92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "The House will come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Springer from the St. John's Lutheran Church in Chester. Pastor Springer is the guest of Representative Reitz. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Springer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Reitz for inviting me to be here today, it's an honor. I bring greetings from the men and women of St. John Lutheran Church and School in Chester, Illinois. Let us pray. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. We give thanks to You, Almighty God through Your Son, Jesus Christ, that You have brought us to this, the beginning of a new day. We pray Your special blessings upon the men and women represented here, who represent our great state. We pray for all those who hold elected office that they may seek Your will in their governance in making these decisions that are so critical to our state and our nation. Look with favor upon the men and women of our armed forces, protecting them with Your strong right arm, as they serve the cause of freedom and oppose terrorism throughout the world. Be with us, that everything that it said and done here today may be done to Your honor and glory. We offer this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior. Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Soto."

Soto - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Bost."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to report that all of the Republicans are here today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Bugielski and Morrow are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure was referred, action taken on Tuesday, February 5, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3652."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of

 House Bills-Second Reading. For what purpose does

 Representative Klingler seek recognition?"
- Klingler: "Thank you, Speaker, a point of personal privilege.

 I've been asked by the Legislative Bible Study Group which
 has been meeting monthly at the Governor's Mansion to
 announce that it's going to begin Thursday morning meetings
 at 7:00 a.m. on the chapel on the first floor and that will
 be beginning tomorrow morning at 7:00 a.m., thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading there appears House Bill 3771, Mr. Jerry Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell. Is the Gentleman in the camber? Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record. On the Order of House Bills-Third Reading there appears House Bill 3645, Mr. Holbrook. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3662, the Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3717, Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

record. House Bill 3734, Mr. Osmond. Mr. Osmond. House Bill 3736, Mr. Parke. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3749, Mr. Holbrook. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. House Bill 3750, Mr. Holbrook. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Hultgren. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3769."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3769, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill that was brought to my attention by the Illinois Municipal League. It was something that was introduced actually, earlier in the Session, because of Bill limits did not go forward. But, simply what this does is, and it's been an issue in quite a few different municipalities where there's been a vacancy among the trustees and the mayor has the authority to appoint a new alderman or trustee with the advice and consent of the other alderman and trustees. The problems is, if they do not act within 60 days that appointment fails. What this is doing is... puts in provisions where if the mayor puts up two qualified candidates and the other aldermen or trustees do not act on that within 60 days then that appointment becomes... the appointment continues after that time. I'd be happy to answer or try and answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

McCarthy: "Thank you. Representative Hultgren, you mentioned that these two people have to be qualified candidates.

What does that include?"

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Hultgren: "It really... it depends on the position and within the city there would be qualifications that'd be laid out within the, you know, there are specific requirements for a position and that would depend on that position."

McCarthy: "Are you aware of any place where there's a requirement other than age and residency, for like to be a trustee or an alderman in the city? I guess what I should say is my understanding is that the only requirements are there's an age, being a registered voter, and being a resident of the village or the city."

Hultgren: "No, I think that's right."

McCarthy: "I don't know if there's any city in Illinois that has a requirement for their trustees or for their aldermen to be a college graduate, or a high school graduate, or any other qualification, other than residency, and age, and registered voter."

Hultgren: "No, I think that's right."

McCarthy: "Okay... so..."

Hultgren: "But I would think that it would be... there are sometimes... this also includes other appointments that the mayor can make, but the city council would have. So, it does include trustees and aldermen, but it also includes other appointments like maybe a village attorney or something like that, where there would be other requirements as far as a law degree or things like that, that a village attorney would need."

McCarthy: "The Section of the Municipal Code that this affects, you say, would also affect other appointments other than...

I believe earlier and I don't have your Bill in front of me, and I don't have my computer in front of me, but we had this Bill in Cities & Villages last year where it was unsuccessful. It was unsuccessful by an overwhelming

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

margin, because it basically applied to the trust... to the replacement of trustees when the vacancy occurs or a replacement of aldermen when a trustee... when a vacancy occurs."

Hultgren: "You're right, I do have the Bill in front of me, and it does apply just to qualified persons to the office of alderman or trustee, prior to the 60th day after a vacancy occurs, and if the mayor has nominated a minimum of two persons for the appointment and each has failed to be confirmed, the mayor or president may make a temporary appointment from those persons who are nominated but failed, to be confirmed by the council or board. That. shall serve until the appointment has been nominated, confirmed, and qualified or until a person has been elected and qualified. So, really what it is it's just to put an end date for these appointments. What's happened is a lot of these appointments the... by the trustees or aldermen not taking any action upon it then these qual... these people who are put up by the mayor, no action is taken, the fall away and there has to be another appointment, there's no end date to it. So, what this is doing is hopefully that's not going to come into play. But, I have heard even in committee there was quite a few different situations where this has become a situation where the mayor by ordinance or whatever within the village or city has the right to make these appointments for temporary aldermen or city council members with the requirement that the other members are to follow up on that. What this is doing is, there was no end date to that before. So, if the city council members or aldermen never took any action upon it that never became a temporary appointment, the person never could never fill that spot

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

and it really halted the business of the city. What we're trying to do is move the business of the city along. Again, hopefully, this never comes into play, what it'll do is two qualified candidates will be out there according to the requirements of that village, maybe it is just age and residency. If they meet those requirements then the city council members can take a look at those two, choose the one that they want, it doesn't come into play. Where this would come into play, is if there's a no action within those 60 days."

McCarthy: "Okay. Basically, where it comes into play there is a requirement already in the... even in the Bill that you have in your hand there, where it says that the mayor should make a... you know, offer a person for this position within 60 days. And then, the village board or the city board votes on the acceptance of this candidate or the nonacceptance of the candidate. And this does happen in a lot of villages. I have seven villages I represent, we have one that had... take close to a year to replace somebody because there was a division on the board. says that when the mayor or president of the village, you know, suggests this person that then it goes to the advise and consent of the rest of the board. And, basically, what your provision is doing is removing that advise and consent, because they would vote on the person, they say, They vote on another person, they say, 'no'. Then after 60 days after the vacancy has occurred, the mayor then has a right to appoint either one of the two that was already turned down by the board. Isn't that right? mean, the mayor has the right to appoint either of the two that were turned down by the board or either of the whatever number were turned down by the board."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Hultgren: "No, I think they have that right to continue to turn them down. It doesn't mean that the mayor has... this has to wait out the 60 days. What this is, is just a temporary appointment that the mayor can make the temporary appointment."

McCarthy: "It's a temporary appointment just like all appointments are temporary."

Hultgren: "Right."

McCarthy: "They're temporary until the next election. I mean, so that it could come up that further down the road, they could make a temporary appointment and then he could find somebody that was acceptable to the majority of the board. He could redo that, bring that person up then, kick the temporary appointment out. But, I think in reality this temporary appointment is the same as any vacancy that is put on the board and filled in. It's for the next election as long as the next election is at least 28 months into the future."

Hultgren: "No, the language of the Bill does say that this is a temporary appointment from those persons who are nominated but failed to be confirmed by the city council or board. That person will serve until an appointment or an appointee has been nominated, confirmed, and qualified or until a person has been elected or qualified. So, either one, so it's a temporary appointment and then if the city council does approve someone else, then that temporary appointee is out or if there is an election in the meantime that temporary appointee is out. So, it's either of those two, it's not just the election."

McCarthy: "I just think that in reality it's going to be until the next election, just like any other vacancy that's filled today. The odds are if the mayor or the president,

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

unless he changes his position, he's gonna keep that person in there until there's another election which is what that thing says or if they find another person. But what your saying is then, he puts a new person in there, puts Doe in there, and then two months later says, well, now we have this Jane Doe who is really acceptable to the whole I'll throw John out. I mean, the odds of that happening are very, I think, you know, very poor. I think what this Bill does and why we voted against it last year in Cities & Villages is that it gives the mayor a negative incentive or the village president a negative incentive to say, you know, I bring up one person to the board. That person, the mayor feels is very well-qualified. board says, 'no' for one reason or another, maybe it's political, maybe it's just that they don't think he's as It gives the mayor a well-qualified as the mayor does. to... when he brings his second negative incentive appointment up in order to fulfill the requirements of your Bill, to bring someone who is less qualified knowing that when that person is turned down then it comes at the end of the 60 days he'll go back and appoint the first person. think this is giving the mayors way too much power. basically, think it's taking the part of 'advise and consent' which is in Section V of that, to make it... instead of 'advise and consent' it's like 'advise and consent or else'. If you don't approve the people I want, I'm going to go back and pick one of them anyway. I think we have to make our mayors, we have to make our presidents of our villages work with their boards, come up with acceptable candidates. If that positions not filled... don't think it's any, I mean,... Homewood, a village that I represent didn't have a seventh trustee for about a year

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

and a couple months they still operated, but the board kept finding the people that the mayor bring forth unacceptable, he only brought like three or four of them. Finally, they came on of a compromise candidate. I think that's the way it works. Taking this person who has been not elected by the people of the city, not elected by the board of the city, and giving one person, the mayor or the president of that town the right to say, I'm going to appoint this person after he has been turned down. I mean, I can almost see it would make more sense to say he can pick a third person that has never been voted on. More so than the legislation clearly says, 'that the person has to be one of the two or more'. So if it's five people, it has to be one of the people that's already been turned down by the village board. Isn't that correct?"

Hultgren: "It would be one of the two appointments, right, that has been brought forth by the mayor."

McCarthy: "It has to be one of the people, it could be two, minimum of two, but there's no maximum."

Hultgren: "Right, that's correct."

McCarthy: "But, it has... the appointed person has to be one of those people that's already been turned down by the village board."

Hultgren: "Right."

McCarthy: "It can't be anybody else, you can't find... now if you found a real great person I guess you could bring them forward at that time, try to get them voted on. But, I think it gives the mayors too many... too much power. I've talked to some of my local mayors, mayors who have been involved in this process, and they feel that, you know, why they might like it in order to stick it to the board... I mean, it's just I think that the boards now are told to

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

work with their mayors, the mayors are told to work with their boards and it certainly is something that we should stick to. Changing this public policy to give one person in the village... I mean this could be a person that can break the tie in the village on a seven member board if they have one vacancy, maybe it's three and three. should be made, to either leave that thing vacant 'til the next election or he should be made to get somebody who can compromise and work with both sides. I have great respect for the Sponsor of this Bill, but I'd have to say as far as public policy goes this is one of those issues and, I guess I'm speaking to the Bill now, Speaker. But, every now and then we get a thing that sounds good when a village person comes to us or a mayor of a town, but this is one of things when you think it through and you say you're gonna give one person in the town the right to break the majority, to appoint a person that... you know, to the village trustees they have already said, they didn't think that person was qualified. Now we're giving the mayor the right to pick one of these people that was turned down say just on his vote alone, his vote of confidence, he can be appointed to that board. I... ya know, like I said, I have a lot of respect for the Sponsor but, I just think it's bad policy, it may have sounded good in one thing. But, when you look at these things you gotta say, we're changing this for every town in the State. The mayor of Chicago has probably appointed more aldermen than any other person in the history of the country, but he's also had to go through approval of the board, you know, he didn't just do it himself. When he gets turned down, you know, the mayor could get two people turned down for an alderman position and then say, I'll wait 60 days then I'm gonna appoint one

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

of those. So, it takes away the right of the legislative body in order to do what they're elected to do, to make the 'advise and consent', we're taking 'advise and consent' out of it, and, I think that's very bad public policy. And I would appreciate an overwhelming 'no' vote on this. I just think it's a bad policy, and I hope that you would agree with me. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, you took this Bill to a committee hearing, I assume, correct?"

Hultgren: "Yes, I did."

Black: "Was there any opposition expressed in committee?"

Hultgren: "No, there was no opposition expressed and it did pass unanimously out of the committee. And it was also cosponsored by the chairman of that committee."

Black: "It passed the committee on a unanimous vote, did it not?"
Hultgren: "Yes, it did."

Black: "Forgive me, I don't have a copy of the Bill in my file.

But, in amending the Illinois Municipal Code does your Bill impact the City of Chicago or are they exempt from that as a Home Rule city?"

Hultgren: "They are exempt."

Black: "That's what I thought. So, it doesn't impact the City of Chicago in any way, shape, or form. Is that... Would that be the correct answer?"

Hultgren: "That's correct."

Black: "All right. In fact, isn't this Bill identical to one we passed last year?"

Hultgren: "I believe it passed out of committee. I don't think

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

it ever came to the House floor, last year."

Black: "According to my files, it's identical to House Bill 3424 that passed the House 115-3. The principal Sponsor at that time was Representative Krause. So, if I've made a mistake in that..."

Hultgren: "No, you're right. I'm sorry."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much for your answers. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, to the Bill. I think the greater of problems that would exist in this case would be a seat that goes unfilled for a period of almost two years before the next election, particularly, if you're on a ward basis or a ward system or a district system. Then your district is left without representation on that board or council for up to 22 months. I don't think... I think that is a greater inherent evil than to allow the in the case of a stalemate to make a temporary mayor appointment to fill the seat. At least then, that district or ward would have representation on the council. It does no one any good to allow a fight between a council and the executive officer to go on and leave a seat unfilled and people unrepresented for a period that could approach 22 months. There's no known opposition to this Bill. It has passed the House before by an overwhelming majority and I simply rise to support the Gentleman's effort again at this point in time and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hultgren to close."

Hultgren: "In closing, I do think this in an important Bill. It is something that I've heard from quite a few different towns where there really has the stalemates... have forced government to grind to a halt. And, I appreciate the cosponsors who have joined on this. It's an issue that as Representative Black has said that it's an issue of

92nd Legislative Day

- February 6, 2002
- representation and making sure that people are represented on their city council and that petty fights don't keep that from happening. So, I would encourage and ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor, signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Three, two people have not voted. One person has not voted. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 60 'ayes', 38 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 6th, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the Floor for consideration' House Resolution 588. Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Younge, are you seeking recognition?"
- Younge: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to announce a time change. The Appropriations Committee for Higher Education (sic-Appropriations-Higher Education) will meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning rather than 8 a.m., the usual time. The new time tomorrow is 9 a.m."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of House Bills-Third Reading there appears House Bill 3717. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3717, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law, Third Reading of this House Bill.
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

House. I'm proud to be sponsoring House Bill 3717 brought to us by the DuPage County State's Attorney, Joe Birkett. This legislation would greatly enhance our law enforcement community's ability to solve crimes more quickly through the expansion of the state's DNA data bank. Currently, Illinois only criminals convicted of a few offences such as, sexual assault are required to submit their DNA House Bill 3717, would extend this data bank. requirement to all felons. And there is compelling evidence about the effectiveness of doing this, 12 states already require all felons to participate in a similar DNA data bank with Virginia being the first in the country to adapt this innovative approach. Since 1990, Virginia has had resounding success in using their DNA data bank to help solve crimes. In fact, nearly 600 crimes have been solved that state from their extended data collection. Virginia has discovered is that as the data bank expands, the effectiveness of the program grows even more rapidly. Just as important, this type of information helps to protect against wrongful convictions. In fact, in Virginia inmates have been exonerated through their DNA data bank. Best of all, federal funds are available to pay for this important program. While not every crime scene yields DNA evidence, many do leave behind a DNA trail and the ability to detect that evidence is becoming sophisticated every year. I hope you'll agree with me that this a program is a logical extension of fingerprinting with added protections for the innocent. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we need to give our law enforcement community every tool we can to help them keep our neighborhoods safe. This is an important anticrime measure that doesn't have to cost the state a cent. Let's do

92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002 everything we can to protect our families and vote to pass House Bill 3717."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels has moved that the House pass House
Bill 3717. The Chair recognizes Representative Monique
Davis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Daniels, are there any opponents to this legislation?"

Daniels: "Not that I'm aware of, nobody's talked to me about being against it."

Davis, M.: "So, does your Bill mandate that once a person is convicted of a crime that they're DNA tested while they're inmates or upon release?"

Daniels: "Once they're convicted of a felony, not just any crime, a felony they would have to submit DNA evidence. That's correct."

Davis, M.: "Once they're convicted of a felony..."

Daniels: "That's correct."

Davis, M.: "They would be DNA tested..."

Daniels: "That is correct."

Davis, M.: "And what did you say the purpose would be?"

Daniels: "To create a DNA database which would help in two phases. One, would be to help solve crimes where there's a DNA trail and secondly, to use in the event that we could find this evidence to help exonerate somebody that may have been improperly convicted in the first place. So, Representative, this has the potential of not only being an advocate for those convicted felons, if they were convicted wrongly and we could find a DNA trail, but also to help create a data bank to solve DNA crimes in the future.

Davis, M.: "Has the ACLU chimed in with this legislation, have

- 92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002 you heard from them?"
- Daniels: "The ACLU was in committee and they didn't say one way or the other."
- Davis, M.: "I understand that the Illinois State Police are opposed to this legislation."
- Daniels: "That is not true."
- Davis, M.: "Well, according to the information we have, they are."
- Daniels: "Where'd you get the information from?"
- Davis, M.: "Can you let me verify this."
- Daniels: "Well, sure you can verify it."
- Davis, M.: "Department of..."
- Daniels: "You can ask me, I'll tell ya."
- Davis, M.: "... Corrections. Department..."
- Daniels: "You say, 'Representative Daniels, are the State Police opposed to this?' The answer is, 'no"."
- Davis, M.: "Is the Department of Corrections opposed to this?"
- Daniels: "Is the Department of Corrections opposed to this? Not to my knowledge."
- Davis, M.: "So, as far as you know at this point the Department of Corrections is not opposed, the State Police is not opposed, the ACLU is not opposed."
- Daniels: "That is correct."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, would this... did you say this would also help if a person is wrongfully convicted, this DNA test could be used to exonerate as you state it?"
- Daniels: "Yes, as a matter of fact, that is the exact experience in Virginia, whereas I stated in my opening comments, 12 people have been exonerated because they had found a DNA trail and the usage of DNA evidence helped exonerate them from the crimes they're convicted of."
- Davis, M.: "Are you aware, Representative, that the Justice

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Department has proposed removing or abolishing the \$750 thousand that they had been providing for DNA tests? In fact, we passed a Resolution that I sponsored asking the Justice Department to not remove that 750 thousand that inmates can use to help prove their innocence through DNA testing. So, are you familiar with the fact that the Federal Government wants to reduce those dollars that are used for this purpose?"

Daniels: "No, I am not aware of that."

Davis, M.: "So, the funds, you believe, would still come from the Federal Government?"

Daniels: "Well, that doesn't have anything to do with what you're referring to. In this case, there are federal grants available quite effectively used in Virginia to help supplant their database collection, which we would hope that Illinois would also take advantage of and of course, we'd do everything we could to assist them in applying for those federal grants. And the hopeful result would be as the experience in Virginia has indicated, there wouldn't be any cost connected to it."

Davis, M.: "So, we would not have to add funds or take funds from the Correctional budget at this point. We would use grants that we obtained from the Federal Government, is that correct?"

Daniels: "There's another factor you ought to understand. The answer to your question is, 'yes', we would hope that it would not cost the state a cent. But, there is a provision in the Bill that would have a \$500 fine connected to it on convicted felons to help utilize that money to offset the cost of the DNA test. So, you know, if I'm looking at this in a purely anticrime mode of solving every criminal case that we could solve, I want to add all scientific advances

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

to my abilities to solve those crimes. So, I would say as a potential victim I want this database to be available to help solve crimes. I would say as a person that may be incarcerated and feel I was incarcerated wrongly, I would want to have additional DNA evidence that potentially could go a long ways to maybe exonerating me, as it has in 12 cases in Virginia."

Davis, M.: "My concern, Representative, of course, is that the Illinois State Police are opponents of this Bill."

Daniels: "That's not true and I don't know who the gentleman is standing behind you, but he might want to update his records so he doesn't embarrass you on the House Floor."

Davis, M.: "It takes a lot to embarrass me, Sir."

Daniels: "I've found that out."

Davis, M.: "I've been here long enough for that. You know, I think, Representative, that your Bill is expanding the types of DNA samples that can be taken, not only from blood but also from other tissue and saliva samples. And your Bill specifies that the tissue and saliva samples may be taken by someone other than a physician or other than a registered nurse."

Daniels: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "Currently, the Illinois State Police, Division of Forensic Services, they only have the equipment and facilities to process blood samples. So, then the question has to be answered of how will the Division of Forensic Services process these samples if they're only equipped to process blood samples?"

Daniels: "They outsource them."

Davis, M.: "Pardon?"

Daniels: "They outsource them."

Davis, M.: "They outsource them?"

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Daniels: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "So, in other words, we're going to privatize it. And that would be more money."

Daniels: "Not necessarily, it depends upon the additional cost to add employees to the State Police, which they will do. But, they do outsource them as they did in Virginia for awhile, not taking away jobs, be adding jobs."

Davis, M.: "Okay. I just received information, Representative Daniels. I just received information that the State Police committee that was opposed to this is now neutral on it. But, let me tell you what my fear is. My fear is, let's say you have a convict or a person who's committed a felony and you now have his or her DNA. What would prevent the use of that DNA to accuse that person of a crime?"

Daniels: "Nothing, that's the point."

Davis, M.: "No, but what I'm saying is, you know, like how is that person protected from false accusations? You know, like that famous O.J. case, where blood samples were spread around every place."

Daniels: "Which case?"

Davis, M.: "That O. J. Simpson case where they found blood samples in different locations..."

Daniels: "Yes, Ma'am."

Davis, M.: "... that were proven by the forensic and scientific community had been placed there by other than that accused person. So, my concern is that once a... young man,... "

Daniels: "That's Representative Watson."

Davis, M.: "... don't embarrass Representative Daniels here.

Don't let Daniels get embarrassed here. Once that accused person has left his saliva, his blood, or whatever in a private laboratory, what would prevent that particular sample from finding its way on a crime scene and get that

- 92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002 person convicted, when actually they're innocent but someone had the availability to use their DNA?"
- Daniels: "Well, let me first say that there's a chain of evidence that has to be followed. So, you would have to lay the proper foundation in court as to where this evidence came from. And assuming for the moment that the representations you made on the O.J. Simpson case are accurate then obviously, the expert testimony was shown that would indicate what you had said. And therefore, you've proven the very point that you've made. If it was improperly placed there, that was part of the evidence as you have alleged. And if that were the case in another instance then of course, the chain of evidence would have to be followed."
- Davis, M.: "Well, see he had money to bring those experts in, many of these people we're talking about won't have that money..."
- Daniels: "Yeah."
- Davis, M.: "... or access to that high level or skill of representation."
- Daniels: "Yeah. Well, again, I would hope that no law enforcement individual would be guilty of improperly placing..."
- Davis, M.: "We all hope that, Representative. We hope that.

 But, let me say this to..."
- Daniels: "Remember only the data, only the scientific data is retained. So, once you do this DNA sample then, you know, the scientific evidence of that data is what is retained."
- Davis, M.: "But, you see we're not even, if you consider this, we're not going to even be in charge of those laboratories.

 Those laboratories are gonna be under a private domain. We won't even have the..."

92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002

Daniels: "No, that's, no."

Davis, M.: "... authority."

Daniels: "Representative, that's not necessarily true. No, they can outsource it. They don't have to outsource it. And even the private laboratory..."

Davis, M.: "At this point, they have to outsource it because the State Police don't have the facilities to do any except the blood. The State Police Forensic Services only has equipment..."

Daniels: "Okay. Now, remember this, remember this..."

Davis, M.: "... to process blood samples."

Daniels: "So, in the State Police, if they want to retain that evidence they can require blood samples and they use experts to draw the blood. Remember, the examples you're talking about could be as simple as taking a DNA sample from somebody's forearm with the use of adhesives or a swab in the inner part of your throat to take a sample of saliva and that's new technology. Now, you know, Representative, I'll tell you they way I look at it. If somebody has committed a felony, I want to use every bit of scientific evidence I can in which to solve that crime, because I want to protect you and your family and every other Illinois citizen that's a victim of a crime. On the other side of the coin, I also argue that I also want to have every bit of evidence available to some person that may have been wrongly convicted, so that that evidence is in an data bank that could exonerate that person that may have been wrongly convicted. Now, we all hope that's not the case, but in Virginia as I cited, there are 12 cases in which the DNA data bank actually showed that there was somebody wrongly convicted and those persons were released."

Davis, M.: "Representative, what states have passed this

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

legislation?"

Daniels: "Virginia, Texas, there's 12 other states. I'm not sure exactly what those states are."

Davis, M.: "Any northern states?"

Daniels: "Any what?"

Davis, M: "Any northern states?"

Daniels: "I don't know."

Davis, M.: "Like Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio?"

Daniels: "No, we're the most progressive of all those states."

Davis, M.: "Well, I mean, are we taking our lead from the southern states?

Daniels: "No, we're taking..."

Davis, M.: "I mean, Texas has a privatized prison system."

Daniels: "We are taking our lead from scientific ability. The lead is to how to solve crimes where there's a DNA trail and that's the lead we're taking, not the lead from any other state. We're using Virginia as an example."

Davis, M.: "But, the people, Representative Daniels, that we're talking about are already incarcerated, these people are already incarcerated. So, the crime for that particular issue has already been solved. You know, I mean, if they're already incarcerated and you're going to test them for DNA and take saliva and so forth, which is fine. But, they're not going to... these won't be the people who have committed a crime while they're in prison."

Daniels: "Yeah. Obviously..."

Davis, M.: "These will be new people."

Daniels: "Obviously, when we create a data bank we will be able to solve crimes of those cases where there may be a instance of recidivism or where they may have committed another crime which they haven't been found responsible for."

92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Daniels: "Of course."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, very much for your candid responses."

Daniels: "You're welcome."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Davis, M.: "I do believe that the intentions are extremely noble. I know that all of us in the State of Illinois want to find the perpetrator of any crime that's committed in the State of Illinois, especially felonies where families or children or people are hurting. And yet, we run an extreme risk of violating the civil liberties of people who are already incarcerated by giving their DNA to a private concern. one of the major issues might be, are there any limits on what that DNA can be used for? Can that DNA be used to say that his or her family is genetically predisposed to a particular disease? Can that DNA be used to stop that person from obtaining insurance because of the information that is found in that DNA from this private industry? I have a major question here. What exactly can that sample be used for? Can it be used just to solve crimes or can it be used for whatever else the forensic area decides to use it for? Does it prohibit information about the medical health of that person and his or her family? I have those questions. Is the use of this material just for solving crimes? Can it be used by an insurance company? There are a lot of questions on this legislation. I'm sure that the Senate will clean it up when it goes over there. We'll probably let it fly out of here, but the Senate'll probably clean it up. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

"I have a feeling that this Bill is going to get the vast majority of everybody's vote including myself. I had a measure like this that I tried to act on through a Resolution and it was last year about this time. And it's because it was brought to my attention by Chicago Police Department that they had a horrible backlog with their DNA testing. And when I talked to them about it they said that the backlog was going to be exasperated (sic-exacerbated) even more so by the Bill that we had past which increased about 11 more offences that we were adding to it. Му concern here is, is not with what you're doing. With what you're reading I fully agree with. I mean, the studies I saw show that there was unbelievable amount of correlation between burglaries that were committed and people that were later found to be... people involved with murders, as well. So, it's a good thing. My problem is though, is the backlog issue. Can you explain to me does... the State Police did they come up with a projection as far as whether this was going to increase/decrease the backlog and if so, by how much?"

Daniels: "Representative, we addressed the issue of backlog in committee. And at that time we used the Virginia example which they had a backlog to start with, but federal funds are available for that purpose. We would hope that Illinois would access those federal funds to help sustain, you know, the backlog problem. I'm not familiar, of course, with the Chicago Police Department exact backlog problem. There's no question about it, once you set this Bill into effect that it would have the potential of adding to the backlog. My response to that is as follows; this is scientific advancement like fingerprinting was years ago, this adds to a trail of evidence that can help solve

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

crimes. No thinking person would want to turn away the opportunity of utilizing our most advantageous and advances in scientific evidence to help solve crimes. And I say to the law enforcement community, here we are to help you, attorneys, chiefs, throughout the State of state's Illinois, law enforced community are very, very supportive this legislation. I've said to the State Police whatever assistance we can be, you need to bring to the attention to the General Assembly. If you're talking about \$2 million to assist in helping with the backlog or you're talking about any additional help we can be, bring it to our attention, work with us, 'cause I know you as thinking Legislator, and I respect you for that, want to be there as part of the solution. We don't want to create a problem, but I want to use every bit of scientific evidence that I can use to help make sure that the criminal justice system is moved forward in a scientific advancement."

"And I couldn't agree with you more and I'm with you a Dart: hundred percent on that. The problem that Chicago Police Department voiced to me though was that because the backlog was such that it was pushing murder cases that they wanted to have solved off the radar screen because they just didn't have enough lab technicians to do this and they were talking about outsourcing and doing some of those other things to try to address that. My question is though, Illinois State Police, did they address as far as... is there a backlog right now and if there are what will this Bill do? Because my... when I was addressing this to them a year ago, I think it was, I had a heck of a time trying to get any numbers from them. And when I tried to find out what would things do, they just kept saying, well as long as the General Assembly doesn't pass anymore expansions

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

we'll be fine. And now we're expanding it, as you said, for the great, perfect reasons, good reasons. But what are they saying now, because when I talked to them they kept talking about some potential federal money. They could never tell me how much or where it'd come from and they kept saying if we kept doing this we're gonna make it ten times worse."

Daniels: "Yeah, but that's if you set aside casework in favor of database work and the State Police testified they would not be doing that. Casework always take precedent. Can you imagine anyone saying they're gonna set aside a potential murder case in order to pick up on the database backlog? No, they aren't going to do that, they're going to still create as a precedent, the casework, and that's what the State Police testified. I think with the utilization of federal funds, the utilization of outsourcing, we could catch up on the backlog, we can do what's necessary. small cost and when I say small cost, remember this state deals with a \$50 billion plus budget and the small amount of money we're talking about to help with this backlog and casework is relatively infinitesimal as far as the overall None of that argument should be budget is concerned. utilized to stop this kind of legislation, which protects the innocent and makes sure that we use our current financial and scientific advances in order to help solve Boy, I'm for that, and I'll sit at any meeting as long as it needs to be to make sure we have the money to do it properly."

Dart: "And I agree with ya. Have they committed, though, to the money that is going to be needed, have they given a commitment?"

Daniels: "Yeah, you know, again they didn't talk about the money

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

that was needed, but I could tell you that, you know, if we're talking we are talking, literally about a few million dollars. Now, that's a lot of money to the average citizen but when you take that out of a state budget of 50 plus billion and the consequences, favorable consequences, to solve crimes and to make sure that no one that's innocent of crime is wrongly convicted, would help."

Dart: "And as I say, I agree wholeheartedly what you're talking about, what you're doing here. My frustration comes more from the Department of State Police because..."

Daniels: "Sure."

Dart: "... as I say, it wasn't even a year ago I was talking about this very same issue and when I asked them about their backlog which I was getting from straight from the source from the chief of staff in the Chicago Police Department and about how many murder cases they had backlogged because they were so bungled down there and they had no resources and when I asked them specifically they couldn't come up with numbers..."

Daniels: "Right."

Dart: "... they couldn't come up with where they'd get money and all they kept telling me is that as long as you guys aren't adding any more offences we should be okay. But I couldn't agree with you more. When you talk about the ability to solve crimes and you talk about the ability to frankly, people who are innocent can be let loose then, too, it's difficult to sit there and say \$2 or 3 million dollars we can't come up with it. But as I say, my frustration's with them, because they seem to be talking out both sides their mouth here. 'Cause one year they're saying we have backlog and we can't do anything about it and just don't add anymore offences. Now, they're saying, oh well, we'll

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

handle it. I guess as I say cynicism comes from them because they have never been able to come forward and say, this is where we're going to get the money."

Daniels: "Well, of course, we... heard much the same. However, it is pretty clear to us that the federal funds were available for this purpose, that we need to apply for those, the Chicago Police Department needs to apply for those and where necessary if they have to outsource then they should outsource. You know, no case should be set aside to solve as that utilization is an excuse. We need to do what's right and this Bill is the right way to approach it."

Dart: "Thank you."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Delgado: "Representative, as you pointed out earlier, this is a pendulum type... having more categories to be able to test that will provide DNA, in this case we've heard Members talk about actually a dul... a pendulum here. Where obviously with more tissue samples, other ways of providing DNA this will exonerate many people. And at the same time help reconfirm those who possibly have said that they're innocent and then the DNA will be clear and convincing in that there will be a variety of samples offered. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "Correct."

Delgado: "And would you also agree that any findings that are made will also be for information purposes on defense attorneys in a courtroom, they also will have access to the findings and the possible ramifications to their client?

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Delgado: "And so basically, this Bill with the Illinois State

Police, from my reading of it they can only test blood

samples at this point and they may have to create another

section to deal with tissue samples and saliva samples.

Would that be correct?"

Daniels: "That would be correct or they could outsource it."

Delgado: "And outsourcing it, are you aware also that Illinois stands for a big chunk of federal dollars, approximately \$55 million of federal dollars that I know in Chicago we're fighting for that will assist the DNA backlog in the State of Illinois and many of those dollars will go to the Illinois State Police Forensic Lab and to the Chicago lab? Are you aware of that possibility, that we may be able to see real soon a pot of gold coming in?"

Daniels: "I'm aware of the fact that we are working on federal funds, I was not aware of the exact amount. If you are aware of that then I appreciate your bringing it up."

Delgado: "Yes, I had the privilege of touring the lab in Chicago."

Daniels: "Right."

Delgado: "And we discussed the fact that we are right now trying to get a hold of \$55 million that will assist Illinois with their backlog. Obviously, it's noncompetitive. I would assume intelligently, Texas, Illinois, New York, and California which have the largest backlogs, these dollars are very necessary and would be a tremendous infusion to make this Bill a realty. Would you agree?"

Daniels: "Yes. I would agree."

Delgado: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. At this point, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Chamber, there are many ways that we have

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

to be careful and protect the rights of citizens and even those who are incarcerated. They have human rights. those human rights many times they may feel are as intrusive to take a sample, a tissue, or some blood, saliva. However, from my perspective, I've worked in criminology for quite a few years and represent a district that have many folks that like many districts are coming in This would provide a wonderful opportunity to and out. widen the categories of opportunity to determine someone's innocence. I could have the same argument and say it could determine someone's guilt. However, in fairness and in an open process and with oversight with this legislation it would be extremely... I would caution my Members that this is truly a good Bill. But it is a pendulum, it can go in either way. We wanna keep criminals locked up if they are hurting and killing our families in the street. We must to everything possible to rehabilitate them, but we must at the same time provide tools and instruments to assist us. And for the Illinois State Police, I would encourage them to begin to look down the road because we will be expanding and finding new ways to exonerate men and women who have been, through prosecutorial misconduct, through errors in their trial or their defense, this will give them a wider array of opportunity. And I support this legislation. do have some underlying concerns, but overall I would think that families of these inmates would suggest to you that they would want to do anything to help prove that their loved ones are innocent. And crime victims, victims of crime want to be sure. They don't want revenge, they want justice and they want to be sure that the person that did something to their loved one is truly and duly processed by law and incarcerated and have no risk of coming out later

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

on when we find out that some error was committed. I would strongly suggest an 'aye' vote for this piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Daniels, I have just a few concerns about this Bill. Right now, DNA has been used to exonerate a lot of men. And I'm afraid and I need for you to help me to understand how this won't be used in the reverse manner, because history has taught us that there has been all kinds of unscrupulous ways that so many innocent people have been incarcerated. Now, if we have DNA out there for the world to see, how and what guarantee can you give this Body that it would not be misused? Because it's not out there for the world to see so many men have been set free. So what..."

Daniels: "You're talking about the DNA evidence, how can I assure you that it will not be misused?"

Flowers: "Yes. How... because you talked about outsourcing and I'm reminded of this past summer when one of our state facilities and its worker had contaminated and crossed up someone's DNA and caused that person to be falsely... and it is my understanding that according to the newspaper that this person knew that the person was innocent but never did anything about it and the DNA was right there. So, I'm asking you if we put DNA out there how can we guarantee that it's protected? How... what guarantee will we have that it will not be misused and abused?"

Daniels: "Okay. My understanding is that the DNA analysis will be kept on a computer file and that the blood, using the blood as an example itself, will not be kept or the saliva if that is what is used, will not be kept."

Flowers: "But..."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Daniels: "Hence, the sample provided cannot be used to plant evidence to frame someone."

Flowers: "Well, let's talk about... you just said that the blood will not be kept. How will it be disposed of? Who would be responsible? How would we know for sure that it has been disposed of..."

Daniels: "Yeah."

Flowers: "... that it will not be later used down the line... "

Daniels: "Through the state."

Flowers: "So, once again, to me, if we pass this legislation we have taken away our guarantee to ensure that innocent men are set free. Right now we have a guarantee. We know that if we take a DNA test from these men that are incarcerated and if it doesn't match up with the sample that's already... that's been out there already or at the scene of the crime, this man is usually or woman, is set free. But, with what you're doing, we are putting someone else's life in a stranger's hand anticipating that this DNA was truly disposed of properly."

Daniels: "Representative, we passed a law a short time ago requiring that any person convicted of a sexual offence or designated as a sexually dangerous person, must submit a blood sample for DNA purposes back in 1994. So, we have been doing this already. The disposal procedure, I'm sure, is one that is followed carefully by the State Police. The guarantee, I think utilizing where you're coming from, if I'm a person that has been wrongfully accused I would want a DNA database to prove that I was not the one that committed the crime that was alleged to be committed. Secondly, remember, that these samples through the proper police procedures are destroyed and replaced and not part of any permanent record, that is the saliva itself or the

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

blood, is kept in a computer file and the databank then would be used with... be the computerization of that file. And it'll be no more available to a private entity as it would to a average citizen. It would be available to law enforcement and if you needed to seek that for proof you would do that through the proper court procedure."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is there any... would there be any time limits for as long as these samples would be held? For example, if an individual was to submit a sample of a DNA specimen for purposes of parole. He was paroled, paroled for his last three years. Would that sample then be destroyed at that point?"

Daniels: "Once it's in the database, it's in there permanently.

So, there's no limitation on how long it remains in the database. That DNA evidence or sample would be in that database."

Colvin: "And it would remain there for perpetuity, and it would be there forever."

Daniels: "Yes."

Colvin: "And, I think we can all agree that DNA specimens and evidence have served to protect and free a lot of wrongly convicted individuals. But I think there's a few problems with this Bill in the sense that it could also harangue those individuals who may be innocent of a crime. And I think of a situation where a specimen may be found at a crime scene, where an individual may have actually been there. And may be someone was killed at this scene, and they found a specimen or blood at the crime scene where maybe the individual was there and he participated in a fight, or he didn't actually kill anyone but his specimen

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

was found there. He's hauled into court and charged with the crime of murder. I think DNA evidence especially given its significance in our court system and our criminal justice system today, that that specimen may be enough, indeed, to convict that man of that crime. And I think that's probably a too big of a chance to risk for supporting this Bill."

Daniels: "Actually, the utilization of DNA evidence and the procedure that's followed would actually do the reverse to what you're fearful of. I believe that what it would do is assure that there is no innocent person that is going to jail. And the fact, the chain of evidence would be required to be utilized in order to prove a person guilty or for that matter, to be allowed to show a person's I mean, I think this is a win/win for everybody, the advancement of scientific evidence, ability to databank DNA evidence, the utilization for purposes of showing that somebody is innocent of the crime they're accused of, or for that matter, guilty of the crime they're accused of. You know, I for one, it's like innovations had when they first started using we fingerprinting and now we have new scientific evidence that we can utilize to help solve crimes. And I know that there's not a person in this Chamber that's not in favor of taking any way we can, utilizing proper procedures to help solve crimes."

Colvin: "I would certainly agree with you then. I don't think anyone in the Chamber would be opposed of anything that would lead to good police work and catching more violent criminals and taking them off of our streets. I just want to make sure that we implement, you know, good policy relative to criminal justice system..."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Daniels: "Yes."

Colvin: "... that's responsible and it protects those individuals who may come up against, maybe an ambitious state's attorney or anyone else for that matter and so that those who maybe, you know, convicted or identified forever in a database as a result of committing some crime that that evidence is used in a very responsible way. Thank you."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels to close."

Daniels: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In 1994, this General Assembly passed a law resulting in the utilization of submitting blood samples to the State Police for inclusion and in a DNA databanks for those people that were convicted of sexual offence or designated as a sexual dangerous person. That was the first step in creating an appropriate database. I think this is a tremendous step forward. I stand here before you and submit to you this is a great Bill for law enforcement, a great Bill for potential victims in the future, and a great Bill to make sure that the innocent are not wrongfully convicted. I urge all of you to support this very important piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3734, Mr. Osmond. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3734, a Bill for an act concerning public funds. Third Reading of this House Bill."

92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3734 will allow municipal authorities to pay bills electronically. It amends the... amends the Act that we talked about this before, about accepting electronic transferred funds. And this simply allows the treasurer, if they want to, to be able to disperse electronically. There's no opposition to it. It was initiative brought by the the Lake County Treasurer. And, we have support through Municipal League, the Illinois County Treasurer Association, Metro Counties, and Illinois Bankers. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Jerry Mitchell, did you wish to move House Bill 3771? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Clerk, have we distributed the Supplemental Calendar?"

Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #1 has been distributed."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Supplemental Calendar there appears HR

588. Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

House Resolution 588 is the Resolution that would urge the
Governor to not go ahead with his planned privatization of
the commissary and dietary systems in the State of Illinois
and ask the Governor to reconsider his thought to
privatizing any of our correctional institutions. Today,
in the State of Illinois we have 36 institutions. We have

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

some 48 thousand inmates in the State of Illinois. In his desire to supposedly to save them money, he is wanting to the dietary and commissary parts of our privatize correctional system. I'm opposed to this concept and idea simply because I think it would jeopardize the security of our correctional system as we know it today. It will allow for things to happen that should not happen. individuals who would be brought in to provide this service probably cannot do it as effective or as reasonable as the dietary and commissary people now provide. I also think that it is a backstepping in going back on the Governor's In many of the communities, as we establish these correctional facilities in the State of Illinois, Department of Corrections and the Department came to communities and asked them to put in bids and to 'wine and dine' them for the ability to have this correctional facility. And one of those commitments were good-paying jobs for a long period of time, a lot of money being spent in those communities. Under the Governor's plan for dietary and commissary privatization, it is my fear that many of these contracts for foodstuffs and other things used at the correctional facilities will be going out of state or to national accounts and will not be provided by local vendors. For those individuals who now are providing that service to the State of Illinois have been told, well, we will find you another job in the system. Well, I only think that adds cost to the whole system. And so, I would urge you to support and adopt House Resolution 588."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I fully agree with the previous speaker and with what he's attempting to do here. I have been down to, I think, virtually every prison now, most of

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

them numerous times. The people that are working there do a tremendous job and they do it under some horrible circumstances. As some previous speakers have talked about on other issues, we are so overwhelmed right now down It is absolutely amazing. There are so few guards watching so many people. They do such a tremendous job and every day they're putting their life in jeopardy, when we do more and more stupid things. Well, this would truly be one of the dumbest things we could do if we go about trying to privatize the vendors. Why? I'll give two reasons. is from the safety side of it. Who would be these people their bringing in? What's their training? Do they have any of the training that the people have right now? And the answer to that is, 'no'. They would have none of that. So, all the people that we'd be bringing in would be people that'd be further jeopardizing other people's lives. The other concern that I would have, too, is look what we did when we privatized before. We privatized health care services. When I went down to Robinson to visit down there they had inmates laying on the floors all over, right by the pharmacy, had complete access to it. absolutely no control, had no idea what was going on. And this is what happened when we privatized the health care So, their track record right now is horrific. services. And the final thing I mentioned, too, is as far as financial savings, no one has been able to come up with a figure that's made any sense, yet. The amount of money we're talking is minuscule. If this is someone's effort to try and solve the budget crisis, it is pigheaded and stupid. As I said, we owe it to the people that are down Each and every day they put their lives on the there. And by doing something like this, we're only line.

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

endangering their lives. That's why I strongly agree with this Resolution and I think we all should support it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McGuire. McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of HR 588.

As a Representative, and a resident of Joliet where there are many correction facilities, I think that safety and security in privatization are not advisable. They're not compatible. And I would urge a 'no' vote, excuse me, an 'aye' vote on this measure. 'No' against privatization, of course. I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Resolution, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, an Inquiry of the Chair. Pursuant to the appropriate House Rule, I'm joined by the sufficient number of people on my side of the aisle to ask for a record vote on this Resolution. Would that be all right with you, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "That sounds like a great idea, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much. To the Resolution, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in strong support of the Resolution, and at one time was a hyphenated cosponsor. But I've been here long enough know to now that I'm relegated to a cosponsor. And that's all right, that's the way to process works. It is our job as Legislators to discuss issues that represent, I think, major changes in policy in State Government. No one has come to Representative Hartke, no one has come to me and I've written and I've asked the question, how is this going to save us money? Compare and contrast the operation at Joliet with the operation in my hometown of Danville. If

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

you can show me that you are saving significant amount of dollars, I'm willing to sit down and discuss that and negotiate that and talk about it. But that's not the way this has been handled. I get up one Friday morning and read in the newspaper that we're going to change the way we have run dietary and commissary in a prison that we, in my town 17 years ago, 18 years ago, had a town meeting and literally they banned and everybody there testified that we wanted this facility in our hometown, in my hometown of Danville. Now, had you done that 30 years ago you wouldn't have had one person speak in favor of locating a prison in my hometown. But things change. We've lost a number of in my area. I just lost 700 more manufacturing jobs in my hometown on December 31st with the closure of Hyster Corporation, a manufacturer of lift trucks that have been in Danville 54 years. This hurts. I don't care whether you're a Republican or Democrat, whether you're a member of AFSCME, or whether you're not a member of AFSCME. When jobs leave your community, it hurts every single person in that community. And I am going to fight just as hard for the jobs at Hyster as I intend to do for the jobs at Danville Correctional Center. I can't afford another 30 people laid off in my community. We've lost over 7,000 manufacturing jobs in 15 years. When the Department of Corrections came to that area in Danville, they promised us about two or three things as I recall. One, they would be a good neighbor. And I think they have been. And the community said we would be a good neighbor to them. think we have been, as well. And they said they would provide steady jobs. And they've done that up to this We could use a few more correctional officers, but point. that's another issue. Now, if ... we're going to start

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

changing the way we operate correctional centers, then we better go back to the communities that asked that they come there and have been good neighbors, how much change do you want to see? I have a lot of questions that I think should be debated by this General Assembly. If you hire a private contractor and they hire people at \$7.50 hour or whatever it is, what's their turnover rate? How well-trained are they going to be in security and safety? Don't tell me you're going to hire Mayor McCheese to give Happy Meals to 19 hundred inmates in my prison. That isn't gonna work. That's just foolishness. And by the way, those 19 hundred inmates are in a prison that was built for 856. We ask these people to do a very difficult job. We pass law after law in this Chamber to put people in prison longer and keep'em there longer and maybe in some cases, keep'em there It is incumbent upon us to be able to discuss and forever. debate major changes of policy if we're going to change how these correctional centers work and that's all I asked for, and I didn't get that. And I still don't have the answers to the questions. Are you going to make these companies be bonded? Are you going to do background checks on these I assume you're going to do background checks companies? on the employees. Are you going to make these employees be subjected to the kind of training and security training our current dietary and commissary officers go through? If you are, tell me that. If you're not, then I should have a right to know that, as well as the right of every citizen who is surrounded by a prison have a right to know how you intend to operate that facility. And major changes in that operation should be discussed openly, publicly, and given a chance. I daresay, you should have a hearing in every community that has a correctional center

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

and discuss how this is going to work and whether or not it puts that community at risk. But even beyond that, let me just tell you as an individual as well as a Legislator, there was a private contractor at the Danville Correctional Center. I'm not sure how much my speech is protected, so I won't give you the name of the company. I don't want to get sued. They were hired to perform health care services at the Danville Correctional Center. They left literally in the dark of night, pulled out of their contract and They left owing a hospital in Danville over \$325 left. thousand in unpaid bills. If you total up all the unpaid bills this private contractor left with local vendors in my hometown it approaches \$400 thousand dollars. Now, if that's the way to save money, no thank you, my town can't afford that. If you're going to do this, then let's discuss it openly, calmly, and rationally, and know exactly what we're gonna to get into. Nobody has yet come to me with any evidence, whatsoever, in light of what my health care private contractor did to our community. And by the way, I have employees of that company that still, they left 1999, they still can't get their 401k money out of that private contractor. That isn't right. It isn't right. isn't fair. But when all is said and done, why hasn't someone come to anybody in this General Assembly and said, 'You know our current system is broken and we need to fix I've not heard from anybody... not on the... not a correctional officer, not a dietary officer, not anybody in the public, not anybody connected with corrections, that the system is broken. It seems to work fairly well at a reasonable cost and at safety and security not only to the people and the inmates, but to the community that welcomed this institution to Danville 17 years ago. Major changes

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

should be thoroughly discussed, well-planned, and well-thought-out. And we should all have the right to weigh in on that. And I feel that we have not had that right and that's the reason I support this Resolution and intend to vote 'aye'. And Mr. Speaker, I've worked with you on House Bill 3714. There's a Bill out there that will prevent privatization. It should be out of Rules. It should be in committee. And it should be on this House Floor the next time we convene."

Speaker Madigan: "Bill, they love ya. The Chair would like to respectfully make a suggestion. There are five people seeking recognition on this matter. Is there anyone who wishes to stand in opposition to it? Is there anyone who wishes to stand in opposition to the Resolution? Now, with that in mind, we still have five people seeking to speak.

Mr. Bost, could you be brief?"

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do rise in support of House Bost: Resolution 588. We've heard about the safety factor. We've heard about the concerns that we've had whenever the nursing was privatized. There's a concern that I have and it has to do with the fact that a lot of these people that are being affected by the proposed privatization are my friends and neighbors. When my children play in Little have to sit beside them. Now, I grandchildren are up and coming, I probably have to do that with them, too. Folks, when we make... when decisions are made and we don't have the opportunity as Legislators to get actively involved, rather than just sending those letters and arguing with the administration or the director, when they're proposing these ideas, and we don't move forward with legislation, we're taken out of the process. We can only do what... the people that sent us

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

here that they do, which is complain, send letters. is a move in the right direction. Representative Black mentioned the fact that there is a House Bill that I believe should be brought to the floor and we support and move on to the Senate, so that we can send it to the Governor. A Resolution, is a statement on how feel and how we believe. And I think it's a very strong statement and I think it's something that we should do. Because each one of these people that are proposed to be let go have families, children that they need to support. And it hits right home with me, right at home. Folks, this is a very serious issue. And I know that we see a lot of issues that are played politics with and when you're playing politics with an issue that has some affect on people around the state, that's one thing, but the amount of people that this affects is a tremendous amount of people, people that serve us very well. Not only, if we privatize the food service and are... well, food service, dietary, and commissary, are we just getting rid of those jobs, we are endangering other guards and the life of possibly some inmates. Folks, this is not the proper way, the privatization is not the proper way to handle our budget problems here in the state, especially, when you look at the actual numbers, that those numbers should be debated and brought before us in appropriation hearings and discussion on these issues so that we can at least see actual numbers. The numbers that we see, we don't see why We just get numbers thrown out. they came to pass. Now, all of a sudden, Originally, it was 2.5 million. we're talking for a full year, we're talking 20 million. I'm not sure how these few a jobs are going to affect that dollar amount. But folks, I hope you pay close attention

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

to everything that's been said here. I think that this will just fly out of here, as it was mentioned awhile ago. No one and I jokingly said I don't believe anybody will stand in opposition to this. But what we need to do is make sure that everybody stands for keeping our guards and our food service people in and under state control, not under a private control. I've seen problems that have came up with privatization in the one veterans home that we have here in the state. And I fought to try to allow us as a state to take that over. Folks, we don't need to go down that path with the Department of Corrections. I support this Resolution and I encourage your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few questions, if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, it seems like... and I want to make sure that prefacing any of my comments, Representative that I'm... understand I'm going to vote for this Resolution. And I suspect that most everybody on our side of the aisle will vote for your Resolution. But it seems to me that I don't know if disingenuous is the word, but for us to be here today is a little late. Wouldn't you agree that if your side of the aisle, the side that is in control of this chamber, had actually come to the table and met with the other Leaders, the Speaker, I speak of specifically and met with the other Leaders and the Governor to discuss the budget and to discuss the cuts that needed to be made in a fair, in a broad way, that we wouldn't even need to be discussing this Resolution? Wouldn't you agree with that, Representative?"

Hartke: "Let me answer you this way, Representative Cross. If

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

you look at the Resolutions that were submitted last spring in March, long before anybody ever recognized that we had a a problem with our budget, I introduced a Resolution that did this very thing and I reintroduced it this fall after the Governor said he was gonna make those cuts. Now, last spring I had conversations in my office with the Director of the Department of Corrections, Mr. Snyder and he assured me he had no intention, no intention whatsoever, of moving forward with any plan to privatize the dietary and commissary portions of our Department of Corrections. You know, Mr. Snyder may have lived up to his word, but somehow the Governor has not..."

Cross: "Was that Bill called, Chuck?"

Hartke: "...following his directors. Excuse me?"

Cross: "Was that Resolution ever called?"

Hartke: "No, that Resolution was not called. But it was submitted and out here and I was aware of it way back then, as were many of the people here in the gallery today, that this was the mode that they were going to get into, to privatize our prison. This Resolution says, 'no, we've had enough.' We have a State Law that says that we don't have private prisons in the State of Illinois, and this is one incremental step after another to do that job. It has nothing to do with our budget problems, now. I wanted to talk about it way last spring. Nobody wanted to talk about it then."

Cross: "Well, Representative, with all due respect, you point to our side of the aisle. We don't control the Rules Committee, if you recall. We don't control the Speaker's Chair. If I'm not mistaken, the Speaker of the House of Representatives decides which Bills get called and which Bills don't. If your Bill is so important then and the

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Resolution was so important, why didn't the Speaker call it?"

Hartke: "Timing is everything, Mr. Cross. Timing is everything."

Cross: "Well, I guess I question how important it was back then, if the Speaker didn't call it."

Hartke: "It was very important. I guess sometimes you've got to scream and holler and go on until..."

Cross: "Obviously, the Speaker didn't..."

Hartke: "...you get that attention. Obviously, we've got that
 attention."

Cross: "Obviously, the Speaker didn't care about the AFSCME workers back then, did he, because he didn't call the Bill."

Hartke: "All right, would you like to get on this Resolution?"

Cross: "Well, again I ask ya, why would your side of the aisle refus... why did your side of the aisle refuse to negotiate the budget cuts that needed to be made subsequent to September 11th? We would all agree that that caused some problems, not only in this state's economy, but around the country. Why wouldn't you simply say, as the Democrat Majority, let's get together with the other Leaders and try to come up with some budget cuts that are fair, instead of limiting the Governor to a just of couple areas where we've... now as you would acknowledge harmed the hospitals and had unnecessary Medicaid cuts. Because simply, Chuck, you guys wouldn't talk. You didn't want to sit down at the table. And that baffles me."

Hartke: "I think that maybe that was part of the discussion and the Governor refused to give up those, his idea of privatization, even if we gave him those cuts. It was never on the table for that."

Cross: "Well, Representative that's simply not true."

92nd Legislative Day February 6, 2002

Hartke: "Of course, Representative Cross, I am..."

Cross: "That's simply not true and I'm not sure your side of the aisle can even address that because you wouldn't come to the table and even talk about giving the Governor more authority to make cuts. That's the sad reality and the fact that you did not want to participate in budget negotiations and the necessary budget cuts. unfortunately, we now have to address this issue today because you wanted to play political games. And that's sad and I'm pointing at everybody on your side of the aisle, Chuck, and specifically, the Speaker, 'cause it's been very clear that the Speaker did not want to negotiate in good faith the necessary budget cuts that we needed to make in this state."

Hartke: "Well, I totally disagree with you."

Cross: "Well, I guess, Representative, I speak not only on behalf of the Republicans on this side, but I would if you want me to, I'll go get all the editorials from the newspapers around the State of Illinois, upstate, downstate, east, and west that have suggested that we are now at a problem stage and that we've picked on solely the hospitals and the Medicaid, made the Medicaid cuts, because you would not, you and the Speaker would not sit down with the Governor and the other Legislative Leaders and make the necessary cuts and give the Governor the necessary authority to broaden his cuts. In fact, if I'm not mistaken, we had a Bill here a couple of weeks ago that many of your side, your side of the aisle wouldn't even vote for that would have given the Governor broader authority and that's still baffling. And if that Bill had passed including, and if it had been voted on by many of the Leaders on the Democrat side, we wouldn't be here

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

today. It would've been over in on the Senate. It would have probably been on the Governor's desk and we could have addressed it. But know we've got this Resolution that, quite frankly, doesn't mean a whole lot, Chuck, and I don't understand why we're doing it now. It's a little late."

Hartke: "Was that a question?"

Cross: "Why are we doing it now, when we could have solved this problem by passing the Bill we had before us a couple of weeks ago?"

Hartke: "I don't think at that time we could have solved the problem if we would've passed that Bill. The Governor said that was not a part of his suggestion. He wanted the privatization anyway."

Cross: "Well, Chuck, as I said earlier, I'm gonna vote for this Bill (sic-Resolution). I think it's the right thing to do. think it's the only thing we can do, given circumstances. But the harsh reality of the fact is, the Speaker of the House, our Speaker, the Democrat, the Chairman of the Democratic Party of the State of Illinois, the Speaker of the Democrat-controlled House refused to participate, refused to Representatives, participate in any meaningful way with the Governor and the other Legislative Leaders to come up with the necessary budget cuts and to give the Governor broader authority to make the cuts that wouldn't put us in this situation and that's sad. And we're gonna vote for your Bill because we don't much choice, 'cause we want to protect the these people, just like you say you do. But if we had been here a couple of weeks ago or a couple of months ago, we wouldn't even have to be addressing this and that's to bad. Thanks a lot."

Speaker Madigan: "Jerry Mitchell."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Hartke, you mentioned that you had some discussions with Director Snyder regarding this issue."

Hartke: "Yes, last spring"

Mitchell, J.: "Once you realized that... that he was moving forward at the direction of the Governor's Office, were you given any statistics concerning the safety of those prisons that have been privatized in various areas?"

Hartke: "Did you say savings?"

Mitchell, J.: "No, safety."

Hartke: "Many, many correctional officers and individuals employed by the Department of Corrections have written me letters and e-mails concerning the question of safety and the possibility that the integrity of the whole system could be broke down, if this system were to be implemented."

Mitchell, J.: "And so, we basically have two factors here that that we need to worry about with the area of privatization of prisons. First of all and foremost to me, is the safety of the prison family. Because I know quite well in Dixon, Illinois, the the guards, the commissary, food services work together as a team and one knows what the other's doing and they all have the training. I'm not so sure that privatizing will allow those people coming in to the prisons to have the training to ensure for all of the guards to have this safety that they have now. We've got one of the best safety records in the nation in our prisons. I sure hate to see that go downhill. But another issue is one that I would also like to refer to. I've been an Aprop Chairman for now six years and I think it's time

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

and I think that other Aprop Chairpersons on both sides of the aisle would agree to me that we need to shed some light on the budget process. We need to open that door, so that we all have discussions in the pro... in the budget process and not just leave it up to the Leaders. We are all taking hits for the seriousness of the budget. But quite frankly, folks, we had very little to say about it. It's high time that this entire Body get involved in the budget process, know where those dollars are going, know what's going to with the budget and make sure that we don't face this kind of situation again. It's a lot of fun to go home with a nice fat budget, but now it's gonna get tough. And even then, Aprop Chairpeople have had very little to say about what to cut, when to cut. We can't even to get the Leaders to get to the table together and discuss with the Governor where to cut. I think it's time now to shed some light that budget, so that we all know and we all have input. Because we certainly haven't had. And anybody in here that's not in Leadership but in a situation where they are in a Chairman of Appropriations, know dagone well, that a lot times we have very, very little input on the final product that we all have to vote on the last day of Let's turn that process around and try to avoid Session. the situations that we have now. We've got good folks out here today worried about their jobs at a time when they shouldn't have to be worrying about that. They should be worrying about whether or not our prisons are as safe as they can possibly be. We need to stand together. We need to send a message that, yeah, there are savings that can be made out there, but we shouldn't be in this situation. that we are, let's make sure that we keep these people working and make sure that we keep our prisons safe. Thank

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers. Mr. Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Resolution and I certainly would urge an 'aye' vote. not sure there's a whole lot that I can add to this discussion and to the benefits of passing this Resolution. But let me make a few comments anyway. I'm sure that there are probably areas of State Government that it's possible to privatize and maybe even some that it might be wise to privatize, but I don't think this is one of them. I have currently, two prisons in my district and I've talked to the correctional officers a number of times about the working conditions within those facilities. I also have talked to the personnel in medical services and medical records whose areas have been privatized. individuals currently tend to have a low morale. And why do they have a low morale? Because every time they turn around there's a new contractor for those services and those individuals, many of whom have worked at the same prison for many, many, years. Every time there's a new contractor come around they start all over again with wages, and benefits and time and everything else. So, it's just like starting a brand new job, even though they've been there for many, many years. The same may be true if you try to privatize these other areas. But more than that, I'm concerned about the safety and welfare of the officers within those prisons, because everybody within those prisons currently, act pretty much as a team. full support group that help each other out, in the event that they see or hear something that could be threatening to the safety and security, not only of them, but of the facility and the institution, as well. And one last thing

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

regarding this whole area, if you privatize food services and dietary and commissary, there is another area of the correctional fac... system that could be impacted and that is correctional industries. We currently have a facility that manufactures some food items that goes into the correctional food system. If you privatize the food and dietary, and they start outsourcing and service outbidding for the food products, it's possible that it could be... we could see the food service or t.he industrie's portion of corrections that manufacture the food items take a big hit. Then that affects another part of Corrections budget, which I guess, brings me to my few comments and that regards the entire budgetary process. As a spokesman on an Appropriations Committee, I would like to see us debate the budget and dig into and discuss the budget in a manner that will alleviate the deep hits and the deep cuts to the budget in certain areas that might relieve the pressure on Corrections and other parts of the budget with regard to where we're going to make these budget cuts. So, I would urge all sides of the ... both sides of the Chamber to seriously negotiate the budget and find areas that are compatible and agreeable to everybody, if we're going to have to make some cuts. But don't make one segment of our state's employment, one segment of our state's structure, infrastructure, take the majority hit in this regard. I certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to speak to the issue of this Bill. I would certainly support this Resolution. But in the ten years that I've been in Illinois General Assembly, eight of those years I've either

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

been the Chair or the Minority Spokesman of Human Service On January 10th we had an opportunity to Appropriations. pass a Bill that would have given the Governor broader powers in order to make fairer cuts in the budget, something we should have done in the Veto Session. We did not do it on January 10th. We did not do it in the Veto Now, we're faced with a flawed budget process. And I'm... assume that the Sponsors of this Resolution and the people that will vote for it will also help those of us when we bring individual Resolutions, where we're going to address a budget in piecemeal, for all of us that have projects, such as mental health. The Resolution that I tried to pass last year, just to put forth a task force to study the problems we're having with the developmentally disabled programs in Illinois. The budget system is seriously flawed here. The fact that Representatives do not have enough input, the fact that our Committee tomorrow morning is going to address the Fiscal 2003 Budget and let advocates come in before we've even seen that budget, only goes to show how scared the people of Illinois are about what's happening and the fact that we can't put together a cohesive way of dealing with the budget. I certainly hope that the Sponsor of this Resolution will come back and help us when we pass... try to pass similar Resolutions that will address these issues. Also, as the Chair for the Fiscal Budget Committee for the Conference of Legislators, we are all concerned about this budget and the that handle these way we matters. Certainly, Representative Hartke, Representative Black, are concerned about people that they represent and so, I will support these Legislators in their attempt to save jobs for people in their districts. But I do not think that it addresses

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

the issue. We should have passed the Bill that gave the Governor broader powers so that we would have a more balanced way of dealing with this. And we certainly aren't dealing with this budget in any manner, that shou... the way it should be dealt with or to put some light on it, so that the Legislature actually has some input in what we're doing. So, I will support this Resolution, but the process is flawed and I think the Majority Party in this Body ought to seriously think about what didn't pass on January 10th here."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, to the Resolution. Real briefly, I guess that some of the previous speakers I respect and I respect their opinions. But let me just tell ya, I never... on January 10th when we voted, in the Veto Session when we voted, where in that Bill, show me where in that Bill, where in any public comments from the Governor's Office did it say that if we gave him that authority on January 10th he wouldn't privatize these services? Show me where. Nowhere, nowhere. That's why some of the people on your side of the aisle joined us and rejected giving him that authority. How can we stand here today and now look back and say on January 10th, if we'd had given that authority to the Governor, he wouldn't have privatized these services and tried to privatize these services? We should not be standing here grandstanding. We should walk hand-in-hand to the Governor's Office and say this affects peoples' lives, peoples' jobs, let's pass the Resolution and quit political grandstanding."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke to close."

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Hartke: "Well, thank you very much. I appreciate all of the response that I've received for... positive response for this Resolution. I think it's high time we take control of what's going on here. You know, the speakers, three or four years ago, created the Committee on Prison Reform, Representative Dart, and Representative Johnson, Representative Delgado and many of us have gone around the state, not only visiting our prisons but looking into this system and question of privatization. It's time we do something. The Governor now is wanting to eliminate the commissary and dietary portions of our correctional systems, in spite of the moratorium and legislation against privatization of our prisons. I want to thank everyone for their support for this Resolution and urge your vote for it today. Thank you very much. "

Speaker Turner: "I'll remind the Body that a Roll Call has been requested on this Bill (sic-Resolution). The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 588 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'nays'. And this Bill... this Resolution, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Will, Representative McGuire, for what reason do rise?"

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to announce that due to the lack of activity, tomorrow's Aging Committee meeting will be canceled. Tomorrow's Aging Committee meeting will be canceled. That will be tomorrow, Thursday. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "So, the Geritol will be here next week? On the

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Order of Resolutions, we have House Resolution 624. Read the Resolution Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "

HOUSE RESOLUTION 624

WHEREAS, President Ronald Wilson Reagan, a man of humble background, worked throughout his life serving the cause of freedom and advancing the public good, having been employed as an entertainer, union leader, corporate spokesman, Governor of California, and President of the United States; and

WHEREAS, Ronald Reagan served with honor and distinction for two terms as the 40th President of the United States of America, the second of which he was victorious in 49 out of the 50 states in the general election, earning the confidence of three-fifths of the electorate - a record unsurpassed in the history of American presidential elections; and

WHEREAS, In 1981, when Ronald Reagan was inaugurated President, he inherited a disillusioned nation shackled by rampant inflation and high unemployment; and

WHEREAS, During Mr. Reagan's presidency, he worked in a bipartisan manner to enact his bold agenda of restoring accountability and common sense to Government, which led to an unprecedented economic expansion and opportunity for millions of Americans; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Reagan's commitment to an active social policy agenda for the nation's children helped lower crime and drug use in our neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, President Reagan's commitment to our armed forces contributed to the restoration of pride in America, her values,

92nd Legislative Day

and those cherished by the free world and prepared America's Armed

Forces to win the Gulf War; and

WHEREAS, President Reagan's "vision of peace through strength" led to the end of the Cold War and the ultimate demise of the Soviet Union, guaranteeing basic human rights for millions of people; and

WHEREAS, On February 6, 2002, Ronald Reagan will celebrate his 91st birthday, thus becoming the oldest living former President; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we designate February 6, 2002, as "President Ronald Reagan Day" in the State of Illinois, in honor of our former President; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to President Ronald Reagan as an expression of our esteem; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Illinois House of Representatives congratulates Congressman J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, on his successful effort to establish the Ronald Reagan Boyhood Home National Historic Site in Dixon; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Congressman J. Dennis Hastert as an expression of our esteem."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Illinois is blessed to have a number of favorite sons who inspire us from both the echoes of days passed and modern times. And when one of our own, one of Illinois'

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

best and brightest rises to a level of great responsibility and honor it brings pride to our state and to our people. feel that way about our current Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Denny Hastert, by the way I might add, a former colleague of all of ours in the Illinois House. He was in this Chamber not so long ago. And now he is one of the most important governmental officials in the world. And how proud we all are when we see Congressman Speaker Denny Hastert presiding over the United States House of Representatives. And you all know how I feel about Abraham Lincoln and the legacy that he left for the state and this country. But there is a living legend we should also recognize, and that's President Ronald Reagan. And Ladies and Gentlemen, today is his birthday. The Resolution that Clerk just read gave a very brief chronicle of 'The Great Communicator's' accomplishments and the changes in America he led us through. If you listen carefully, one fact becomes crystal clear, Ronald Reagan presided over some of the most historically significant times this country has through. And he did it with grace. And he did it with dignity. And he did it for us. Today, President Reagan's battle with the ravages of one of our cruelest diseases is well-known. I think it only fitting that on his 91st birthday, we unanimously honor President Reagan with this Resolution. And very soon, we will make this honor a yearly event to be celebrated in the ages. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for your affirmative vote for 'The Great Communicator', the great son of Illinois, the great leader of the free world, Ronald Reagan."

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

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Resolution. I have the privilege and the honor of having the district where 'Dutch' Reagan was born and went through his boyhood years. Parallel to a lot of things that this great president did, attended the same college and had the great opportunity of meeting him on two different occasions when he came back to Eureka College. Ronald Reagan was the only president born in this state. He is a favorite son and 'The Great Communicator'. One thing I did want to bring up that Leader Daniels did not bring up, is the fact that this year we did lose another great American and true champion for the Alzheimer's disease and the fight against it, and that's his daughter, Maureen Reagan, who succumbed to cancer this year. She was a great orator, herself. She was a super speaker and a lady. We all admire and miss her. She was back great many, many times, in fact, she was there to speak to the students at Ronald Reagan Middle School in Dixon, Illinois, not too long ago. She was in Tampico, the birthplace of Ronald Reagan, to celebrate the opening of Reagan Trail that runs from Dixon or from Tampico down through Dixon to Eureka, Illinois. Many, many, many things in this state are attributed to this great leader. And I think this is a wonderful tribute on President Reagan's birthday. So, happy date, happy birthday, 'Dutch', and let's all get behind the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Resolution. I've got a little story to tell about the former president. He was the first president I've met and I met him before he was President of the United States,

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

when he was an ex-Governor. He was in my hometown of Decatur. And I was covering him for the local high school. And I walked into to the press conference and I asked a question and the press shouted over me. They had another. And so the Governor, he looked down and he said, and I finally got to ask my question. Then the evening he was speaking at a fundraising dinner at Holiday Inn. I walk into the corridor and the Governor was standing there. And the Governor stopped and he said, 'young man, come here.' So, I walked over and talked to And he says, 'I just about didn't think the Governor. you'd get your question in.' I said, 'Well, Governor, I appreciate you, you, ya know, asking me.' And he said, 'Well, ya.' He says, 'Do you go to Millikin University?' said, 'No, I go to Saint Teresa High School.' He said, 'Well, you know I went to Eureka.' And he said, 'We played Millikin and I think Millikin beat us back then in the '20s.' And I said, 'well, that you know,... high school.' And he spent, and he spent five minutes talking to a 16-year-old boy. And then finally he said, 'Where you going to be tonight for the dinner?' And I said, 'Well, don't know even if they'll let me in.' He says, 'Young man', he says, 'why don't you sit with my folks?' put me at the front table with his staff. And I'll tell ya, I've never forgotten what a great man he was to spend five minutes with a 16-year-old kid. And he made me... really got my start in government. I just wanna to say, happy birthday, Mr. President. I appreciate your kindness to me."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, question is, 'Shall House Resolution 624 pass?' All those in favor, should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

92nd Legislative Day

- February 6, 2002
- Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is passed.

 The Lady from Grundy, Representative O'Brien."
- O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement."
- Speaker Turner: "Speak, state your case."
- O'Brien: "The House Judiciary II Committee will convene tomorrow morning at 9:00, not 8:00 in the morning."
- Speaker Turner: "Any further announcements? The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Mr. Speaker, for the point of personal privilege. I just want to thank the Representatives that just spoke to notice that we are having committees. I was beginning to think we're the Senate. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk,
 Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned
 until tomorrow, Thursday, at the hour of 11 a.m., 11 a.m.
 Thursday. All in favor say, 'aye'. And the 'ayes' have
 it. And the House stands adjourned until 11:00, Thursday."
- Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction First Reading of Bills. House Bill 4991,
 offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act
 respecting education. House Bill 4992, offered by
 Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, a Bill for an Act
 concerning environmental protection. House Bill 4993,
 offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act making
 appropriations and reappropriations. House Bill 4994,
 offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act
 in relation to child support. House Bill 4995, offered by
 Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes.
 House Bill 4996, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a
 Bill for an Act concerning procurement. House Bill 4997,
 offered by Representative Mathias, A Bill for an Act in

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

relation to criminal law. House Bill 4998, offered by Representative Berns, a Bill for an Act regarding taxation. House Bill 4999, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 5000, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. House Bill 5001, offered by Representative Granberg, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5002, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5003, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5004, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a for an Act in relation to crime victims. House Bill 5005, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act Bill 5006, concerning seeds. House offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for Act concerning an agriculture. House Bill 5007, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 5008, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5009, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 5010, executive agencies. offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5011, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5012, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5013, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act in relation to workers' compensation. House Bill 5014, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for Act concerning workers' an compensation. House Bill 5015, offered by Representative

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Winkel, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. House Bill 5016, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the Historic Preservation Agency. House Bill 5017, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the Historic Preservation Agency. House Bill 5018, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to sports facilities. House Bill 5019, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5020, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. House Bill 5021, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5022, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5023, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 5024, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 5025, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5026, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 5027, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning grain. House Bill 5028, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. House Bill 5029, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 5030, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 5031, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning aquaculture. House Bill 5032, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to offered endangered species. House Bill 5033, by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

wildlife. House Bill 5034, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to wildlife. House Bill 5035, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to animals. House Bill 5036, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning life. House Bill 5037, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to forestry. House Bill 5038, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning land conservation. House Bill 5039, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5040, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to lakes. House Bill 5041, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency management. House Bill 5042, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family farmers. House Bill 5043, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning inspections. House Bill 5044, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning natural resources. House Bill 5045, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning resources. House Bill 5046, offered natural by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning forestry. House Bill 5047, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning State parks. House Bill 5048, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning open lands. House Bill 5049, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. House Bill 5050, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning alternate fuels. House Bill 5051, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to State finance. House Bill 5052, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

taxation. House Bill 5053, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning animal welfare. House Bill 5054, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an House Bill 5055, offered by concerning water. Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5056, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5057, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning forest preserves. House Bill 5058, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to Bill 5059, executive agencies. House offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to agencies. House Bill 5060, offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning wetlands. House Bill 5061, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipal government. House Bill 5062, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5063, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5064, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning premises liability. House Bill 5065, offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning land management. House Bill 5066, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning wastewater disposal. House Bill 5067, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning redevelopment. House Bill 5069, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 5070, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

conservation. House Bill 5071, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 5072, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the recreational use of land and water areas. House Bill 5073, offered by Representative Daniels, for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 5074, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to property taxes. House Bill 5075, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 5076, offered lands. open space by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. House Bill 5077, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5078, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5079, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5080, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to support. House Bill 5081, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning tourism. House Bill 5082, offered Representative Daniels, A Bill for an Act concerning Bill 5083, offered by historic preservation. House Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to development. House Bill 5084, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning museum districts. House Bill 5085, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning State audits. House Bill 5086, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Attorney General. House Bill 5087, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to the State Treasurer. House Bill 5088, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

the State Comptroller. House Bill 5089, offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Secretary of State. House Bill 5090, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act with regard to House Bill 5091, offered by Representative vehicles. Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5093, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to family law. House Bill 5094, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5095, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5096, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to trusts. House Bill 5097, offered by Representative Daniels, A Bill for an Act in relation to families. House Bill 5098, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. House Bill 5099, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family House Bill 5100, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relating to commercial transactions. House Bill 5101, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to family law. House Bill 5102, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to trusts. House Bill 5103, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil liability. House Bill 5104, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning probate law. House Bill 5105, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to House civil immunities. Bill 5106, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to Bill 5107, offered local government. House by

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the courts. House Bill 5108, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5109, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to child care. House Bill 5110, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 5111, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to estates. House Bill 5112, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to human rights. House Bill 5113, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. House Bill 5114, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning the courts. House Bill 5115, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. House Bill 5116, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning child care. House Bill 5117, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning hospital liens. House Bill 5118, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5119, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning motor vehicles. House Bill 5120, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill children's health. House 5121, offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning surrogate decision makers. House Bill 5122, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to liens. House Bill 5123, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning liens. House Bill 5124, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5125, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

civil procedure. House Bill 5126, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning civil procedure. House Bill 5127, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning freedom of information. House Bill 5128, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning open meetings. House Bill 5129, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public bodies. House Bill 5130, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning freedom of information. House Bill 5131, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to freedom of information. House Bill 5132, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 5133, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 5134, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to civil procedure. House Bill 5135, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 5136, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning real property. House Bill 5137, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 5138, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5139, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to families. House Bill offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. House Bill 5141, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. House Bill 5142, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning civil procedure. House Bill 5143, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 5144, offered

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment. House Bill 5145, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to unemployment insurance. House Bill 5146, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to unemployment 5147, offered by Representative insurance. House Bill Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to health in the workplace. House Bill 5148, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to health in the workplace. House Bill 5149, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to executive agencies. House Bill 5150, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to executive agencies. House Bill 5151, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5152, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. House Bill 5153, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to local governments. House Bill 5154, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning development. House Bill 5155, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 5156, offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning development. House Bill 5157, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 5158, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. House Bill 5159, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to executive agencies. House Bill 5160, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 5161, offered by Representative Daniels,

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. House Bill 5162, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in Bill 5163, relation to alcohol. House offered Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcohol. House Bill 5164, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. House Bill 5165, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 5166, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. House Bill 5167, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 5168, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5169, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5170, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5171, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5172, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5173, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5174, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in House Bill 5175, relation to public employee benefits. offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5176, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5177, for an Act offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5178, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act

February 6, 2002

92nd Legislative Day

relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5179, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5180, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5181, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5182, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5183, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5184, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5185, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5186, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5187, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5188, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5189, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5190, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in House Bill 5191, relation to public employee benefits. offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5192, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5193, for an Act offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5194, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5195, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5196, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5197, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5198, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5199, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5200, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning families. House Bill 5201, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 5202, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 5203, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5204, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5205, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5206, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5207, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act House Bill 5208, offered by relation to health. Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 5209, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 5210, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5211, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5212, offered by Representative

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5213, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5214, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. The following Bills are offered by Representative Daniels. House Bill 5215, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5216, a for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5217, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 5218, a Bill for an Act in relation to health facilities. House Bill 5219, a Bill for an Act concerning long-term care facilities. House Bill 5220, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health and developmental disabilities. House Bill 5221, offered... a Bill for an Act concerning health services. House Bill 5222, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5223, a Bill for an Act with regard to vehicles. House Bill 5224, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 5225, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 5226, a Bill for an Act regarding airports. House Bill 5227, a Bill for an Act in relation to airports. House Bill 5228, a Bill for an Act in relation to airports. House Bill 5229, a Bill for an Act in relation to airports. House Bill 5230, a Bill for an Act concerning airports. House Bill 5231, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. House Bill 5232, a Bill for an Act concerning highways. House Bill 5233, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. House Bill 5234, a Bill for an Act with regard to highways. House Bill 5235, a Bill for an Act concerning highways. House Bill 5236, a Bill for an Act in relation to State finance. House Bill 5237, a Bill for an Act in relation to State finance. House Bill 5238, a Bill for an Act regarding finance. House Bill 5239, a Bill for

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

an Act regarding transportation. House Bill 5240, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation. House Bill 5241, a Bill for an Act concerning public transportation. House Bill 5242, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5243, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 5244, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 5245, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 5246, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. House Bill 5247, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5248, a Bill for an Act with regard to vehicles. House Bill 5249, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5250, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. House Bill a Bill for an Act in relation to boats. House Bill 5252, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 5253, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5254, a Bill for an Act with regard to vehicles. House Bill 5255, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. House Bill 5256, a Bill for an Act concerning child care. House Bill 5257, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 5258, a Bill for an Act concerning veterinary medicine. House Bill 5259, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5260, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5261, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 5262, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5263, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5264, a Bill for an Act concerning pawnbrokers. House Bill 5265, a Bill for an Act concerning accounting. House Bill 5266, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5267, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Bill 5268, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5269, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5270, a Bill for an Act in relation to health facilities. House Bill 5271, a Bill for an Act in relation to hospitals. House Bill 5272, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation of professions. House Bill 5273, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5274, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5275, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5276, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 5277, a Bill for an Act concerning hearing instruments. House Bill 5278, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation professions. House Bill 5279, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5280, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of 5281, professions. House Bill 5282, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5283, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5284, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5285, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5286, a Bill for an Act concerning contact lenses. House Bill 5287, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5288, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5289, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 5290, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5291, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5292, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

professions. House Bill 5293, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5294, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5295, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 5296, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5297, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 5298, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5299, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 5300, a Bill for an Act concerning elder abuse. House Bill 5301, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5302, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5303, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5304, a Bill for an Act in relation to elderly persons. House Bill 5305, a Bill for an Act concerning the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan. House Bill 5306, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5307, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5308, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5309, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5310, a Bill for Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5311, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5312, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5313, a Bill for an Act in relation to State employees. House Bill 5314, a Bill for an Act relating to State employee benefits. House Bill 5315, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 5316, a Bill for an Act in relation to executive agencies. House Bill 5317, a Bill for an Act in relation to health facilities. House Bill 5318, a Bill for an Act in relation to health care. House Bill 5319, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. House Bill 5320, a Bill for an Act in relation to health care. House Bill

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

5321, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5322, a Bill for an Act concerning assistance to citizens. House Bill 5323, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5324, a Bill for an Act concerning citizen benefits. House Bill 5325, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5326, a Bill for an Act relation to public aid. House Bill 5327, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5328, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5329, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5330, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5331, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5332, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5333, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5334, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. House Bill 5335, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. House Bill 5336, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. House Bill 5337, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. House Bill 5338, a Bill for an Act concerning children's health programs. House Bill 5339, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5340, a Bill for an Act relating to children's health insurance. House Bill 5341, a Bill for an Act in relation to health services. House Bill 5342, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5343, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5344, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. House Bill 5345, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5346, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5347, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5348, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5349, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5350, a Bill for an Act concerning

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

education. House Bill 5351, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 5352, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5353, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5354, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5355, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5356, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5357, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. House Bill 5358, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 5359, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5360, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5361, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5362, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5363, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. House Bill 5364, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. House Bill 5365, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5366, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 5367, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5368, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. House Bill 5369, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. House Bill 5370, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5371, a Bill for an Act in relation to county government. House Bill 5372, a Bill for an Act in relation to county government. House Bill 5373, a Bill for an Act in relation to county government. House Bill 5374, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. House Bill 5375, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipal government. House Bill 5376, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipal government. House Bill 5377, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5378, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5379, a Bill for

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

an Act in relation to schools. House Bill 5380, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5381, a Bill for an Act respecting education. House Bill 5382, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5383, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 5384, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5385, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 5386, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5387, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5388, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5389, a Bill for an Act in relation to schools. House Bill 5390, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5391, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5392, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill 5393, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5394, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois lottery. House Bill Bill for an Act concerning debt management services. House Bill 5396, a Bill for an Act in relation to loans. House Bill 5397, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5398, a Bill for an Act in relation to credit and debit cards. House Bill 5399, a Bill for an Act to create the Payday Loan Act. House Bill 5400, a Bill for an Act to create the Predatory Lending Act. House Bill 5401, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5402, a Bill for an Act concerning sales finance agencies. House Bill 5403, a Bill for an Act concerning the sale and issuances of payment instruments. House Bill 5404, a Bill for an Act concerning foreign banking offices. House Bill 5405, a Bill for an Act concerning residential mortgages. House Bill 5406, a Bill for an Act to amend the Corporate Fiduciary Act. House Bill 5407, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5408, a

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Bill for an Act concerning consumer deposit accounts. House 5409, a Bill for an Act concerning pawnbrokers. House Bill 5410, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5411, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5412, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5414, a Bill for an Act concerning banks. House Bill 5415, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5416, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5417, a Bill for an Act in relation to business transactions. House Bill 5418, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5419, a Bill for an Act in relation transactions. House Bill 5420, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5421, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 5422, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 5423, a Bill for an Act in relation to real property. House Bill 5424, a Bill for an Act in relation to trusts. House Bill 5425, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Public Health. House Bill 5426, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Public Health. House Bill 5427, a Bill for an Act relation to public health. House Bill 5428, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5429, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5430, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5431, a Bill for Act concerning an health availability. House Bill 5432, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5433, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5434, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. House Bill 5435, a

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Bill for an Act concerning emergency management. House Bill 5436, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency management. House Bill 5437, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency management. House Bill 5438, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. House Bill 5439, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. House Bill 5440, a Bill for an Act relation to minors. House Bill 5441, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. House Bill 5442, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. House Bill 5443, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5444, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5445, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. House Bill 5446, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5447, Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5448, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5449, a for an Act in relation to elections. House Bill 5450, a Bill for an Act in relation to elections. House Bill 5451, a Bill for an Act in relation to elections. House Bill 5452, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal penalties. House Bill 5453, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5454, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5455, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal penalties. House Bill 5456, a Bill for an Act concerning government employee benefits. House Bill 5457, a Bill for an Act concerning energy. House Bill 5458, a Bill for an Act concerning certain land. House Bill 5459, a Bill for an Act in relation to executive agencies. House Bill 5460, a Bill for an Act in relation to State procurement. House Bill 5461, a Bill for an Act in relation to State procurement. House Bill 5462, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5463, a Bill for an Act regarding taxes. House Bill 5464, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

regulation. House Bill 5465, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5466, a Bill for an Act in relation to property taxes. House Bill 5467, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5468, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5469, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5470, a Bill for in relation to taxes. House Bill 5471, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5472, a Bill for an Act in relation to senior citizens and disabled persons. House Bill 5473, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5474, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5475, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. House Bill 5476, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. House Bill 5477, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5478, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5479, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment. House Bill 5480, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 5481, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment. House Bill 5482, a Bill for an Act in relation to business transactions. House Bill 5483, a Bill for an Act in relation to business transactions. House Bill Bill for an Act in relation to financial regulation. House Bill 5485, a Bill for an Act in relation to amusement rides. House Bill 5486, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5487, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5488, a Bill for an Act concerning telephone solicitation. House Bill 5489, a Bill for an Act concerning tobacco. House Bill 5490, a Bill for an Act concerning fireworks. House Bill 5491, a Bill for an Act in relation to fireworks. House Bill 5492, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcohol. House Bill 5493, a Bill for an Act in relation

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

to alcohol. House Bill 5494, a Bill for an Act in relation to business transactions. House Bill 5495, offered by Representative a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. House Bill 5496, offered by Representative a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5497, offered by Representative a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5498, offered by Representative a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5499, offered by Representative a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5500, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5501, a Bill for an Act concerning the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan. House Bill 5502, a Bill for an Act in relation to State employees. House Bill 5503, a Bill for an Act with respect to education. 5504, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5505, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5506, a Bill for an Act concerning the military. House Bill 5507, a Bill for an Act concerning military property. House Bill 5508, a Bill for an Act concerning military leave of absence. House Bill 5509, a Bill for an Act concerning the military. House Bill 5510, a Bill for an Act concerning the military. House Bill 5511, a Bill for Act concerning education. House Bill 5512, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5513, a Bill for an in relation to education. House Bill 5514, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5515, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5516, a Bill for Act in relation to veterans homes. House Bill 5517, for an Act in relation to veterans homes. House Bill 5518, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. House Bill 5519, a Bill for an Act in relation to veterans. House Bill 5520, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 5521, a

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 5522, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 5523, Bill for an Act in relation to veterans homes. House Bill 5524, a Bill for an Act concerning child care. House Bill 5525, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. House Bill 5526, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5527, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. House Bill 5528, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. House Bill 5529, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. House Bill 5530, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education. House Bill 5531, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5532, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5533, a Bill for Act concerning higher education. House Bill 5534, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5535, Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5536, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. House Bill 5537, a Bill for an Act with respect to higher education. House Bill 5538, a Bill for an Act with respect to higher education. House Bill 5539, a Bill for an Act with regard to higher education. House Bill 5540, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. House Bill 5541, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. House Bill 5542, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. House Bill 5543, a Bill for an Act with respect to higher education. House Bill 5544, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. House Bill 5545, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental protection. House Bill 5546, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5547, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5548, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. House Bill 5549, a Bill for an Act in

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

relation to environmental safety. House Bill 5550, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5551, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. House Bill 5552, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. House Bill 5553, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5554, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5555, a Bill for an Act concerning the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan. House Bill 5556, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. House Bill 5557, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5558, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 5559, a Bill for an Act in relation to utilities. House Bill 5560, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 5561, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. House Bill 5562, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 5563, a Bill for an Act relating to telecommunications. House Bill 5564, a Bill for an Act in relation to utilities. House Bill 5565, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5566, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5567, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5568, a Bill for an Act relating to telecommunications. House Bill 5569, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 5570, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5571, offered by Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health and developmental disabilities. House Bill 5572, offered by Representative Marquardt, a Bill for an Act in relation to computer databases. House Bill 5573, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government offered by Representative Schoenberg. House Bill 5574, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Bill for an Act in relation to State procurement. House Bill 5575, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act concerning installment loans. House Bill 5576, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5577, offered Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. House Bill 5578, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5579, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 5580, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning electronic communications. House Bill 5581, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning price gouging. House Bill 5582, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning information. House Bill 5583, offered by personal Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 5584, offered by Representative vehicles. Krause, a Bill for an Act concerning health information. House Bill 5585, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act concerning health information. House Bill 5586, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5587, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act concerning health information. House Bill 5588, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act concerning health information. House Bill 5589, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil liabilities. House Bill 5590, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5591, offered by Representative Steve Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5592, offered by Representative Steve

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Davis, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. House 5593, offered by Representative Hoeft, a Bill for an Act concerning land. House Bill 5594, offered Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5595, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning labor. House Bill 5596, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5597, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 5598, alcoholic liquor. offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning military leave of absence. House Bill 5599, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning attorneys' education expenses. House Bill 5600, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning home care. House Bill 5601, offered by nursing Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act concerning 5602, offered by Representative elections. House Bill Bellock, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5603, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5604, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 5605, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5606, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning the comprehensive health insurance plan. House Bill 5607, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5608, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5609, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act relating to insurance. House Bill 5610, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5611, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5612, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 5613, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5614, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5615, offered by Representative Slone, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 5616, offered by Representative vehicles. Franks, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic assistance. House Bill 5617, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning workers' occupational diseases. House Bill 5618, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5619, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5620, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5621, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5622, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5623, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5624, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5625, offered by Representative Rutherford, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 5626, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Living Wage Act. House Bill 5627, offered by Representative May, a Bill for an Act concerning land conveyances. House Bill 5628, offered by Representative Kenner, a Bill for an Act in

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

relation to interrogations. House Bill 5629, offered by Representative Joseph Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5630, offered by Representative Joseph Lyons, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 5631, offered by Representative Joseph Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning business corporations. House Bill offered by Representative Crotty, a Bill for an Act in relation to support. House Bill 5633, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 5634, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. House Bill 5635, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 5636, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5637, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5638, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5639, offered by Representative Zickus, a Bill for an Act concerning police animals. House Bill 5640, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 5641, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. House Bill 5642, offered bv Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5643, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. House Bill 5644, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5645, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5646, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5647, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5648, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5649, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act in relation to the transmission of drug information by the Internet. House Bill 5650, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act gambling. House Bill 5651, offered by to Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act in relation to sex offenders. House Bill 5652, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5653, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5654, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning counties. House Bill 5655, Representative Slone, a Bill for an Act concerning feed. House Bill 5656, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5657, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5658, offered by Representative O'Brien, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5659, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 5660, offered by Representative Wait, a Bill for an Act in relation to schools. House Bill 5661, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 5662, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning teacher incentive and programs. Bill 5663, mentoring House Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. House Bill 5664, offered by Representative Hoeft, a Bill for an Act with respect to schools. House Bill 5665, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act in

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

relation to education. House Bill 5666, offered Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5667, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5668, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5669, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 5670, offered criminal procedure. by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5671, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5672, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. House Bill 5675 (sic-5673), offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act education. House Bill 5674, relation to offered by for an Representative Smith, a Bill Act. concerning House Bill 5675, offered by Representative counties. Hannig, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 5676, offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5677, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5678, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act in relation to police training. House Bill 5679, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 5680, offered by Representative Dart, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 5681, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning the State's Attorneys Appellate Prosecutor. House Bill 5682, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. House Bill 5683, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

motor vehicles. House Bill 5684, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. House Bill 5685, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning legislative oversight contracts. Bill 5686, offered by State House Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation government. House Bill 5687, by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 5688, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to 5689, State government. House Bill offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation government. House Bill 5690, offered Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. House Bill 5691, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. House Bill 5692, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an 5693, Act concerning taxes. House Bill offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning credit reporting. House Bill 5694, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning forest preserve districts. House Bill 5695, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. House Bill 5696, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 5697, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 5698, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 5699, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. First Reading of these House Bills. Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session

92nd Legislative Day

February 6, 2002

now stands adjourned."