealing of these tanks."

Durkin: "Well, thank you very much. I appreciate your patience."
O'Brien: "You're welcome, Representative Durkin."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Act... Actually, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recognized on a point of personal privilege. So, if you could call me at the appropriate time?"

Speaker Hartke: "Will do."

Schoenberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion on the legislation?"

O'Brien: "Anytime, Jeff."

Speaker Hartke: "Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative O'Brien to close."

O'Brien: "I just, again, seek an 'aye' vote on the Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 376?' This is final All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed voting '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 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 376. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 90. Representative Holbrook. Excuse me, out of the record. Representative Schoenberg."

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're joined here today by the class, by a class from St. Athanasius School in Evanston, Illinois. And let's give them a warm Springfield welcome. This is my parish. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "On Supplemental Calendar, appears House Bill...

Senate Bill 340. Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk. Mr.

Mautino. House Bill 340. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340. This is a Bill for the Criminal Justice Information Authority. It will add the Director of the Law Enforcement, Training, and Standards Board to the Criminal Justice Information Authority. Everyone is agreed. What Senate Amendment does... #1 did was to delete the word 'or designee', which means the director, himself, must attend all the meetings. And that's the same as it is for all the rest of the officers."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

Mr. Durkin."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Frank, just to get back to what you just said, this is going to eliminate the executive... this will take the Executive Director of Law Enforcements Standards away, out of the Criminal Justice Information Act?"

Mautino: "No, no, no. It... the, this Bill... Currently, the Director of Law Enforcement, Training, and Standards Board is not a member of the Criminal Justice Information Authority. This Bill creates a seat on that authority, which is designed to give out about \$40,000,000 in, in federal funds back to policing agencies. The original language that was put in there said, 'the... the executive director or his designee,' would attend those meetings. Since none of our Constitutional officers or the head of the State Police can allow a designee to go to the meeting in their stead, we took that out."

Durkin: "Okay. Just briefly, do these people... do you know if there, if this is a compensated position or is this just strictly, do they... are expenses paid for them for whatever occurs..."

Mautino: "Expenses and what has occurred."

Mautino: "Right."

Durkin: "But this is not a salaried position, correct?"

Mautino: "No, no. This is not a salaried position."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 340?' All

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 340. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 842. Representative Andrea Moore. Representative Moore."

- Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 842. The Senate made several Amendments to... made one Amendment to this House Bill. It was clarifying the issue of appointed officials receiving insurance and so, I would move to concur."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 842?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. question there were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 842. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1809, Representative Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to concur with

 Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1809. The underlying

 Bill addresses the reduced fee registration option that

 limits second division vehicles to a restricted number of

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

miles per year. If the individuals exceed that number of miles they will have to pay a charge. And a surety is put up in lieu of this and this... the language of the Amendment is agreed language between the Secretary of State and the insurance industry. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1809?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 were 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill... and this House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1809. And this Bill having received a... received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 90. Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you. House Bill 90, we wish to concur with the Senate Amendment. It just does some clean up language and does some limitations on who a victim can... the procedure the victim can be notified on whose perpetrated the crime against him."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, as you said, that what you want to do is that under certain... certain circumstances you want to release vital information to victims of for... on juveniles, for... for crimes that juveniles committed upon

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

them, correct?

Holbrook: "Correct."

Durkin: "Is it for all crimes or are we talking about property crimes, violent crimes, or is it... is there any, can it be for any type of offense? Any offense which there is a victim. Doesn't make a difference whether or not it's, it's something like an aggravated battery down to somebody burglarizing an automobile, correct?"

Holbrook: "Correct."

Durkin: "Okay. And how would this information be disseminated?

Would they have to petition the court to, to get this information?"

Holbrook: "Correct."

Durkin: "Okay. Now as I read it, it says, 'that there must be a clear and convincing standard, which is going to be used in order for the... who is the victim to get this information.' Is that correct?"

Holbrook: "That's correct. It's a good Bill."

Durkin: "Okay. Is there any limitation which the... that party has upon using this information? Can they use it just for their basic, for... I just... if they just say, 'I want to know some information about this person. We've been victimized by him, through this juvenile crime.' Or do they have to show that they're going to use it for some type of legal proceeding, perhaps a civil proceeding, or do they just the option of getting it without establishing what their reason is?"

Holbrook: "Correct. Only, only if they're going to use it, specifically, for those reasons outlined in the Bill. Civic, civil, or to protect themselves. They have to show a specific reason why they need the information and it's limited what they can do with the information."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Durkin: "Okay. So, we're leaving it up a court, a court to make that decision, whether or not they feel that the information that they potentially are getting is going to be used for some type of purpose, which is going to be a reasonable purpose, just not for a reason that person wants to keep this information, you know, written on a piece of paper and I just want to make sure I have it. There, there has to be something more than that, correct?"

Holbrook: "That's correct."

Durkin: "Great. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 90?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 90. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill... or House Bill 734, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 734. I think that we've seen this piece of legislation before. The Amendment is, basically, taking a piece of legislation that was passed out of this Body unanimously earlier this year, provides that the inmate of a penal institution that causes or attempts to cause an employee of the penal institution to come into contact with either blood, seminal fluid, urine, feces, by throwing or tossing on to that employee shall be prosecuted and this is aggressive battery. Would

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

appreciate your consideration of this Senate Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Woolard: "Certainly not."

Cross: "Is this the t... I mean, third Amendment that we're adopting? Representative or..."

Woolard: "Senate Amendment 1."

Cross: "Senate Amendment 1. Okay. I'm sorry, we... this

Amendment really smells, to be honest with you and if you

could, but in a good way. If you could explain it again to

us, we'd appreciate it. We couldn't hear you over here,

Representative."

Woolard: "I think there's a lot of people that work in the penal institutions in this state that have been abused by inmates in various ways. None any more distasteful or disgraceful or unacceptable than having either urine, or feces, or whatever if might be, thrown in your face. We had guards present in the committee hearing some few weeks ago, that had experienced this circumstance. We believe, without question, this is intolerable and this Bill would give us the ability to prosecute with..."

Cross: "I, I don't think anyone disagrees with that, Larry, at all. Can you... and everyone wants to stop that. What does the Bill give... what authority does it give?"

Woolard: "It would be an aggravated offense if it was an aggravated battery... offense."

Cross: "You, you... they can be charged if, if any of these items that you mentioned in the Bill are utilized, it will become an aggravated battery, as opposed to a battery?"

Woolard: "Yes."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Cross: "Are there any steps that,... or does... maybe perhaps, the director of the department already have the authority to discipline internally. Does this give them additional authority, to discipline inmates, in addition to the criminal offense, Larry?"

Woolard: "I don't think there's any additional authority given, but it certainly gives recognition to the fact that this conduct has been committed and would give the justification for the people in the penal institution to proceed with whatever penalties or punishments would be justified by the director."

Cross: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Woolard to close."

Woolard: "I, I believe without question this is good..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 734?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 118 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and O voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 734 and this Chair... Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1959, Representative Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3. The Senate Amendments would clarify that the service agency could not use state dollars to stop unions, but they could use private money and they could a... not have meetings during business hours, but they could have any kind of other activity and send their

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

members anything they wanted to say that they did not need a union as long as it wasn't during business time. And I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Cross: "Todd, is there any opposition to this Bill?"

Stroger: "Hold on just a second, Tom."

Cross: "I'm, I'm sorry. Oh, all right."

Stroger: "Can we take this out of the record for a minute, while

I get my able assistant?"

Cross: "Definitely."

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 2013. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amend... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2013. This is, basically, cleanup language for the Reserve Officers Training Corp. Basically, what it does, is it allows to make sure... in the original language it said that these scholarships would be available, but the language was not clear enough to allow incoming freshman and/or transfers from other schools to take the, take the scholarships and this... the language the way it is will allow them to do that. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2013?' This is final action. All of those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there were 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2013. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1959. Representative Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer the last question that was asked, the Catholic Conference is opposed to this Bill and also the Health Care Association."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all... if the Sponsor would yield, but before I get to that point, in the event this Bill gets the... or this Motion gets the requisite number of votes, we request a verification on this side of the aisle. I assume that the nod is an acknowledgement."

Speaker Hartke: "Your wish will be granted."

Cross: "What? Yes."

Speaker Hartke: "Your request will be granted."

Cross: "I apologize for bringing that up in mid swallow.

Representative..."

Stroger: "Yes, Sir."

Cross: "Todd, I'm sorry. I didn't hear the answer. You said there was some opposition."

Stroger: "Yes, the Catholic Conference and... the Catholic Conference and the Health Care Association."

Cross: "All right and I understand too that the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is also opposed to this. Can you tell us what this Bill does in its entirety, with both Senate Amendments 1 and 3? And I... you may have explained it earlier, it's just impossible to hear on the House Floor right now. And Mr. Speaker, I think this is a rather important Bill with

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

some significant issues, if we could get some attention here."

Speaker Hartke: "Your point is well taken. Ladies and Gentleman, please. This is final readings. Shhh. Please, let's give the speaker... the speakers your attention. Shhh. Thank you. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I'm just... I'm waiting on an answer."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Stroger."

Stroger: "With the Amendments, it changes the language of the Bill a bit, to say that the employer cannot use state funds to help or harm a union that they're organizing. But it also states that they can use their private, cooperate funds, if they wish. But they cannot allow... but they cannot demand that the workers come during working hours and have classes on why they shouldn't be in the union."

Cross: "So, I want to make sure that every... that we understand this. If I, if I receive state money..."

Stroger: "Mr. Speaker, could I take this out of the record, please?"

Cross: "We're not... no objection."

Stroger: "Mr. Speaker."

Cross: "Take it out of the record."

Stroger: "Could we take this out of the record?"

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 1987. Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... I rise to concur with House... with, with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1987.

House Bill 1987 is designed to allow for low income property developers to receive or to maintain the incentive that they received on the front end of the development process, that was originally taken away. And this particular Amendment would allow for that incentive to be

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

maintained. And I'm ready to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "You know, Mr. Speaker, I apologize again, but it's the ability to hear in here is somewhat tainted and I..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh. Please."

Cross: "If perhaps, the, the Sponsor could explain again what Senate Amendment #1 does. Will... will the Sponsor..."

Pugh: "Senate, Senate Amen... Senate Amend... the Senate Amendment is merely a technical Amendment that changes the... the wording to say, specifically, where appropriate these developers will maintain that incentive that is initially allotted to them through the purpose of the over... overriding Bill. The overriding... program and that was to allow for low income housing to be developed as a result of a developer receiving an incentive from a local government."

Cross: "Would this apply, Coy, statewide?"

Pugh: "Yes, it does."

Cross: "And this is a proposal, the underlying Bill is a proposal of the Illinois Housing Development Authority?"

Pugh: "This is an initiative of the, of, of Mr. Houlihan's office. And... and it... it applies to the Housing Development Authority, they have... they have a role."

Cross: "I'm sorry ours just indicated... our file indicated that

Housing Development Authority supported it. But do the
assessors, if you know, statewide support this Bill?"

Pugh: "There, there hasn't been any... to answer specifically, I can't... I haven't had any dialogue with the county assessors statewide, but there hasn't been any objections."

Cross: "All right. Are you aware... I, I don't see any opposition, Coy, on our side, in our file. Do you know of

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

any opposition to the Bill?"

Pugh: "No, I... No, I do not.

Cross: "All right. I don't have any other questions. Thank you,

Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1987?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill having received... And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1987. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 227, Repre... Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking for a concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 227. This is a technical change to the... to the original Bill, which changes the various penalties for aggravated pos... possession of a firearm and I should quote, 'of a stolen firearm'. This is a technical change, in that, we found that a Class III for possession, was typed in as a lower sentence than a Class II. So, this was a technical change to the Bill. Other than that, I would ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Cross: "Representative, it appears that the Senate Amendment,

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

primarily, deals with the... if I'm, if I'm reading it correctly, the sentencing segment of this Bill. Is that, and maybe you said that, is that correct?"

Delgado: "That is correct, Representative."

Cross: "Do you know of... if there's any opposition to the Amendment?"

Delgado: "No. There's no opposition, Representative. Basically, what happened was, we applied... we, we realized that we... that one of the sentences would have been less than a Class II. So, we've... so, in essence, what we did was just corrected, the Senate corrected it for us. And it doesn't remove or, actually, it doesn't do anything to the Bill, other than correct certain sentences."

Cross: "Just with respect to the sentencing levels, if I'm reading it right."

Delgado: "Exactly."

Cross: "So, the... in, in the substanent (sic-substantive) portion of the Bill remains the same."

Delgado: "Absolutely, Representative."

Cross: "And at that point, there was no opposition, as well, if I remember correctly."

Delgado: "There is no opposition to this Bill, whatsoever."

Cross: "You had eliminated with an Amendment the NRA's opposition, if I'm not mistaken, and it remains that way.

Okay."

Delgado: "That's right. Everybody's on board this ship."

Cross: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Delgado: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 227?' This is

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 227. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 107, to Mr. Davis. Steve Davis."

- Davis, S.: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 107. Senate Amendment 1 is agreed language between CMS and the Department of Veteran Affairs and it has to do with requiring a copy of a DD-214 certificate or other acceptable evidence before people can be put on the Veterans Preference List. And I would move for... the concurrence."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're having trouble hearing on this side of the aisle. I wonder if, Ladies and Gentlemen..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, would we please pay attention to the speakers. Will staff please move to the rear of the chamber? Take your conversations down. Shhh. Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I, I just wondered if the Gentleman could briefly explain the Amendment again that we're concurring to."
- Davis, S.: "Yes. The Amendment is agreed to betwe... is an agreed Amendment between the Department of Central Management Services and the Department of Veteran Affairs.

 It has to do with requiring proof of discharge from service

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

for veterans preference hiring and it requires a copy of the DD-214 certificate or other evidence acceptable to the Department of Central Management Services and it deletes language, allowing use of a discharge certificate or report of separation."

- Stephens: "All right. This doesn't change the rules, as to who qualifies for veterans preference?"
- Davis, S.: "Absolutely not. What this does... we had a problem with people being put on to the preference list before they were verified. So, what we're doing is trying to verify them before they take up spaces on the preference list."
- Stephens: "All right. So... To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

- Stephens: "... what this does is, if a person seeking employment with the State of Illinois makes claim to be a veteran, before we've had a chance to verify that, it is part of the record that they are a veteran and then we find later that when we check their DD-214 that, indeed, they do not qualify for veteran status. And that causes complications in people that... to be hired or have been hired. And this would.... this is a Bill that veterans and those who support veterans should favor. I would stand in support of the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 107?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. There are four people not voting. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

record. On this question, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and, 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 107. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 137, Representative Davis."

Davis, S.: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137. It's an Agreed Amendment with the Retail Beverage Association and what it does, it requires distributors, in a case of a retailer located in a county with a population of, at least, 3,000,000 people or in a county adjacent there to, the retailer agrees to purchase, at least, \$200 of wine and spirits from the distributor every two weeks. In all other counties not covered above, the retailer agrees to purchase, at least, \$50 of wine or spirits from the distributor every two weeks. I would ask for an 'aye' vote in, into the concurrence."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 254. Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Bill 254. You might recall, this Bill had to do with violators of the Wildlife Code and penalties and suspension of licenses. Went out of here with a... with a large majority of votes and the Senate, simply, clarified the language. We met in Senator Bob Madigan's office with the DNR to, to maybe, or to indicate that the suspension of license, for example, a hunting license would refer only to activities dealing with hunting and not fishing activities. So, it was a clarification in the Senate Amendment, which was agreed on, with the DNR. And I would ask for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 254?" This is final action. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'... by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 254. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2217. Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "I thank you. I, I move to concur in the Senate

Amendment to 2217. I..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Klingler: "This Amendment reflects an agreement between the Department of Human Services and the Poverty Law Project, concerning the Child Care Assistance Test Program for the non-TANFs recipients enrolled in the education and training activities. The parties reached agreement on the following

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

items: a cap allocation of 7.5 million for this program, DHS agreed to write the necessary implementing rules for the persons in each of the following three categories of education and training will be eligible for child care assistance: 1) Below post secondary, which includes literacy and other adult basic education, 2) Nondegreed occupational vocational training, three and two, two-year college degree programs. A child care assistance would be available during time periods that are reasonably related to the education or training activity, including class hours and research. The Department of Human Services shall allocate 7.5 million dollars, annually, for a test program for families who are income eligible for child care assistance, who are not recipients of TANF and who need child, child care assistance to participate in education and training activities. I, I would ask your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2217?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 118 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and O voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2217. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2721. Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for concur...

move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1. This Bill

was the initiative of the Illinois State Police regarding

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

the Child Sex Offender Notification Bill. And the Amendment that was done in the Senate was, primarily, to comply with federal guidelines and federal definitions. For example, the sexual predators are defined under federal law as 'those persons who have committed multiple sexual offenses', and if they've been declared by the court to be sexual predators and under this Amendment they would be required to register for natural life, in subject of full notification. Again, the language in here was, primarily, to bring this into compliance with federal law and there would be a... if the state were not in compliance, the state would be losing money on this program. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2721?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2721. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby 1762. Representative declared passed. House Bill Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (1762), we're asking for concurrence. The Senate has added an Amendment to this that clarifies for people who are sentenced to TASK that they must also be sentenced to probation. And I'd ask for approval of that."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Will the Sponsor yield?'

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, can you more clear... go into a little more detail, exactly, what it is that this Amendment is going to do? Because you, you and I had some conversations earlier, because there was a draft of an Amendment that never got put on the Bill, but which was going to botch things up, quite a bit. And I just wanted to make sure that we aren't going down that road here."

Hultgren: "Yes. There, there was some concerns brought up with our... I think, it was Amendment #2..."

Dart: "Yeah."

Hultgren: "... which never was carried forward. There was no vote taken on the floor and that was dropped. In the Senate it went forward with concerns that, you know, we didn't want to risk some of the things that have already been done with residential burglary and some other thoughts that way. What this does, is it just tightens up those people who are sentenced to TASK, must also comply with probation. So, it doesn't open it up or limit how probations can be used, it just adds on to how TASK is used, is my understanding."

Dart: "So, this would just insure that the people on TASK would have to comply with all other type of probation requirements they have, as well."

Hultgren: "That, that's right."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Hultgren to close."

Hultgren: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and concurrence on

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

this."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1762?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1762. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. For what reason does Representative Lyons seek recognition?"

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 2721, my vote was not recorded. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 610?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 610, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "With leave of the Body, Representative Schoenberg will handle the Amendment for Representative Hannig. Leave is granted. Representative Schoenberg. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Spe... Thank you, Mr. Spe... What?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryder, would you want to handle the Amendment for Representative Hannig?"

Ryder: "No. Schoenberg will."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

53rd Legislative Day

- May 18, 1999
- Floor Amendment #2 adds an effective date to this Bill and forwards it to the Governor."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let... let me, understand what we're doing here. Now these... is this a... an Amendment that guts the Bill and makes it a shell? What are we doing?"
- Schoenberg: "No. No, Sir. It mer... it... simply adds an effective date to the Bill."
- Parke: "It makes an effective date and then... what are you going with the Bill after that? Are we gonna to put it on Third Reading?"
- Schoenberg: "We will send this Bill to the Senate for concurrence and then, subsequently, it will go to the Governor."
- Parke: "So, this is the only time, once this Amendment goes on, you're going to move it to Third and then the Body will vote on it. It'll go to the Senate for concurrence, if they concur it goes directly to the Governor's desk."
- Schoenberg: "That's correct."
- Parke: "So, this is the only time the Members of the General Assembly and the House will have to vote on this particular Bill, is that correct? Well, after the Third Reading, I mean."
- Schoenberg: "Conceivably... Well, conceivably, yes. In the unlikely event that there is a nonconcurrence, we will be..."
- Parke: "Representative, are you planning on moving this to Third immediately upon attachment of this Amendment and then call for a vote? Is that the pleasure of the Chair? What are we... What are we gonna do here?"
- Speaker Hartke: "We're going to move these Bills to Third and they will stay on Third Reading."

53rd Legislative Day May 18, 1999

Parke: "And they're going to stay on Third."

Speaker Hartke: "Today."

Parke: "Thank you. I appreciate that understanding of what we're doing here."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 610 pass?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Readings. Senate Bill 611, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 611, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, may
 Representative Schoenberg... does he have leave to handle
 the Amendment? Leave is granted. Representative
 Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 611 adds an effective date to this Bill and it's our hope to then move it to Third Reading and send it back to the Senate for concurrence and then to the Governor's Desk. I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 611?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

53rd Legislative Day May 18, 1999

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 612. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 612, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, may Mr. Schoenberg have leave to handle the Amendment? Leave is granted. Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As with the previous two Bills, Floor Amendment #2 adds an effective date to Senate Bill 612. I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 612?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 629. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 629. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, Mr.

 Schoenberg ask leave to handle the Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 629 removes

- 53rd Legislative Day

 the effective date. This is a vehicle Bill for the IEPA

 Brownfield's Grant Program. I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 629?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 630. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 630. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, may Mr. Schoenberg have leave to handle the Amendment? Leave is granted. Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 630 removes the effective date from the Bill and we'll send it on Third Reading over to the Senate."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 630?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 630 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 632. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 632. The Bill has been read a second

- 53rd Legislative Day

 time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor

 Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, the Body... ask leave of the Body for Representative Monique Davis to handle the Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic-Mr. Speaker). Senate Bill 632, Amendment #1. It changes the effective date.
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 632?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment 1 is adopted. Further Amendments?
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 595. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 595. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, she asks leave, leave of the Body for Representative Monique Davis to handle the Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, in Senate Bill 595, Amendment #2, changes the effective date."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that nobody is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 595?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 26?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 26. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative O'Brien, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am seeking in the approval of Floor Amendment #2, which was passed in the Executive Committee and then strips the Bill, in its entirety, and leaves only the following provision: that a forest preserve district in a county with a county executive form of government cannot use its eminent domain powers to take the home or a farm of an individual, unless that individual has been identified as a willing seller."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "She indicates she will."

Cross: "Representative, this only applies to counties with executive form of governments?"

O'Brien: "And those that would and are... have a forest preserve that would be created after July 1st of 1999."

Cross: "Why would we single out executive form of governments?"

O'Brien: "Because it seemed to be appropriate for the end that I was trying to, to reach."

Cross: "So, this, basically, applies only to Will County?"

O'Brien: "I believe that Will is the only county in Illinois, at this time, with the county executive form of government."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Cross: "Where is Will County with this Amendment? I know its... they've opposed to this Bill."

O'Brien: "I worked with the Will County Forest Preserve District in order to draft this legislation. I certainly am not going to stand here and say that they're in full support of it, but they have time, and time, and time again, said that they would never seek to take someone's home or their property, unless they were a willing seller. And this addresses that... you know, what they say that they're going to do, this would simply codify what they say that their position is."

Cross: "So... if I'm not mistaken, they were opposed in committee, were they not? Of the under... with the original Amendment?"

O'Brien: "There was no slips in opposition to Floor Amendment #2."

Cross: "All right. Maybe, subsequent to committee. My, my understanding, from what I've heard from Will County officials is they, they were opposed to the initial Amendment."

O'Brien: "Well, what I've read in the newspaper, county board member, Lee Deutch, Dan Buddy, who's on the Forest Preserve District, are in support of my legislation and urge residents of Will County, in fact, to contact my office.

But as far as them taking an official position, I have not gotten anything about their official position of Will County."

Cross: "All right. Other forest preserves in nonexecutive form of governments will still have this power?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Cross: "Why are we..."

O'Brien: "Unless they are created after July 1st of 1999."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Cross: "Why would... if, if this is a concern, why would we limit it to Will?"

O'Brien: "Well, I would certainly look in... in down the road at addressing that issue. But the issue that I'm seeking to address, right now, is immediate. One that I needed to address immediately, and that's why I defined it, only to include counties with a executive form a government."

Cross: "All right. I will... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hassert."

Hassert: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hassert: "Representative O'Brien, you know I'm opposed to this Amendment, particularly because it singles out Will County.

And I know you've talked to Will County. And could you just explain what this... basically, this does, it takes away their condemnation powers?"

O'Brien: "Actually, it does not take away all condemnation powers."

Hassert: "In... in what instance does it?"

O'Brien: "If the seller is identified as a willing seller, then they do still have the power of eminent domain."

Hassert: "Okay and this just takes in homesteads only?

O'Brien: "No. It would be to an owner-occupied residence, and to an owner-operated farm."

Hassert: "Okay. So, I can clarify this then, if there is a willing seller, say for example, if it's a hundred acres and they want to just maintain their homestead, could they still go after the other 80 acres or something, 90 acres if they wanna kept 10 acres out, or is a homestead inclusive of all the property within a farm?"

O'Brien: "If the person living in that farmhouse is the owner of

53rd Legislative Day

- May 18, 1999
- that farm and they are farming that farm property, then it would all be exempt unless they were willing to sell that portion."
- Hassert: "What if it's not just farm ground? What if it's woodland, wetlands, what not?"
- O'Brien: "If it's in agriculture production and they can't, as defined by the Tax Code, if they can't classify it as farm property under the Tax Code, and it's not their house, then it is not included under the provisions of this Bill."
- Hassert: "Could you explain to me why you think this is necessary just for Will County?"
- O'Brien: "Well, certainly, I think that it has a much far reaching impact, but as you know, there was a referendum passed in Will County, that was passed by the... the portions of the county that are not going to be impacted by eminent domain. The Will County Forest Preserve has passed a \$70,000,000 bond referendum in order to purchase property in the sou... in the... primarily, in the southern portion of Will County and that portion of Will County did not vote to pass that referendum. And as we've had, you know, numerous discussions before, they feel that they have been good stewards of the land, that is still land in ag production. It's still their homes. It hasn't been sold. hasn't been made 'Camelot Subdivision', and overdeveloped. And we have over 100,000 acres of open space, nontax role property in that area already. These people want to say loud and clear, 'Enough is enough.' They want to keep their homes. They want to keep their farms safe from... and they want to leave it on the tax roles."
- Hassert: "I, I, I understand that. Could you identify how many people you're talking about that might be affected? I

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

mean, I've heard from one or two of them. So, we're running special legislation for a handful of people who are opposing a referendum that was overwhelmingly supported by the whole. So, we're going to actually pa... Now, I'm not talking about the people in your district, I'm talking about the people that have been identified..."

O'Brien: "No. I have several petitions in your district, too."

Hassert: "...by the people that have been identified by this forest preserve to, basically, take their homestead. We're not talking dozens of farms. We're not talking hundreds of people going to be misplaced. We're talking about one or two people. So, we're going to pass special legislation down here, dealing with this and impact the whole county, based upon a few complaints within your district."

O'Brien: "That's not correct. Is... is that a ques... I mean, if... if... if I'm allowed to respond. As a matter of fact, I've gotten petitions signed with over a thousand signed petitions, many of them within your district, as a matter of fact. And there are about..."

Hassert: "But, but, but that's not from the people who are identified in this Forest Preserve Referendum that they're seeking their land. How many people are actually going to be misplaced by the forest preserve purchasing in the identified land? Give me, just give me a rough idea."

O'Brien: "I've iden... I've identified at least 43..."

Hassert: "Not, not the people who don't support the tax
 increase."

O'Brien: "No."

Hassert: "Give me the people who are going to be misplaced."

O'Brien: "Forty... 43 homes, right now, are subject to that and almost 2200 acres. But 43 homes that I can find, that are identified there."

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Hassert: "Okay. To the Bill... to the Amendment. Just basically, this is special legislation that's been drafted, that we had a referendum passed in our county, overwhelmingly to support open-land purchases. This, basically, infringes upon our county only, to stop that referendum from happening. It's a bad Amendment. I would ask that there be a roll call on this Amendment. And please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Because of potential conflict of inter... interests with the underlying Bill, I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative O'Brien to close."

O'Brien: "I would just urge your 'aye' vote. This is a very important piece of legislation to protect homeowners and farmers, not just in my district, not just in Southern Illinois, but in... in areas in downstate Illinois where there may be a potential forest preserve district. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "There has been a roll call requested, so please vote your switches. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1... #2 to Senate Bill 260(sic-26)?' Will those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'yes'; those opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 26. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 26, there were 50 Members voting 'yes', 65 Members voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present' and this Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to hold this Bill on Second or

- 53rd Legislative Day May 18, 1999
 move it to Third? Hold that Bill on Second. Senate Bill
 630. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill 603. Mr.
 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 603. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 608."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 608. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 617. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 617. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg, seek recognition? He has declined. Senate Bill 602. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 602. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig, Mr...

 Mr. Morrow ask leave of the Body to handle that leg...

 Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #... Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 602 just brings the budget back to the Governor's introduced level. I would urge that we adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 602."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 602?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 605. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 605, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hannig has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "In the absence of Representative Hannig,

 Representative Morrow ask leave of the Body to handle the

 Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Floor Amendment #3 does is to restore some cuts made in the Senate. The Senate cut four... \$4,154,000 for the lease purchase of 500 new cars. We made an agreement. We added 6,186,000 to purchase, not lease, 300 new cars. I'd be glad to ask... to answer any questions... Floor Amendment #3."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 605?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 607. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 607, the Bill's been read a second

- 53rd Legislative Day

 time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "In the absence of Representative Hannig,
 Representative Morr... Morrow ask leave of the Body... or
 to handle the Amendment. Leave is granted. Representative
 Morrow."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 607 just puts in the effective date on it at the Governor's introduced level."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 607?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 480?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 480 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that back to the Order of Second Reading, for the purpose of an Amendment, at the request of the Sponsor. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House or Senate... House Bill 2792. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you. How are you today? I move to concur..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Good to see you, Representative Black."
- Black: "... in Senate Amendment #1. Thank you. Senate Amendment #1 simply adds to the Bill that provides that IDOT and/or local authorities are authorized to mark 'ownership' on the

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

front of the sign, in letters between three-eighths of an inch and three-quarter inch letters. The original Bill contained language that would allow the letters to be larger than three-quarter inch tall. I, I don't have any problem with that. I rely on the Senate to distinguish between three-eighths of an inch and three-quarters of That's what they're there for. That's what they're there for. It's that narrow window that the Senate is over there for, so they've taken a good Bill that passed here unanimously and they've made a distinguishing Amendment between three-quarters of an inch and three-eighths of an inch. And, I know, Mr. Speaker, you'll join me in sleeping much more soundly tonight if we concur in Senate Amendment #1. I'd say the future of the Midwest, if in not... not the entire Western World hinges on our concurrence with this Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on this profound Amendment? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2792?' This is final action. All those is favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? There are people not voting on this profound piece of legislation, down to one. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Bolin, would you like to vote on this profound piece of legislation? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment to House Bill 2792. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 249, Representative Novak. Out of the record. House

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Bill 2164, Representative Curry. To Senate Amendment #1, Representative Curry."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I ask that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2164. This is just a technical change in the Bill. It changes the association from the 'Illinois Library Association' to the 'Illinois School Library Media Association' to make the Bill correct. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2164?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2164. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 249, Representative Novak, on Senate Amendment #1."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249. Senate Amendment #1 strengthens House Bill 249. It, it also applies to a, a... creates a criminal offense should any adults on the internet be harassed or if their names were posted in any obscene or pornographic websites. The original body of this Bill came from the Joliet area dealing with a lady and her daughter whose name was posted on a website and the consequential harassment she received. So, this is now federal law and we think we sh... we think it should be state law. So, I'm asking the

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Body to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249.
Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249?' This is final action. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 249. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 806, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I now move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 806. This deals with some modifications of the procurement, a code dealing with McCormick Place. The language that we sent over from the House was not acceptable. So they changed it back to the threshold on bidding and it is noncontroversial and I ask my colleagues to adopt Senate Amendment #1... or concur in Senate Amendment #1... #1 to House Bill 806, please."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Yeah. Representative, I heard you say... what got my attention is that we're revising the Procurement Code. Did you mean to say that? The Procurement Code that we passed... you know, the statewide Procurement Code, only as it pertains to McCormick Place."

53rd Legislative Day May 18, 1999

Novak: "Yes. Representative, I misspoke a little bit."

Black: "Okay."

Novak: "Their, their original request was to... increase the threshold for the bidding... increase the bidding threshold for emergency purchases. We passed it unanimously in the House, but when it got to the Senate, apparently, some of the Senate Members didn't like the idea and they required the McCormick/McPier Authority to accept the original language... In the current law."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brunsvold in the Chair."

Black: "Okay. So, we're not... we're not making any changes to the State Procurement Code."

Novak: "You're correct."

Black: "All right. Because the reason I was concerned about that, I'd been trying to change that as it relates to vendors at the State Fair..."

Novak: "Yes. I know you are."

Black: "That thing just keeps getting lost in the process, somewhere."

Novak: "I agree with you on that one, Representative."

Black: "Well, I... many of us downstaters do, but maybe we'll find it when the new 'Star Wars' movie comes out. I don't know what happened to it."

Novak: "Someday I'd like to sell my elephant ears at the State Fair."

Black: "Well, I could understand that. So, are you telling me that Senate Amendment #1 simply puts the Bill... well, it doesn't put the Bill back in it's original form..."

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

Black: "What... So, they, did they take out the emergency purchase?"

Novak: "Yes, they did. They... they lowered the

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

threshold to back, back to where it was, prior to the passage of the Bill in the House. I think we raised it to 25,000, Representative and the Senate refused to go along with that."

Black: "Right. Right."

Novak: "Okay. So, now it goes back to its original language that's currently in the law."

Black: "So, we're allowing McCorm... the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, excuse me. I keep forgetting the new name. We're allowing them, if... if we concur in this Senate Amendment, we're going to say that, that if they want to... if they have a \$30,000 construction project, they don't have to bid that."

Novak: "Yes."

Black: "And that's already in current law? I thought we had lowered the... I thought the threshold was \$5,000."

Novak: "No, no. I take, I take that back, Representative. It lowers it back to \$5,000, so if they have a \$30,000 project they have to bid it."

Black: "Okay. Well, now I... now I've got a problem. Staff is... is whispering in my ear, telling me it's just the opposite. Hang on just a second. Mr. Speaker, oh, Mr. Speaker, oh, Mr. Speaker, Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Yes, Mr. Black."

Black: "Well, the first that goes is the hearing, Mr. Speaker.

What? Can we, can we take this out of the record
just for one second?"

Novak: "Yes."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Yes."

Black: "I, I think our two staffs have a semantics problem here."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Novak."

53rd Legislative Day

Novak: "Yes."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Are you willing to..."

Novak: "Mr... Mr. Speaker could you please take... take this out of the record?"

Black: "Thank you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Novak takes the Bill out of the record.

Mr. Novak, are you prepared to do 1893?"

Novak: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Clerk."

Novak: "Thank you. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have a concurrence Motion. Yes, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1893. The... the Bill allows investor-owned water participate in the newly created Safe Drinking Water Loan Program. The Governor, in his Ill... Illinois First proposal has promised to expand that program, so many of our communities can participate. The original, as I said, the original Bill allows private utilities to get involved in the low interest loan programs. We have many communities that are serviced by private investor-owned This is a technical Amendment that the Senate sent back over to the House. It strengthens it in some respects. And I ask my colleagues to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1893."

Speaker Brunsvold: "The Gentleman has asked for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Seeing none the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1893?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

May 18, 1999

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

record. And on that question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1893. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 379, Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I ask for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 379. Senate Amendment #1 replaces the Bill with another House Bill that got hung up over here, passed the House 118 to 0, and then sat in Senate Rules. What House Bill 632 did was clarified the language in the assessment of the check-off for the propane that are... that are, that's sold in the State of Illinois. If it's sold to an out-of-state dealer and stored there and put into commerce there. The assessment for the educational plan for the propane dealers it does not take affect. So, in it's essence it clarifies the language, to make sure that only propane that is bought, paid for, purchased, and used here in the State of Il... State of Illinois will be used for the assessment on the check-off. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Brunsvold: "The Gentleman has asked for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connor."

O'Connor: "Mr. Speaker, on the last vote on Hou... on, on Senate Bill 1893 my vote was a 'yes' and my key didn't function."

Speaker Brunsvold: "It will be so noted. Any discussion on House Bill 379 and Senate Amendment #1? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 379?' This is final action. All those in favor sign... 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? And

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

on that question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 379. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Novak, have you discussed (sic-House Bill) 806 with Mr. Black?"

Novak: "Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker"

Speaker Brunsvold: "Are we preturd... pre... prepared to proceed?"

Novak: "Mr. Black is on our side of the aisle and I think we just reserved him a seat over here, but I think he's leaving now. We'll wait for Mr. Black."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Novak, on House Bill 806."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm sorry for a little confusion. Mr. Black and I conferred and we've got... we're on the same wavelength. When the Bill origine... originally left the House we took the threshold on the bid and lowered it to \$5,000, for emergency purposes. But when it got to the Senate, the Senate had some different ideas and changed it. They allowed... they allowed for ordinary purchases, up to \$10,000. They moved the threshold up to 10 and any... for... for any construction items, such as a small job, they made it a \$30,000 threshold. So, that is the change that is included in Senate Amendment #1 and I ask this Body to concur in Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 806."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Novak has moved for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any question? Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. No questions.

I just thank the Gentleman for taking the Bill out of the record. And let me just say, for the record, our staff was

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

correct in their interpretation and as Representative Novak has said, it, it now allows the Met... Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, without competitive bidding to do a construction project up to \$30,000, where the old threshold was \$10,000. Now, I realize that construction costs in the City of Chicago are probably much higher than I'm used to or, or aware of down in my district. But, but I just... I feel compelled to say that I have a, a problem in giving a governmental Body a, a blank check for any construction project up to \$30,000. Now, I'll... I'll grant you they probably can't even get a contractor to come out and measure something in Chicago that isn't going to cost close to that and I don't think we ought to make them bid every issue, but there are some downstate folks on my side of the aisle that think this may be to broad of an exemption to go from 10 to \$30,000. And I again, thank the Gentleman from Kankakee for his willingness to let us get this language straightened out and thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Any dis... further discussion on the Concurrence Motion? Seeing none, Mr. Novak to close."

Novak: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These are some minor modifications made to the... with respect to the operation of the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, one of our premier convention facilities in the State of Illinois. Some of the language that Representative Black and I discussed, dealing with some emergency purposes in bidding. They are quite nominal. A \$30,000 construction job really is peanuts, so to speak, up in the City of Chicago. So, I would ask my colleagues for their support in concurring on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 806."

Speaker Brunsvold: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in

53rd Legislative Day

May 18, 1999

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3...806?' This is final action. All those 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 wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 806. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I attempted in vain to cast my vote there. And I would like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Brunsvold: "It'll be so recorded."

Fritchey: "Thank you."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Representative Silva."

Silva: "I pushed the wrong button by accident when you locked it.

My intention was to vote 'present'."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Be so recorded. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair is prepared to adjourn. Are there any announcements? Are there any announcements? Seeing none, Majority Leader Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until May 19th, at the hour of 11:00 a.m., allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does stand adjourned until May 19th, Wednesday, at the hour of 11:00 a.m."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Senate Bills-Second Reading to be held on the Order of
Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 652, a Bill for
an Act amending the School Code. Second Reading of this
Senate Bill. There be no further business, the House
Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."