15th Legislative Day Fe

February 22, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The House shall come to order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray and lift up our hearts before His most holy presence. Most sovereign and infallible God, we love, worship and adore You. Father, Your word asked a question, who do men say that I am? Moses asked You, who do I say that You are? You respond to say that I am that I am. So, we come in the spirit of Moses seeking to know who You are. So as we ponder and in reverence Your sovereignty we're comforted through Your word which says that You are bread to the hungry for You are the bread of life, and he that eats it shall never hunger. For You are water to the thirsty, he that drinks of it shall never thirst again. For You are life to the lifeless, for through You shall we all live. So most precious Father, I pray that the spirit of life, the spirit of good health, the spirit of goodwill, and of a sound mind would rest, rule, and abide amongst us this hour, this moment, and this day. Amen."

- Speaker Hartke: "We shall be led in the Pledge today by Representative Yarbrough."
- Yarbrough: et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hartke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, a report on the Democrat side."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. And let the record show that we have no excused absences today."

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Poe, on the Republican side."

- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that all Republicans are present and ready to go to work."
- Speaker Hartke: "Take the record. Responding to the roll call,

  116 Members, we have a quorum and the House is ready to do

  business. Mr. Clerk, do you have Committee Reports? For

  what reason does the Gentleman from Sangamon,

  Representative Poe, seek recognition?"
- Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative Durkin is excused today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Excused absence for Representative Durkin.

  Temporarily, we do not have a Committee Report. On page 2 of the Calendar, on Second Reading, appears House Bill 28, Representative Black. Out of the record. House Bill 41, Representative Meyer. Representative Meyer. Out of the record. House Bill 60, Representative Black. Out of the record. House Bill 68, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 68, a Bill for an Act in relation to defendants found not guilty by reason of insanity. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 75, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 28, Representative Schoenberg. Jeff Schoenberg. Out of the record. House Bill 151, Representative Turner. House Bill 151. It's on Second Reading? You want to let it there. Let that Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 156, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Brosnahan, that has notes requested that have not been filed yet, leave that Bill on Bill Second. House 176, Representative Black. Representative Black, 176. Excuse me. Hoffman.

#### 15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Representative Hoffman, House Bill 176. Out of the record. House Bill 190, Representative Hoeft. Out of the record. House Bill 215, Representative Lindner. Out of the record. On page 3 on the Calendar, on Second Reading, appears House Bill 226. Representative Winters. Representative Winters in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 305, Representative Righter. Out of the record. On page 2, on Second Reading, appears House Bill 325. Representative Black. Representative Black, 325. Out of the record. House Bill 400, Representative Fritchey. The Amendment is in Rules, out of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 476, Representative Black. Read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 476, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 480, Representative Younge, Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 480, a Bill for an Act concerning guaranteed job opportunity projects. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 582, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 583, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 583, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 591, out of the record. 592, out of the record. House Bill 594, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 594, a Bill for an Act concerning registration of persons convicted of certain offenses

- 15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001 against the elderly. Second reading of this House Bill.

  No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 596, out of the record. House Bill 642... no, out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 593?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 593 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. On page 4 on the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 10, Representative Bugielski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 10, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I bring before you today House Bill 10. What House Bill 10 does, it amends the present law, right now that we would be able to use either a single-sided headset or an earbud that is attached to a cellular telephone. Right now, in the State of Illinois, it is against the law to use any headset or an earpiece in your ear while talking on a telephone. This law was instituted back in the 70's because of the Walkman radios. So all we're doing is amending the present law, stating that you would be able to use single-sided headset, Representative Black. Representative Black, a single-sided. So, I ask for your favorable roll call and if there is any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can't hear you,

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

I have on a headset. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Take off your headset."

Black: "What?"

Speaker Hartke: "Take off your headset."

Black: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Hartke: "It's supposed to only be one-sided."

Black: "That's what I want to ask the Gentleman."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. He will yield for a question."

Black: "Thank you. This precludes the two-ear headset?"

Bugielski: "What you are wearing right now looks like you're gonna go fly a Cessna plane."

Black: "How did you know?"

Bugielski: "You would only be able to have a single-sided headset or an earbug."

Black: "Well, I use this to listen in on the Senate, on the rare occasions that they're here."

Bugielski: "Well, you know, at first when I looked across the aisle over there, there with your headset on and the microphone on, I thought it was Arthur Godfrey over there."

Black: "At least you and I are old enough to remember Arthur Godfrey."

Bugielski: "Oh yes. We're in the same bracket over there."

Black: "So if I just cut one of these off, then it would be legal."

Bugielski: "Well, in all reality, as you know, the single-sided headsets that they sell for the telephones are a lot smaller and a little more cosmetic looking than what you're wearing right now. But yes, one-sided headset or an earplug."

Black: "Are you casting some kind of an aspersion on my headset, Sir?"

Bugielski: "Not really, Sir, but that looks like an antique."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Black: "Well, let's not bring up the word cosmetic when you're addressing me, if you would, please. I think this is a wonderful idea. It's so good, I think it was filed 31 times, wasn't it?"

Bugielski: "Correct."

Black: "Okay, well one of the 31 Bills is due to pass. Is it yours or did you allow... I see you've allowed Representative Cowlishaw on your Bill because she had one as well."

Bugielski: "As well as Representative Parke."

Black: "So, we're altogether on this, right?"

Bugielski: "Correct."

Black: "All right, thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Parke: "Representative Bugielski, I know that in your opening remarks you shared with the Body that this is the change of current law that's in place, isn't that correct?"

Bugielski: "It's to amend the law right now to allow this because presently, the law states that you cannot have anything in your ear while driving a vehicle."

Parke: "So if I ride down the road coming back and forth to Springfield and I'm making phone calls and I have an earbug in my ear while I'm doing that, I'm breaking the law currently?"

Bugielski: "Correct."

Parke: "And that was done to solve a problem that they didn't want... the government did not want people listening to Walkman on the car in case there was an accident, or somebody beeped the horn, or an emergency vehicle or

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

something, was that the purpose?"

Bugielski: "That is correct, Sir."

Parke: "So your Bill is simply gonna correct that and just simply say is that we can have a safe hands-free system in Illinois that makes sense. Is that right?"

Bugielski: "You're absolutely right, Representative."

Parke: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is something that's absolutely necessary. It's public safety. We know that there are people even talking about saying that you cannot even have a car phone because of the safety features that are lacking because of this. This is a common-sense approach to solving a problem that needs to be solved. I commend the Sponsor on that and I would ask the Body to support this safety piece of legislation. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Scully: "Mr. Bugielski, in the existing law, the general prohibition states that a driver of a motor vehicle on the highways of the state shall not wear headset 'receivers' while driving. I point to the word receivers as being plural. And as the existing prohibition, is it clear under the current law that a single earplug would violate this provision of law which prohibits headset receivers?"

Bugielski: "Yes, it would. Yes, it would because I've... it's been brought to my attention as well as to some of the others, my other Sponsors, where they... people have received tickets because they had an earpiece in their ear talking on a telephone."

Scully: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

seeking recognition, Representative Bugielski to close."

- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, just as
  Representative Parke mentioned, this is a safety Bill.

  It's just... we're not mandating anything, we're just
  allowing that we would be able to use these adapters to our
  telephone. There's no opposition. The entire telephone
  industry is in favor of this and I ask for a favorable roll
  call."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
  Bill 10?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes';
  those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all
  voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
  who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 10,
  there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0
  voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a
  Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On
  page 4 of the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House
  Bill 25. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record.
  House Bill 32, Representative McKeon. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 32, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McKeon."

McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am honored to move House Bill 32 for consideration by the Members of the House. This was amended in committee. The Amendment became the Bill. The Bill amends the Illinois Government Ethics Act to delete the requirement for persons examining economic disclosure statements, sometimes commonly referred to as ethics statements, when they ask to review those materials. Currently, they would have to identify themselves by name

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

and address and a copy of that information would go to the person for whom they're examining their record. change would make it consistent to laws we passed in the last two General Assemblies with respect to political committee contributions or D2's as we know them. eliminated that requirement. The Bill changes the date the statements of economic interest filed by candidates and incumbents for statewide and General Assembly offices must be available on the Internet to June 1st, 2003. And the Amendment further provides the Secretary of State may by rule provide for optional electronic filing of the statements of economic interest. In addition, the Bill provides for the optional electronic filing of any reports required under the Lobbyist Registration Act. I'll gladly answer any questions from the Members."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Parke: "Representative McKeon, with all the noise, I just didn't understand exactly what you want to do. You want to be able to electronically file the ethics statement. Is that what you're saying?"

McKeon: "Representative Parke, could you repeat your question. I think I might be able to hear you now."

Parke: "I simply said, and I'm not sure with the noise, I didn't really understand. In two sentences, what does this Bill do?"

McKeon: "The Bill would require or eliminate the requirement #1, that you were to go to examine my statement of financial interest that if you would happen to identify yourself and that exam... I would be personally notified of the fact

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

that you did in fact examine those records."

Parke: "So we wouldn't receive the little yellow sleeve of paper saying XYZ looked at my ethics statement?"

McKeon: "Right. That's the same that we did in the last General Assembly with respect to the examination of D2's. We eliminated that requirement."

Parke: "So, you're saying is that it would be a secret who reviews your ethics statements. You won't know who looks at them then."

McKeon: "You won't know that it was examined."

Parke: "Why? Why do you want to do that? Why wouldn't you want to know that XYZ organization was looking at your ethics statement? Why wouldn't you want that public?"

McKeon: "The rationale behind this as with the examination of the D2's is that people were... felt threatened to look at those public records. They felt vulnerable or at risk because they had to identify themselves. So many people running for public office played silly games where they get some unknown person to go down and fill out those requests and so forth, and we eliminated that requirement. So that if a citizen wants to look at this public record, they can do so and not feel in some way threatened in terms of retaliation or other action that might be taken against them by someone, an elected official or candidate for elective office, in their district."

Parke: "I can understand that position. What's the second... Oh, in committee did anybody sign in in objecting to that point?"

McKeon: "No."

Parke: "All right, what's the second point?"

McKeon: "The second part requires that this information just as our D2's are posted on the Internet, it gives the Secretary

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

of State until 2003 to do that. And optionally he may provide for electronic submission. So instead of filling out the form you may optionally file it electronically."

Parke: "I thought that it was mandated that you had to do that now."

McKeon: "For the D2s, yes."

Parke: "Okay. What are we talking about, the ethics statement?"

McKeon: "This is talking about the statement of economic interest or what we commonly call..."

Parke: "Oh, so then we could do that on the Internet, also. We're gonna try to file that part, too. Is that what you're saying?"

McKeon: "Yes, If I... it's very difficult to hear. I think your question was, we would do that on the Internet. It would be posted on the Internet. The Secretary would have the option if it was a cost-saving measure for him to allow for or require electronic filing of this information."

Parke: "All right, and you know of no opposition to your legislation?"

McKeon: "I know of no opposition that's been formally filed to the legislation."

Parke: "Okay, well then I think it's good legislation. Thank you."

McKeon: "You're welcome."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Black: "Representative in your Amendment on page 5, Section 5.5,

Electronic Filing, I just want a clarification. The
language says, the new language, 'The Secretary may, by

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

rule, allow for the optional filing of the reports required by this Act in an electronic format.' What I want to make certain of, the Secretary of State will file the reports that we send in or does this Amendment mean that my treasurer may have to file them electronically if the Secretary of State so rules?"

McKeon: "If I understand the two parts to your question."

Black: "Yes."

McKeon: "The first part... "

Black: "It has to do with the... on your Amendment, on page 5, line 2, Section 5.5, Electronic Filing."

McKeon: "Right, the first part of your question is the Secretary of State would reproduce your paper filing in a way that it could be visually inspected on the Internet."

Black: "That's what I would prefer."

McKeon: "The second part of your question, I believe the answer, if I understand your question, is yes, the Secretary may by rule, require that these documents be filed electronically rather than on paper."

Black: "Okay. The only concern I have with that and I intend to vote for your Bill, Representative, we talk about the digital divide and try to make that an economic issue. There are areas in this state where to get on the Internet through the various toll charges can be not only cumbersome but very expensive. And I would think that that would be rectified, but I know many of us would much prefer to send in our statements, let the Secretary convert them to an electronic format and post them. I mean, I have some safeguards if he wants to do that by rule I can certainly go to JCAR. But I think we're three or more years away from all of us having that instant access. And in rural areas it gets harder and harder to find somebody who will

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

serve as your campaign treasurer who wants to do all of this. It was a lot easier when you just filled out the paper and sent it in. I think it's a step in the right direction. But again, just a cautionary note, this is a very diverse state and while I certainly have no problem with your underlying Bill, I do appreciate that clarification."

McKeon: "Thank you."

Black: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, let me understand what this Bill does. Presently, when someone goes to be provided with an opportunity to look at my statement of economic interest, that individual's name, and not much else, just the name of the individual, and the fact that someone did look at those records is communicated to me so that I know how many people have gone to look at that and what their names are. Is that correct?"

McKeon: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Now under this Bill nobody would need to tell me when someone came and wanted to examine my statement of economic interest. That would no longer be required. But if I really wanted to know how many people came that month, could I call and would somebody be obligated to give me that information..."

McKeon: "No."

Cowlishaw: "Or is it now a closed system?"

McKeon: "No."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Cowlishaw: "So if I called and wanted to know who had investigated my statement of economic interest, I would be given that information."

McKeon: "No."

Cowlishaw: "No. Well, first you said... Okay, would you explain to me what would happen in that situation then."

McKeon: "The current system they would take a form like this."

Cowlishaw: "Right."

McKeon: "They'd be required to identify themselves with some form of identification. They would fill out their name, their address..."

Cowlishaw: "I understand all that."

McKeon: "The reason for their inquiry, and you would get a copy of that..."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct, right."

McKeon: "With their name, address and inquiry."

Cowlishaw: "All right. And under this Bill what would happen?"

McKeon: "That would not occur. They would walk in and they would say I want to examine Representative Cowlishaw's statement of economic interest for the last five years and they would say okay, they cost twenty-five cents per copy, to photocopy and they make them copies. And they don't have to identify themselves and you are not informed."

Cowlishaw: "So, then we have no name, no identification, we have no idea why they want this information or whatever, is that correct?"

McKeon: "That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "All right. If I want to take advantage of the Freedom of Information Act, because I want to get some records from a municipal or local government somewhere in Illinois that may not otherwise be readily available and I go through the processes of the Freedom of Information Act

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

to try to get access to that public information, do I have to give my name and say who I am?"

McKeon: "Well, I'm not an attorney, Representative, but I presume that would be the case."

Cowlishaw: "That's correct, you do have to identify yourself if you wish to take advantage of the Freedom of Information Act. So it would seem to me that this Bill that you have here is in direct conflict with the kinds of provisions that we already have in the Freedom of Information Act so that at least we have some record of who it is who has a particular interest in a given set of facts or a given piece of information. Now you say that people are intimidated about the prospect of going in and signing a little piece of paper in order to get a chance to look at this form. How many cases have been reported of people who felt intimidated?"

McKeon: "I don't know that anyone keeps those records but I know from my own experience over the years that people have been intimidated, particularly at the local level, to examine say D2 reports where it would come back to the alderman or committeeman or someone that they have examined those reports. Out of fear of retaliation."

Cowlishaw: "I see. Well, I find it somewhat difficult to understand why any official of the Illinois State Government, who are the people who are responsible for making these things available to those who may want to consult them, would try to intimidate somebody because they had simply asked for some information. I can imagine that it would be much more likely they would intimidate somebody who was using the Freedom of Information Act in order to gain access to something. And as far as I know in the entire history of the Freedom of Information Act, there has

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

never been a case reported of anybody who felt they'd been intimidated. I think that given the way the current law works and that people have to identify themselves, only by name, maybe their name is John Smith. There are hundreds of John Smiths in Illinois, and so in fact. identification is not particularly precise, but at least they have to take the responsibility of writing down their name and saying, I am the person who is seeking this information. To have an arrangement totally unlike the Freedom of Information Act, so that anybody can go in and get this kind of information without any identification whatsoever, they don't even have to be able to show that they are a citizen of the United States. The fact that somebody, anybody can do that, does not produce open government, it produces closed government and I stand in opposition to this Bill."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative McKeon to close."
- McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is identical to a Bill that we passed out of this Body almost unanimously in the last General Assembly and I ask for your favorable support."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 32?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brady, would you like to record yourself? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 32, there were 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calender

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

appears House Bill 55, Representative Parke. Terry Parke.

Out on the record. On page 4 of the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 129, Representative Schoenberg. Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill 126. Representative Cross. Mr. Daniels, Mr. Cross. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 126, a Bill for an Act in relation to controlled substances. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm gonna present House Bill 126 today that deals with the ecstasy drug and drugs similar to ecstasy and I appreciate Representative Daniels taking the lead on this. This has become, unfortunately, an issue that has faced many of us throughout the state. The issue of ecstasy drugs we're finding has... surfacing not only in the inner city, but in the suburban area as well as downstate Illinois. And I had the opportunity to conduct statewide hearings last summer and this fall on this issue and it became apparent as a drug that we can no longer There are really two reasons for the rapid increase in the use and sale of this drug. One, from a profit standpoint, it costs about twenty cents per pill to ecstasy type drugs. They manufacture sell approximately \$40 per pill on the street. We have had in the suburban area, outside the City of Chicago, at least three related deaths attributed to ecstasy. The other reason that we see so many kids using the ecstasy drug is because drug dealers know that the penalties that deal with ecstasy are significantly lower than for drugs such as LSD, cocaine and the like. So as a result of that the drug dealers are pushing the ecstasy much more so than even the cocaine or LSD type drugs. As a result of that, HB 126

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

attempts to close the loophole with respect to the drugs... with respect to the amount issue. It also expands the definition of drug-induced homicide and drug- induced great bodily harm. To cover those situations where only a small amount of drugs change hands and results in either death or great bodily harm. This Bill unanimously passed out of the Judiciary Criminal Law Committee when Representative Daniels presented the Bill and I would ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 126. I think it's unfortunately a Bill that we have to pass to keep up with the times. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 126?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 126, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill, on Third Reading, House Bill Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read... out of the record. House Bill 147, Representative Black. Read the Bill."

Black: "Speaker?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir, Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I've talked to the Speaker's legal counsel and pursuant to Rule 55C, I would ask that House Bill 147 be recommitted to its committee. It's an issue with me but quite frankly flies in the face of Federal Law and I don't want to string anybody out on a vote. There will be a Resolution that I think I can make my point by a Resolution

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

and not have anybody vote on a law that's clearly in violation of Federal Law. So, if Mr. Uhe would entertain my request, I believe it's Rule 55C, I would like to take House Bill 147 off the Calender and recommit it to its committee."

Speaker Hartke: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. He needs unanimous consent. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and by unanimous consent, House Bill 147 will removed from the Calendar. On page 4 of the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 181, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 181, a Bill for an Act concerning government employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 181 amends the State Employees Group Insurance Act. And basically, what it allows is strictly, the smaller school districts to unite to form groups to seek a better rates on insurance through the state insurance program. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Parke: "Yeah, this is a voluntary program, Representative?"

Bost: "Yes, Representative, it is. It's a voluntary program.

Right now, other school districts, larger school districts have the opportunity and what happens with them is... with the smaller school districts we have a 51% requirement of all employees. Well, if you only got 16 or 17 employees,

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

it's hard to make that if there's other insurances that are offered to them through their spouses. This allows them to pool together... to come together to try to participate in this program. They're not forced to, by any means."

Parke: "What committee did this come through?"

Bost: "It was brought through Executive Committee."

Parke: "Is it exempt from any of the mandates that we place on any other health insurance?"

Bost: "No, not at all."

Parke: "Is it exempt from ERISA requirements in any way?"

Bost: "Not that I know of."

Parke: "So it has to... so if we mandate hair pieces then, for the State of Illinois, then those groups will have to accept that?"

Bost: "Any mandates would be come in they... to through the...

for the group, would also be applied to them because this

just allows them to act like a larger school district by

pooling together."

Parke: "Do you know if you've talked to any insurance companies have indicated an interest?"

Bost: "I have talked to the insurance companies. The insurance companies said that these school districts can do this now with them. They went neutral on the Bill."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. This is a good piece of leg..."

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

Franks: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm intrigued by your idea, as I'm reading the analysis. Tell me what you're trying to do here is to include state health insurance plan employees

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

into a buying coop?"

Bost: "Yes. Basically, what we have now is... our school districts have this opportunity now, as individual school districts, but many of our smaller school districts don't have the ability to meet the requirements to be able to participate in the program. Be it with the fact they don't have 51% participation, or what other problems that might be required."

Franks: "And they're being discriminated against, basically, because they don't have the buying power as the larger groups."

Bost: "Because they don't have the volume."

Franks: "I'm reading this and I see that CMS would be administering this and presently CMS is already purchasing for the insurance for some of the school districts."

Bost: "Right now, CMS... the pooling that goes on... or not pooling but the... CMS has a program that basically, each of the school districts as they shop for insurance have the opportunity to look at what CMS has to offer and voluntarily participate in their insurance program."

Franks: "So they're basically getting the bulk rate, getting a cheaper rate for those that wouldn't normally qualify."

Bost: "Not always a cheaper rate, but if that is cheaper, yeah."

Franks: "Would it cost the state any money?"

Bost: "No, it doesn't because it is their... they have to pay for their insurance just like we, you know, we pay for ours."

Franks: "Because they're already doing it anyway basically, CMS is already negotiating, so this wouldn't be any extra work for them."

Bost: "This is no extra work for them, it's the same thing. It just allows the smaller school districts to pool together."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. I stand in support of this Bill and

#### 15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

I appreciate the Sponsor bringing it forward. I think it's great to use the CMS that's already put in. And Representative, I'd like to sponsor this Bill, if I could. I appreciate that. I've got a very similar Bill that we just put through today, it's House Bill 2236, and that has to do with pooling and using CMS as the purchasing agent for prescription drugs for the entire state, as well as for our seniors, and this is closely analogous. So I appreciate it and I urge everyone to vote for this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Osmond: "Representative, have there been any figures from CMS as to what they think their experiences will be if you bring in school districts?"

Bost: "No, there were no figures given to us during committee and they haven't given us that at this time. They... it's not really considered that it would be a large impact, they don't believe."

Osmond: "Typically, school districts have a problem with their losses and that's one of the reasons why the rates keep going up. CNA or the CMS did not render any kind of opinion as to what they think would happen if the influx of the schools come in..."

Bost: "No, because CMS right now, it's a minimal amount of schools that are participating in this program in comparison. They're still... the outside vendors that offer quite often can offer a better deal. And... but this just allows them the opportunity to do what they can do with outside vendors right now. They don't believe that, you know, the cost to CMS, except for administration, would

15th Legislative Day

- February 22, 2001
- be their only cost because you do have this local body still paid through CMS for the insurance."
- Osmond: "Have you talked with the Township Officials of Illinois to see if they have any opinion as to what might happen with their pool?"
- Bost: "I believe the townships can do this now. Now, whether they can pool together I don't know whether they can do that or not."
- Osmond: "The townships are eligible for the local government health plan..."
- Bost: "I'm sorry, Representative, I can't hear you."
- Osmond: "They're eligible now to join that plan and I'm just wondering whether or not you got an opinion from them as to whether or not they wanted to have school districts as part of that group which, in my opinion, would also then affect what their future rates are gonna be."
- Bost: "I did not get an opinion from townships on this particular... on this Bill at all."
- Osmond: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Bost to close."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is not anything great, fantastic above anything else. All it does is allow those smaller school districts the opportunity to participate in a program that larger school districts do by pooling together. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 181?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

15th Legislative Day

- February 22, 2001
- the record. On House Bill 181, there were 114 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'.

  And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like to recognize Representative McCarthy for an announcement."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Child Support Enforcement Committee scheduled for 4:00 p.m. this afternoon has been canceled. The Child Support Enforcement Committee has been canceled. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 4 of the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 196, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 196, a Bill for an Act amending the Humane Care for Animals Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an extension of an existing Bill which provides procedural safeguards for our police dogs. But what we found was a loophole in that the dogs that are used in search and rescue aren't afforded those same protections. So we've tried to remedy that with this Bill. It sailed out of committee unanimously and I'd ask... I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that...

  Representative Black is seeking recognition.

  Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."
- Black: "Representative, do you know the history of this Bill?

  I've seen this Bill before."
- Franks: "Oh, I haven't. You've got the benefit of wisdom and

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

longer years here, Representative."

Black: "Far Ι think. I believe this was too many, Representative McPike Bill several years ago. And I... let me ask you a question that was asked of former Majority Leader McPike at the time. Under your Bill, making it a Class B misdemeanor to willfully and maliciously taunt, torment, tease, beat, strike, administer or subject any desensitizing drugs, chemicals or substance to a search and rescue dog or to interfere or meddle with a search and rescue dog or the dog's handler provides it as a Class A misdemeanor to willfully or maliciously torture, mutilate, injure, disable or poison a search and rescue dog and a Class IV felony if the dog is killed or totally disabled. As I recall the debate some years ago, one of the concerns raised was that a criminal in the act of robbing a store, let's say or a bank, and in his haste to get away hit and killed a police search and rescue dog or injured the dog, also hit and seriously injured the police officer. And under this Bill I think it was... I don't remember who was asking the question, possibly then Representative, now Judge Greiman, you could put the perpetrator in a real He might stop and give the dog mouth-to-mouth dilemma. resuscitation and let the police officer expire because the penalties for harming the dog maybe more severe than the penalties for running over the police officer. Now is that your intent?"

Franks: "Absolutely not."

Black: "I think that's what Representative McPike answered as well, as I recall. So, the language of your Bill now does not carry any penalty for a veterinarian who acts in good faith to euthanize an injured search and rescue dog."

Franks: "That's correct."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Black: "Is there anything that would indicate the veterinarian must have the implied or expressed consent of the dog's owner or handler?"

Franks: "No, it's not... it's not expressed."

Black: "Okay, because in a scenario, the handler could be indisposed, the veterinarian would have to make a decision."

Franks: "Correct."

Black: "It is not your intent to hold that veterinarian liable without the consent to put the injured animal down."

Franks: "Correct."

Black: "Okay. I have no problem with your Bill, whatsoever, but I have one coming up that I anticipate several questions so I'm just gonna ask you one. Are you aware that this is a problem? Do people actually taunt and harass a search and rescue dog?"

Franks: "Yeah. Frankly, I was unaware of it but I had some constituents in my district come to me and tell me about the problem and they're the ones who asked me to bring forward this legislation."

Black: "Just for my own edification, there is nothing in your...
in the language that would... what I don't want to ... I
want to vote for your Bill, but I don't want to be in a
position where somebody could come to me and say, you voted
for a Bill to make it a stronger penalty, if you will, a
more serious offense, if you will, to injure the animal
than the human handler. I don't think you do that."

Franks: "No."

Black: "Is that your understanding?"

Franks: "That's my understanding. It's certainly not our intent, either."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Franks: "Thank you."

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

Franks: "Ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
Bill 196?' All those in favor will signify by voting
'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill
196, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no',
and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On
page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill 205,
Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill... House Bill 205, a Bill for an Act in relation to nursing. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 205 is a clean-up Bill which addresses out-of-state and out-of-country applicants for nursing licenses. Presently, the law says that within three years of completion of their nursing education, they have to complete their exams. For out-of-state and out-of-country nurses, that time period is somewhat cumbersome. So, we're creating exemption for those applicants so the clock starts running when they arrive into the state and begin their examination process. This is an Agreed Bill. We've worked it out with all the organizations. And I would agree for approval. Thank you."

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

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

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Parke: "Representative Saviano, is the Illinois Nurses

Association in agreement with this legislation?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Parke: "Has this Bill been put in to alleviate the nurses shortage here in this state?"

Saviano: "It's a component of that, yes."

Parke: "So, you introduce it to help move along the process of getting qualified nurses that might be coming in from another state or another country, is it both?"

Saviano: "That is correct and they are not exempt from our exam process, it's just the time period they have to complete the exam. The clock starts running when they arrive here instead of when they finish their studies at whatever state or country they're in."

Parke: "Is there anything that's lost by increasing the time? I mean, the reason the time qualification was put in was what to adjust to the country, to adjust to the nursing system in Illinois? And will your Bill hurt that concept or was that the concept as you understand it?"

Saviano: "Well, it just alleviates a undue hardship on that applicant when they come into this state, but it doesn't hurt them at all, no."

Parke: "Okay. And, so there's no opposition to your legislation?"

Saviano: "Absolutely not."

Parke: "Thank you. This looks like a good piece of legislation."

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

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Hoffman: "Mr. Saviano, I saw prior to the Amendment that the Nurses Association may have had some problem. Are they

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

okay after the Amendment?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Okay. I think it's a good Bill."

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

Saviano: "I would ask for your favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 205?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner, would you like to vote on this issue? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 205, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill 216, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 216, a Bill for an Act in relation to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Sir. This Bill relates to a classroom reduction Bill. It is similar to House Bill 3319 that was passed out of Legislature in the 91st General Assembly, 115 to 0. It provides for establishment of a classroom reduction program that will allow... that will allow the state board to establish a program for grades kindergarten through third. The only people that would be eligible for the program would be school districts with class sizes larger than 18 and they would have to reduce their class size under the auspices of this program. The money that is used in this program must be targeted towards the classes that are established for class reduction. I will take any

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001 questions."

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

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, I wanted to talk about the Amendment. You'd indicated previously that House Bill 3319 passed the 91st General Assembly 115 to 0."

Kosel: "Yes."

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that that Bill had indicated that we would reduce class sizes for K through five, is that right?"

Kosel: "That's right. We changed it to K through three so that
 we could line up with a federal program. By lining up with
 this federal program we'll be able to access federal
 funds."

Hoffman: "Well, I think that everybody is in agreement that we want to reduce class size. It's my understanding that the grants will be available to local school districts if indeed they have... if they have 18 or over students in a classroom, is that right?"

Kosel: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "And what will be the criteria then for determining which school districts are gonna get the money?"

Kosel: "The criteria will be set up by the State Board of
 Education under the JCAR rule process in the Legislature.
 So they will set up the rules. They will have to go
 through JCAR."

Hoffman: "Isn't it... doesn't it concern you a bit that those rules will not essentially address... my concern is is we have a competitive process. I would assume there won't be sufficient money there in order to take care of all the

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001 school districts that are gonna need to make K through three class sizes 18 and under, is that right?"

Kosel: "That's correct. I'm sure we'll not be able to address all those. But what we want to make sure with this Bill and the idea of this Bill is that the dollars that are already in the state budget and those that we could have available through federal grants are actually used for classroom size reduction."

Hoffman: "And how much is already in the state budget to do this?"

Kosel: "Five million dollars."

Hoffman: "Five Million?"

Kosel: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "And what would be the average grant, do you know?"

Kosel: "No, I do not. 'Cause that criteria is not established
 yet."

Hoffman: "And will the money go to hire teachers, is that the idea?"

Kosel: "It could go to hire teachers, it could go for reconstruction of classroom space, whatever the problem is. You know, classrooms are crowded across this state for a lot of different reasons and so this grant could be used for any kind of reason that is causing the overcrowded. Whether it's a lack of space or a lack of faculty or whatever ..."

Hoffman: "Right. I think... I agree with that. My only concern is this, is that there's only \$5 million there and everybody would, I think you would agree, that it's gonna take substantially much more money than that in order to really address the overcrowding problem."

Kosel: "Absolutely, and hopefully through this grant by realigning it to K- three we will be able to access federal

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

dollars to do that."

Hoffman: "Are there federal dollars available right now for that?"

Kosel: "Yes, there are."

Hoffman: "And how much is available?"

Kosel: "Eighty-one million."

Hoffman: "So, we could potentially have a program of \$86 million,
5 million from the state, \$81 million federally per year to
address this issue?"

Kosel: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "Okay. Do you know how then or do you have any idea or have you talked to anybody at the State Board of Education, how we're going to then spend that \$81 million? I understand it's your intent to let the state board determine the criteria for spending the money. But, I mean, obviously, my school districts... I live in a growth area like you do, so it's an issue."

Kosel: "Sure is."

Hoffman: "And other school districts throughout the state... I don't want to just go into politically powerful school districts. You understand what I'm saying?"

Kosel: "I understand."

Hoffman: "Like Representative Persico's, who is a very powerful individual."

Kosel: "That's right."

Hoffman: "And his school, his children will have class sizes of 10 while ours will stay about 30 or 40 people."

Kosel: "And I do have classrooms of 30 and 40... 35 and 40 in my district, in fact in my hometown. And that's why a competitive grant process needs to be set up to prioritize those needs and because the state board deals with this all the time I think it's the appropriate place for them to do

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

that."

Hoffman: "Have they indicated to you what criteria they intend to use?"

Kosel: "No, they have not. But I will work with them as it goes through the JCAR process."

Hoffman: "And why did you decide to move it from K to five to K to three?"

Kosel: "Pardon?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that your Amendment reduced the cost, the potential cost by saying that we're only gonna give grants for class size reduction to Kindergarten through third grade as opposed to kindergarten through fifth grade. Was at the request of any..."

Kosel: "No. As I stated before that's to line it up with the federal program to access those federal grants."

Hoffman: "So, by doing that we now can access \$81 million dollars."

Kosel: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "And are we making application now for that or once we pass the Bill we'll make application?"

Kosel: "The funds should be coming. We already have made application for those."

Hoffman: "Okay. Thank you. Well, let me just say this, first of all, I agree with the Bill and obviously I'm gonna support it. Class size reduction is something that we all believe needs to happen. Study after study shows the smaller the classes the better children will learn. I would personally like to see it go K through five and secondly, I would rather know the criteria of how we're going to dole out this grant money. However, in light of the fact that I think it needs to be done, we'll hopefully trust JCAR and they will have I know some very outstanding individuals

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

serve on JCAR such as Representative Steve Davis, and Representative Novak and they'll look out for our best interests to make sure that this is done fairly and properly. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Lang: "Representative, you said this Bill passed the House 115 to 0?"

Kosel: "Yes, it did."

Lang: "What happened when the Bill got to the Senate?"

Kosel: "It did not move in the Senate."

Lang: "I'm sorry?"

Kosel: "It did not move in the Senate."

Lang: "In other words, it stayed in Senate Rules?"

Kosel: "No, I believe it was assigned to a committee."

Lang: "And what happened in the committee?"

Kosel: "It never was called in the committee, I believe."

Lang: "It was never called. Who was your Senate Sponsor?"

Kosel: "House Bill 17, two years ago, was called in the Senate, gutted by a Senator, sent back here with a totally different subject. So the original Bill... this has passed the House twice, so the original one was sent over gutted and sent back. The one last year, no action was taken in the Senate."

Lang: "So that Bill stayed in the Rules Committee?"

Kosel: "Yes."

Lang: "A lot of Bills stay in the Senate Rules Committee."

Kosel: "It has been known to happen."

Lang: "What do you think we ought to do about that,

Representative?"

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Kosel: "If you find a way that we can control what happens in the other chamber, you let me know."

Lang: "So, your Bills stay in the Senate Rules Committee just like mine?"

Kosel: "That's correct, Sir."

Lang: "Good to know, thank you."

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

Kosel: "I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 216?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 216, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill 260, Representative Curry. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 260, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Curry."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 260 is an initiative that I have brought before this chamber before. It's an initiative of the Legislative Audit Commission and a recommendation by the Auditor General of this State and has to do with the tuition and fee waivers that public university and colleges provide each year. And all this legislation does is requires that public colleges and universities in the State of Illinois report to the Illinois Board of Higher Education with those

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

names of those students who have received those scholarships and tuition waivers and other information regarding that the scholarship programs. The State Board of Higher Education is then to report to the General Assembly by the end of the year. I know of no opposition to this legislation and I think it's an important tool for us in determining how many scholarships and tuition waivers are granted each year. I ask for your support."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."

Black: "Representative, just a quick question. We had some notes on our file that you had agreed to hold this on Second Reading, pending further discussion. I assume then that the discussion has been concluded?"

Curry: "Yes, Representative Black. The Board of Higher Education was a little confused about what school year they would have to be reporting. And it's the previous school year. None of the colleges or universities have a problem with this. They will have already submitted that information. So their concerns have been cleared up."

Black: "Okay. Fine, thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Curry to close."

Curry: "I would just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 260?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 260,

15th Legislative Day

- February 22, 2001
- there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 479?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 479 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Please place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. On page 4 on the Calendar appears House Bill 271, Representative Garrett. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 271, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Garrett."
- Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. This
  Bill simply allows that we amend the Illinois Vehicle Code
  to allow retired Members of the General Assembly whom have
  served at least two years to receive retired Member license
  plates."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Righter."
- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that she will yield."
- Righter: "Representative, how is this a change from the current law?"
- Garrett: "Representative, the current law says that you have to be six years and 62 years of age or older to be able to be able to receive a retired plate."
- Righter: "Is there a reason that you want to move that down to two?"
- Garrett: "Well, actually, I think it's important that if we're here it's an honor to serve in the General Assembly and represent our constituents in the State of Illinois and I

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

don't see any reason why if you serve for two years or four years that you should not be allowed to show how proud you are of that particular honor."

Righter: "Is there any privileges that are extended to people who have these retired plates on their cars?"

Garrett: "Not that I know of."

Righter: "Are there people that know you of or former Members that you know of who maybe served at least two years but didn't serve six years who want the plates?"

Garrett: "There are, I'm sure, plenty of people in the State of Illinois who have served two years who would like to see the plate. And you know, quite frankly, Representative, I think they deserve it. I think that anybody who serves in the General Assembly should be entitled."

Righter: "We should be entitled to have plates that are different from every other taxpayer, even... 'cause we served in the General Assembly for two years?"

Garrett: "Well, already if you have served a minimum of six years or 62 years of age or older you are entitled to these plates and I think it's really just a matter of pride and recognition and it's really good for the citizens of the state to see that we care enough about our job that we would like to display these plates."

Righter: "How much are these plates?"

Garrett: "I don't know."

Righter: "The Bill doesn't..."

Garrett: "I imagine they're the same as the other plates. I've never looked into the cost."

Righter: "The Bill doesn't speak to how much the plates cost?"

Garrett: "Well, the plates are the same whether you've served the six years or two years. I mean, they're the same price."

Righter: "No, no. What I was asking is..."

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Garrett: "As the regular plate."

Righter: "So they would cost whatever the regular plate is."

Garrett: "Yes."

Righter: "Plus the \$78 registration fee."

Garrett: "Yes, yes."

Righter: "Okay. What... how much more does it cost to make these plates, do you know?"

- Garrett: "It's everything... as far as I know, is the same. I don't see that... I haven't gotten a fiscal note on this so I don't think that there's any additional costs. I know it's the same. Everybody's telling me it's the same."
- Righter: "What... is there a reason if you want to be concerned about, you know, someone who serves six years, gets a plate but not someone who served four or three. What about someone who had the honor of serving here for a year?"
- Garrett: "Well, you know, that's a good point except we decided
   that one term, which is two years, would qualify a
   Legislator to receive a plate."
- Righter: "Do you know what the basis was for originally setting six years as the threshold?"
- Garrett: "You know, I did ask that question, Representative, and I just heard that it was sort of an arbitrary number that they came up with. It may have something to do with the pension plan. Again, I don't know. My reason for introducing this Bill is really a source of pride for all the legislators that have served at least one term in the State of Illinois."
- Righter: "Well, I know it's not out of concern for your own seat,

  'cause it's obvious that you're gonna be here for a long,

  long time, Representative. As long as you choose to be."

Garrett: "Well, I don't know about that, Representative."

Righter: "Do you know how many people there are, former Members

- 15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001 who would fall in this gap that currently exists under six years to two years?"
- Garrett: "I really don't have any idea. Again, it's a source of pride for any Legislator who has served."
- Righter: "Okay."
- Garrett: "I don't think that we will have hundreds of Legislators trying to purchase these additional plates."
- Righter: "Well, I'm not to six years yet, so maybe I'll... sometime short... near future I'll be glad that you passed the Bill then, Representative. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Garrett to close."
- Garrett: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I hope that you consider this piece of legislation. I think it's important as Legislators that we extend our pride and it is a source of pride that we have served in the General Assembly and I think that everybody should be included if they have in fact, served one term. I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
  Bill 271?' All those in favor will signify by voting
  'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have
  all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
  voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? There are still
  8 people who have not cast their votes. Have all voted who
  wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, take the
  record. On House Bill 271, there are 42 Members voting
  'yes', 69 Members voting 'no'. And this Bill, having
  failed to reach a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
  declared lost. On page 4 of the Calendar appears House Bill
  281, Representative Feigenholtz. Would you like to try

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

yours now? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 281, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical care. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 281 is a Bill that we've seen on the House Floor before. It... last year I believe it was House Bill 1544 and it creates the Community Health Center Expansion Act. It authorizes the Department of Public Health to make grants to community providers for the purpose of establishing new community health center sites to provide primary health care services to the medically underserved. The Bill is subject to appropriation and it just sets statute in place if the department decides, and we hope they do, to put money into the fund. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 281?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? There are still people that... 2 people that have not recorded themselves. Representative May? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 281, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and no one voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 289, Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson, would you like to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 289, a Bill for an Act concerning governmental ethics. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Johnson."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is basically just a very good government Bill and I would appreciate your 'aye'. Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Yeah, I know it's a good government Bill but what's it do? I mean all... everything we do here is good government, I hope."

Johnson: "Well, this Bill really reduces..."

Hoffman: "Everything we try to do here is good government."

Johnson: "The killing of trees in this state. But, no, what it does is it amends the Governmental Ethics Act and it provides that a person whose multiple offices or positions each require a statement of economic interest need file only one statement with the Secretary of State where that's required for offices and one with the county clerk for offices where that's required. So if I serve on multiple entities that all require the filing of an ethics statement, I'm really saying I only have to file one. There'll be a new form created that will say I am filing for X, Y and Z offices that I hold. That's why it's good government, Jay."

Hoffman: "Okay, well you're saying it's reducing paperwork."

Johnson: "That's right."

Hoffman: "Okay. Representative, the issue with regard to some positions you file locally with the local county clerk and we file with the state. If you have a position that would require you under current law, to file with the county clerk and because of our position with the state would you still have to file two? Because that's a little bit different situation in that you would look... people want to see these things but look in a different place for it."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Johnson: "No, the Bill would provide... the Bill provides that where you will have to file one with the Secretary of State, you will continue to file one with the Secretary of State, where you have to file one with the Clerk, you have to file one with the Clerk. So in cases like you've just said... I'm still mandating a file in both, but where I might have multiple ones that are required at the Clerk's office, it could be handled in one form. Okay?"

Hoffman: "And what's Common Cause's position?"

Johnson: "I have no idea. I don't know that there's any opposition and I think that they were basically, in support of this."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

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

Johnson: "Ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 289?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 289, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 on the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 333. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman.

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 333, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "It's Hoffman."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir. Hoffman. Excuse me."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Hoffman: "That's all right. All this Bill would do is it would extend the quick take power for the MetroLink Bi-State Development Agency. Metro Link Rail System is being built in St. Clair County. It's doing the last phase of extension. And we had, in the General Assembly, given quick take procedure for 48 months. That expired as of January 1, 2001. All this does is extends it for another 12 months so the last phase of the project can be completed and they can purchase the land."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "Representative, I got to tell ya, there's confusion now on our side of the aisle, before I get to the Bill, about your name. Can you let us know, is it Huffman, Hoofman or Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Well, you know, I think when..."

Cross: "And I think you could tell we've got some new people here, and I think it's only fair to you that you clear this up."

Hoffman: "I appreciate you caring, Representative."

Cross: "Well, I care about you especially, Representative."

Hoffman: "Yes, I know you do. Well, I gotta tell you, so I've been called a lot worse than Huffman."

Cross: "Bucky the Clown."

Hoffman: "No, I would prefer Hoffman. I think that, you know, years ago when the family came across the ocean I think they had two N's at the end of the name, of our name and more people would call them Hoffmann."

Cross: "Well, that clears everything up, Jay."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Thank you very much."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Cross: "I don't think I have any more questions. You've pretty much covered everything we were concerned about. Good luck on this Bill, Representative Hoffman, Hoffmann."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
Bill 333?' All those in favor will signify by voting
'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? There are still
2 people who have not recorded themselves. Have all voted
who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 333,
there were 71 Members voting 'yes', 44 people voting 'no'.
Bill 333, having received 71 'aye' votes, 44 'no' votes.
This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. For what reason does the Gentleman
from Cook, Representative Giles, seek recognition?"

Giles: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the last vote I pressed my 'yes' button, it did not light."

Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes. On page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 394, Representative Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 394, a Bill for an Act amending the Electronic Fund Transfer Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 394 has been more familiarly known as the ATM Surcharge Ban. In order to understand what this Bill does it's important to understand the nature of ATM surcharges and how the transactions work. If an individual uses an ATM machine that is owned by a financial institution other than their bank, it costs the

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

owner of that ATM machine about twenty seven cents to service that individual and that's per the Department of Treasury's findings. That bank is then reimbursed by the customer's own bank \$1 through an interchange fee. customer's bank then charges them usually an out-of-network fee of approximately \$1.50. So, without a surcharge, bank presently makes a profit of between fifty and seventy five cents every time a card is inserted into an ATM machine, regardless of who uses that machine, whether it's a customer or noncustomer. What this Bill does simply, is prevent a financial institution from charging a fee to a noncustomer for use of that machine. Over the past five years, the number of banks, just in Chicago, that have gone from surcharging has gone from two out of the top twenty banks, to all twenty of the top twenty banks. And the amount of that surcharge has gone up 700%. For those of you that have been in this Body long enough you will recall that the ATM machines were brought in by the banks as a cost-saving mechanism. They said it would save them money by reducing labor costs, and by making the banks more What has happened is that they have now seen these as a new profit center. ATM's provide profits to banks nationally between 2 and \$3 billion annually. What we have now seen is that banks have found additional ways, they will surcharge you for using a teller when you could have used the ATM machine. They will surcharge you for using their own ATM machine too many times during a month. What has also happened now, banks are surcharging users of the LINK cards. The LINK cards, are those cards issued by the Department of Public Aid for people within this state to access their welfare money. If you are getting your money through a LINK card and you use the machine, you are

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

being surcharged by the bank. In effect, the banks are surcharging taxpayers of Illinois and taxpayer money to That money that they are paying these people. the surcharge is money that is coming out of their grocery bill, out of their prescription bills. This has been very excessive and regressive fee that is being put on these individuals. The banks have raised the issue that we may not be able to impose these fees on national, or impose this Bill on nationally-chartered banks. The comptroller of the currency for the United States Treasury, in their statutes has held that the states cannot impose regulations between banks and their customers. What this Bill does is seek to impose a regulation between banks and noncustomers. to that end, the Electronic Funds Transfer Act specifically states that a State Law is not inconsistent, the protection the law affords any consumer is greater than the protection afforded by the Federal Law. In effect, the Federal Law says that the states can enact consumer protection laws with respect to automatic teller transaction fees. There has been no court finding. repeat, there has been no court finding by any court, specifically with respect to this issue, that says that State Laws cannot regulate ATM fees. The Office of Banks and Real Estate for Illinois has taken a neutral position on this Bill. I had asked the commissioner of the office for a letter of any substantiation saying that we cannot regulate nationally-chartered banks with respect to this issue and we received no response from the office. I think that the easiest way to do this will be to respond to any questions and I'm sure that all of the relevant points will be brought up at that time."

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

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Parke: "Representative, does this Bill force anybody to use an ATM?"

Fritchey: "Of course not."

Parke: "And does... currently are people forced to use an ATM?"

Fritchey: "Do we want to ask substantive questions?"

Parke: "I asked you a simple question. Answer 'yes' or 'no'."

Fritchey: "Of course not."

Parke: "That's right. It's a choice. People have a choice whether or not they want to use an ATM machine. Isn't that correct?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: "All right, so what we want to do is that we want to pass this legislation that says we're not gonna deal... we're gonna interfere in the free market system. A system that says, if you want a service, you pay for it. If you don't want the service, you don't pay for it. Now let me ask you a question, are national banks that have ATM's are they gonna be included in this Bill?"

Fritchey: "Yes, they will."

Parke: "National banks are."

Fritchey: "Yes, they will."

Parke: "My understanding is that they are not... you cannot regulate a national bank with this legislation. It's unconstitutional."

Fritchey: "As I just said there has been zero substantiation for that position put forward by the banking lobby. No substantiation for that position put forward by the Office of Banks and Real Estate. I will further tell you that when we had regulations for disclosure of ATM fees in this

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

state and I believe, Representative, that you were in the Body when that Bill passed. All banks in this state, state and nationally chartered, have complied with that law. Iowa, when the ATM surcharge ban was introduced legislation, the courts struck it down on other grounds. The Iowa Bankers' Association supported the overall Act. There are no surcharges in Iowa. There are no surcharges in Connecticut. The number of ATM machines in Iowa has kept pace with the number new ATM machines nationally. The number of new ATM machines in Connecticut has outpaced the national average. And the reason for that is even without the surcharge, ATM's are still profitable without the surcharge. If this Bill passes, every bank involved in the ATM transaction will make between fifty and seventy five cents per transaction. That is profit that they will make over and above maintenance costs of any machine and there is a maintenance cost to machines. It costs them money to maintain them, it costs them money to restock them. costs them money to service them. I'm talking about profit over and above that maintenance cost. So, yes, the national banks have complied with every regulation that we have put on ATM machines to date. I have no reason to think that they would not comply here and there has been no evidence put forth that they cannot be compelled to comply here."

Parke: "Yes, well, it's my understanding that there is case law that says you cannot regulate a national bank. Are private ATM's covered under this?"

Fritchey: "You've got two statements in there. I understand it's your understanding that case law says that and I mean this with all due respect, Terry, there is no case law on point.

I will put my reputation that there is 0 case law on point,

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

nationally, plain and simple. With respect to private ATM's being covered, they are not covered for a very specific reason; we did not want to punish, we did not want to punish and make it a situation where there was a disincentive to have the ATM machines. Privately-owned ATM's are not reimbursed by the bank's cardholder. An ATM that is owned by a financial institution, the financial institution that owns that ATM are getting reimbursed through the interchange fee from the cardholders own bank. So they are getting that. If there is an ATM in a gas station that is privately owned, it costs them money to have that ATM there. I want them to continue to have that ATM there, that is a reasonable charge and they should be allowed to continue to have that."

Parke: "You alluded in your opening comments, Representative, that there's a welfare card that they use and they use it in the ATM's and it costs... how much does it cost normally to use that ATM machine for welfare... to cash a welfare check?"

Fritchey: "Average charges now are approximately \$1.50."

Parke: "A dollar fifty to use it. Do you know... what is the current... when someone has a welfare check, what do they do with it now?"

Fritchey: "I don't think that I understand..."

Parke: "What is the current procedure? If you're a welfare recipient, you have the check, you received in the mail and you go cash it, where do they cash it now?"

Fritchey: "It could be direct deposit or it could be cash. I would imagine, you know, I gotta tell you, Representative Delgado's gonna speak more to this issue and if you'd like I could turn this over to Representative Delgado right now.

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

I'd rather give you a correct and coherent answer."

Parke: "Well, let me just share with you that staff has told us that normally they go to a currency exchange. Do you know that the currency exchange charges on a sliding scale depending on the amount of money in the welfare check? And that raises from 1 to 5 dollars, so that they use the ATM machine in fact, in most cases, they're saving money by using the ATM rather then going to the currency exchange.

Were you aware of that?"

Fritchey: "I would disagree with that, respectfully. And again, if you'd like, I could turn this over now or wait until Representative Delgado's comments with respect to this. If you'd like, I'd be more than happy to defer to him."

Parke: "If the Chair wishes to entertain that, I would be curious myself. It's up to the Chair."

Fritchey: "Can you allow Representative Delgado to speak?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to the Sponsor of the Bill. As a member of the Consumer Committee we are very concerned, Representative Parke, regarding welfare to work and creating a new card called the LINK card and then having banks take a dollar out of the state check in order to cash that check, which is the minimum. Every time they use it though, Representative, if you use it in a currency exchange, you only pay ninety cents and many times like you pointed out, on a sliding scale, that's a one-shot deal. But right now, because of the new system... your point is very well taken if it was in the old system, but with the LINK card now, a recipient can use it more than once and every time they use it, it's a dollar charge. And that is wrong. And knowing that the State of Illinois is trying to get people from welfare to work, not from welfare into

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

someone's pocket, to be able to say let's treat these folks who we're trying to help get back into the workforce so that they're not a burden on us, let's make sure that the state creates the provision to be able to take care of this. So, to answer your question directly, they are not saving, because one shot at the currency exchange takes care of that."

Parke: "Okay, thank you, Representative. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Ladies and Gentlemen, we know that the Parke: "Thank you. Sponsor really believes in this. He thinks this is right answer and the previous speaker believes that you should not have more than a dollar taken out to use the new card. And I would think that that probably is reasonable. I would agree that if they use it more than three times maybe then the cost would be less than the currency exchange. But Ladies and Gentlemen, think about this. This legislation interferes with the free-market system, on choice. People have a choice. If they want to go use an that is their prerogative. It is... makes it simple for them. They pay a \$1.50 or they pay \$2.00, that's their choice to use it. Why should we as a government interfere in the marketplace? And if they want to use this smart card or this LINK card, then that's their choice. tells them they have to take it in three or four times to If you're buying groceries for your family be used. because that's what the check was for or the LINK card was for, it's to take care of those needs. I would think that you're not gonna go to buy a one thing of milk, you're gonna be prudent and know that it's gonna cost you money to use it. They can go to a bank and use their own bank where there's no charge at all. I mean, that makes sense to me.

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

But why should we interfere in the free-market system? It is choice, it is based on what is fair. Ladies and Gentlemen, I also predict if this Bill passes and the Governor signs it, it'll be ruled unconstitutional. understanding and not the Sponsor's explanation withstanding, I'm sure he believes that that's true, but it is my understanding that national banks and private banks are exempt from this and if they're not it is truly gonna be unconstitutional because you cannot apply one law to one group and not apply it to the other group. If you don't have private ATM's covered, this is unconstitutional. Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope that the Sponsor finds a solution to this. None of us want people to be gouged, but this is a choice matter. This is a matter of choice. So I would ask either to vote 'no' or 'present' on this and perhaps the Sponsor can work something out with the financial institutions that's more acceptable, makes it easier, 'cause then everybody's in agreement. But right now this is a take it or leave it approach. I don't think this is healthy. I don't think this is what we should be doing as a state."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. Reminder, this Bill is on Short Debate."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect of the Sponsor, I would reference the appropriate rule and joined by a sufficient number of Members of my side of the aisle, to take the Bill off Short Debate."

Speaker Hartke: "So noticed."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Black: "Representative, a point of clarification. There are people who have gone to this business and they go into convenience stores, quasi public locations and they own an ATM machine. And I don't know what their fee structure is and it is a growing business. Now, it is my understanding upon having had time to read through the Bill, I don't believe this would regulate the usage of a privately owned ATM machine, would it?"

Fritchey: "That is correct. The Electronic Funds Transfer Act applies to ATM's and this would apply to those owned by financial institutions for the reasons that I stated."

Black: "All right, but what... and there are some, as you well know, there are ATM machines out there who are not owned by a financial institution, they are owned by an investment group who then make, through various contractual agreements through a variety of financial sources, maybe an insurance company rather than a bank, you can access the machine with cash, obviously pay a fee. Now, would these nonfinancially affiliated ATM machines be regulated under this Bill?"

Fritchey: "No, they would not."

Black: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill, if I could."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I hold the Sponsor of this Bill in high regard and I have learned something from his debate. I was not aware that a LINK card would be so used or could be so used and therefore subject to a fee. I thought I recalled when we did that it was a debit card. But I stand corrected, I've learned something. And obviously, that is a problem that I think the Department of Human Services and the General Assembly should make a good faith effort to change. I don't believe those fees should accrue to a LINK card. But

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

above that, Ladies and Gentlemen, privately-owned ATM machine is not subject to any of the provisions of this legislation. And I think what you will should this become law, institutions, financial institutions may very well decide to sell their ATM machines to a consortium of investors who would then not be subject to any fees and you use those as we used to say, caveat emptor, let the buyer beware, let the user beware. These fees may escalate to an outrageous amount privately-owned machines. Furthermore, amplifying on what my colleague, Representative Parke said, it's our understanding that the Federal 8th Circuit Court has recently released a ruling which declared the Iowa ATM Law that limits the fees to be nonbinding on national banks that operate in Iowa. I think Representative Fritchey is correct, that will I'm sure will be appealed if it already under appeal. There is, staff tells me, there is considerable amount of litigation on this issue as we meet here today, as to whether or not nationally-chartered financial institution can be so regulated by State Law. I don't know what the outcome of the court decision will be. My hesitation for voting for this Bill and my only reason for standing in opposition, my concern on the LINK card notwithstanding, is that if in fact we find we cannot regulate nationally-chartered banks, then the only affected are those in small banks communities, state-chartered institutions. That is not the Sponsor's intent, but if that happens, then you are taking people in my portion of the state under state-chartered banks, they would be the only ATM network subjected to this regulatory scheme. I would submit to you that they in the rural areas Illinois, that those machines would then simply οf

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

disappear. And I again, I have great respect for the Sponsor, I have empathy for what he is attempting to do. But when all is said and done this is a very diverse state. I hesitate to stand here publicly and tell you in my 59 plus years, I have never used an ATM machine. Never had reason to use one and have never used one. Probably, long as I'm on this streak of honesty, not sure I would know how to use one. So it is a conscious decision that people can make. The same conscious decision we make on credit card use. Some of them carry 20% interest on the unpaid balance a month. You shop around you can get some for 12%. I've been here long enough to remember when we tried to regulate credit card interest. We've often gone down this regulatory path. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, summation, because of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in the Iowa case and litigation that is underway, the ruling could well be that national banks would not be affected by State Law. If that's the case, then the burden of this law would fall on those small state-chartered banks represented by the Community Bankers Association And that would then put a hardship on people in my area who choose to use an ATM machine, generally one that they are affiliated with, and they pay no fee. The vast majority of the transactions, I think anybody in the banking business can tell you, is at a home-owned machine where they do not pay the fee. I have, as I said, empathy for what the Gentleman is trying to do, but often when we go down the regulatory scheme before the courts have given a clear indication of how they will react to such State Laws, oftentimes do just the opposite of what we intend to do. So it's for that reason I rise in opposition to House Bill 394."

- 15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative O'Brien."
- O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, because of a possible conflict of interest, I'll be recorded as a 'present' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Berns."
- Berns: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Out of a concern for potential conflict of interest, I'll vote 'present' on this Bill.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of t.he I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. unlike the previous speaker, he has a choice, but people on welfare, our poorer citizens do not have a choice. have to go to the banks and they have to use the ATM machines, because once upon a time, they were going to currency exchanges. And the currency exchanges charging them upwards of \$3.50 to cash their checks. We call ourselves making it easy and more reasonable on the poorest people of this state by having them to put their monies in the banks. Now you have to understand, the banks are reaping the benefit of them using their monies and allowing it to sit overnight. And so what we're in essence is doing, we are charging people, the poorest people again, we're charging them twice to use their own money. This is a very good Bill and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Righter."
- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Righter: "Thank you. Representative Fritchey, how many ATM's are there in the State of Illinois?"

Fritchey: "I'd say several thousands. I can't give you a more accurate number, Dale."

Righter: "You can't get a more accurate number?"

Fritchey: "I cannot."

Righter: "Is there something that is prohibiting you from getting a more accurate number than that?"

Fritchey: "Lack of information."

Righter: "Can I ask you if you've requested the information from someone or somebody or some organization, some agency?"

Fritchey: "I have not."

Righter: "Well, Representative Fritchey, one of the things that you're asking this Body to do is pass legislation which would ban fees on certain machines and you don't know how many of those there are and..."

Fritchey: "I believe, if you look at the merits of the argument here that it's irrelevant how many there are. As I will more fully address in my closing comments, over the past ten minutes or so there has been a wealth of, I believe wholly unintentional, but a wealth of misinformation that has been spread to the Members of this Body on several very relevant facts. The salient issues remain the same whether there are 1 thousand, 2 thousand or 5 thousand ATM's in this state."

Righter: "Have you asked any of the banking associations how many ATM's there might be in the state?"

Fritchey: "I haven't had a need to ask the banking associations how many there have."

Righter: "Has anyone on your staff asked the banking associations how many ATM's there might be in the state?"

15th Legislative Day February 22, 2001

Fritchey: "I've been handling this myself, Representative."

Righter: "This is not your first year on this legislation, is it

Representative?"

Fritchey: "You're well aware of that."

Righter: "Well, no, Representative Fritchey, I'm just asking a question. How many years have you carried this Bill?"

Fritchey: "This would be the third year."

Righter: "In the two previous years have you acquired any information about how many ATM's there may be in the state?"

Fritchey: "Representative, I would welcome you to walk back to my office right now and open my top file drawer and you will find the information sitting there. If you want to..."

Righter: "About how many ATM's there are in the state?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Righter: "How many is that? I mean, do you have a ball park figure for us?"

Speaker Hartke: "... Representative Fritchey on? Here we go,

Representative Fritchey. Our audio man has fixed our

system."

Fritchey: "Thank you. Just to give you by reference and, Representative, I do apologize for not having the full numbers even though I still maintain that there is no direct relevance to the issue, but just to give you a reference point. Bank One is probably the largest ATM owner in this state and they have approximately 6 thousand ATM's."

Righter: "Representative Fritchey, one of the reasons I think that..."

Speaker Hartke: "We seem to be having trouble with our audio system. Is he back on now? Okay."

Righter: "I'm on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, one

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

of the reasons I think that number is important is because as you pointed out in your opening and as I'm sure you'll point out again in your closing is that these financial institutions to your mind are making money off of these people when they shouldn't be doing that, which is the point of your Bill. I guess..."

Fritchey: "Actually, that's not the point of... that's ... I apologize for interupting, Representative. I did not say that they shouldn't be making money on the transaction, actually quite to the contrary. I said even without this surcharge they will still make a considerable amount of money on every transaction."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Righter, we're having trouble with the switchboard completely. Bear with us, please."

Righter: "I think I'm back, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Righter, continue."

Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that Representative Fritchey was in the middle of a comment when we cut out."

Speaker Hartke: "Well, we're still having trouble trying to put Representative Fritchey back on."

Righter: "Yeah, I need to be careful, don't I."

Fritchey: "All right, Representative, I've got to apologize if you want the truth I forgot where exactly we were."

Righter: "Do you have, Representative Fritchey, how much money was made in fees from ATM's in maybe the last year or..."

Fritchey: "Nationally, it was just under \$3 billion."

Righter: "Okay. What about the State of Illinois?"

Fritchey: "We don't have state-by-state breakdowns and I actually had inquired that of Office of Banks and Real Estate and they didn't have those figures either."

Righter: "Do you know... now it's your contention, Representative... Okay, I'm back. Representative

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Fritchey, it's my understanding that you believe that even though there is federal legislation on the books regulating federally-chartered banks which includes the regulation of ATM fees for those federally-chartered banks, that the State of Illinois can pass a law and bind those federally-chartered banks by state legislation, is that right?"

- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentleman, since we're about ready to adjourn for this afternoon, I would request that Representative Fritchey take this Bill out of the record and we'll take it up when the microphone system for its Members are working again. The Clerk advises me that the switchboard and the voting mechanism probably will not work properly and so Representative Fritchey... Mr. Clerk... Representative Fritchey. Representative Fritchey requests that we take the Bill out of the record... at the request of the Chair."
- Fritchey: "Wait a second, I got my microphone back. Speaker, do we trust this is fixed? And, Speaker, solely for purposes of the record, I'd like to say it's being taken out of the record over objections right now."
- Speaker Hartke: "Yes, we'll take it up tomorrow. The Chair would like to recognize former State Representative Suzanne Deuchler is on the floor. Please welcome her back to the chamber. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "The following committees have been canceled: The State Procurement Committee which is going to meet at 2:00 p.m. in Room 115. Repeating, that committee was not canceled. The State Procurement Committee will meet at 2:30 in Room 115. Repeating, the State Procurement Committee will meet at 2:30 in Room 115. The Child Support Enforcement Committee scheduled to meet at 4:00 p.m. has

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

been canceled. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'll look at your watches it's 2:00. The board has been frozen up here at 1:47, so our recording mechanism for the voting is not working. We apologize, we will try to get this audio system fixed for tomorrow's Session. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 1:00 p.m. tomorrow. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does stand adjourned."
- Clerk "The Perfunctory Session will now come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 22, 2001 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'To the Floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 28; Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 60; Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 325 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 476. Representative Scott, Chairperson from the Committee on Urban Revitalization, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 760. Representative Curry, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with t.he following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 81; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 217, House Bill

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

449. Representative Crotty, Chairperson from the Committee on Children and Youth, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 66 and House Bill 638; 'do Short Debate' amended House Bill Representative Bugielski, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 383. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability and Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 243. Representative Steve Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Constitutional Officers, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 201, House Bill 208 and House Bill 930.; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill Representative Mike Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 776. Representative Boland, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections and Campaign Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 200. Introduction - First

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Bills. House Bill Reading of 2153, offered by Representative Turner, Art Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2154, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 2155, offered by Representative Garrett, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2156, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. House Bill 2157, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2158, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning medical malpractice insurance. House Bill 2159, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State budget stabilization. House Bill 2160, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 2161, offered by Representative Klingler, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2162, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2163, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical matters. House Bill 2164, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. House Bill 2165, offered by Younge, a Bill for an Act regarding Representative appropriations. House Bill 2166, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2167, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2168, offered Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2169, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2170, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

regarding higher education. House Bill 2171, offered by Representative Bill for an Act making Younge, а appropriations. House Bill 2172, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the St. Clair County Act. Bill Research Park House 2173, offered Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the Old Man River City Syntegration Act. House Bill 2174, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning design science. House Bill 2175, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to amend the Technology Advancement and Development Act. House Bill 2176, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning the Community Development Finance Corporation. House Bill 2177, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning economic opportunity. House Bill 2178, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. House Bill 2179, offered Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning urban assistance. House Bill 2180, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act in relation to East St. Louis Area economic development. House Bill 2181, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the East St. Louis Historical District Act. House Bill 2182, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the Millennium Project Act. House Bill 2183, offered a Bill for an Act regarding Representative Younge, appropriations. House Bill 2184, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning capital development. House Bill 2185, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2186, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2187, offered by Representative

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Younge, a Bill for an Act in relation to construction trades training. House Bill 2188, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2189, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning Frank Holten State Park. House Bill 2190, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2191, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Natural Resources. House Bill 2192, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act in relation to workplace injuries and diseases. Introduction and First Reading of these House Bills. House Bill 2193, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning public labor relations. House Bill 2194, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act in regard to uniform peace officers. House Bill 2195, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning counties. House Bill 2196, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning partnerships. House Bill 2197, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2198, offered by Representative Fowler, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2199, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 2200, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act concerning property taxes. House Bill 2201, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2202, offered by Representative Joe Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 2203, offered by Representative John Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2204, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act relating

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

to certification of school personnel. House Bill 2205, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act Bill 2206, taxes. House offered concerning by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 2207, offered by Representative Bugielski, a Bill for an Act concerning mortgages. House Bill 2208, offered by Representative Wirsing, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 2209, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone systems. House Bill 2210, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2211, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 2212, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2213, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act concerning evidence. House Bill 2214, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation of trusts and estates. House Bill 2215, offered by Representative Garrett, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 2216, offered by Representative Garrett, a Bill for an Act education. House Bill 2217, offered by regarding Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 2218, offered by Representative taxation. Hoffman, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House 2219, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 2220, offered by Representative Persico, a Bill for an Act concerning rights and remedies. House Bill 2221, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2222, offered by Representative John

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Turner, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 2223, offered by Representative Connie Howard, a for an Act regarding higher education student Bill assistance. House Bill 2224, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 2225, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. House Bill 2226, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act in relation to discovery depositions. House Bill 2227, offered by Representative Steve Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning mortgages. House Bill 2228, offered by Representative Tom Johnson, a Bill for an Act concerning evidence. House Bill 2229, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning the administration of mental developmental disabilities services. House Bill 2230, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for Act. concerning the Department of Human Services. House Bill 2231, offered by Representative Scott, a Bill for an Act concerning children and family services. House Bill 2232, offered by Representative Rutherford, a Bill for an Act in relation to sports facilities. House Bill 2233, offered by Representative Rutherford, a Bill for an Act in relation to public records. House Bill 2234, offered by Representative Kenner, a Bill for an Act concerning State finance. House Bill 2235, offered by Representative Kenner, a Bill for an Act concerning State employees. (Sic- House Bill 2236, offered by Representatives Franks, a Bill for an Act that creates the Senior Citizen Prescription Drug Discount Program Act.) House Bill 2237, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 2238, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. House Bill 2239, offered by

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Representative Julie Curry, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2240, offered by Representative Stroger, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. House Bill 2241, offered by Representative John Turner, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 2242, offered by Representative John Turner, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 2243, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 2244, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2245, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to human rights. House Bill 2246, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 2247, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire inspectors. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction - First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2248, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. House Bill 2249, offered by Representative Bugielski, a Bill for an Act concerning certain lending practices. House Bill 2250, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 2251, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. House Bill 2252, offered by Representative Hassert, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2253, offered by Representative Scully, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. House Bill 2254, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2255, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 2256, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act concerning the

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Court of Claims. House Bill 2257, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2258, offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act concerning the Illinois commemorative quarter. House Bill 2259, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to motor carriers. House Bill 2260, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act municipalities. First Reading of these House Bills. House Bill 2261, offered by Representative Steve Davis, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 2262, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. House Bill 2263, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2264, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Secretary of State. House Bill offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2266, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 2267, offered by Representative vehicles. Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. House Bill 2268, offered by Representative Zickus, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill 2269, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2270, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act in regard to vehicles. House Bill offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act 2273, offered concerning taxation. House Bill by Representative Scott, a Bill for an Act in relation to service dogs. House Bill 2274, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. House

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Bill 2275, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for in relation to elections. House Bill 2276, offered by Representative Ryder, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 2277, offered by Representative Moore, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government bonds. House Bill 2278, offered by Representative Moore, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 2279, offered by Representative Moore, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. House Bill 2280, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act in relation to human rights. House Bill 2281, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning currency exchanges. House Bill 2282, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 2283, Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act in relation to cemeteries. House Bill 2284, offered by Representative Shirley Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 2285, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. House Bill 2286, offered by Representative Johnson, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 2287, offered by Representative vehicles. Johnson, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2288, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2289, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2290, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. First Reading of these House Bills. House Bill 2291, offered by Representative O'Connor, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2292, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. (sic - House Bill 2293, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

an Act that Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code.) First Reading of these House Bills. House Bill 2294, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2295, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2296, offered by Representative Johnson, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2297, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2298, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning child support. House Bill 2299, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2300, offered by Representative Johnson, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2301, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act in relation to families. House Bill 2302, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act in relation to families. House Bill 2303, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 2304, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning offered benefits. House Bill 2305, citizen by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act in relation to 2306, taxes. House Bill offered by Representative Capparelli, a Bill for an Act concerning appraisers. House Bill 2307, offered by Representative Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. House Bill 2308, offered by Representative Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. House Bill 2309, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to State grants. House Bill 2310, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 2311, offered taxes. by

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Representative Smith, A Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2312, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2313, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 2314, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 2315, offered by Representative Mendoza, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2316, offered by Representative John Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2317, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2318, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2319, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2320, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2321, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2322, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2323, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2324, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2325, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2326, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 2327, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2328, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2329, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

appropriations. House Bill 2330, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2331, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2332, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2333, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Bill 2334, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2335, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2336, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2337, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2338, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 2339, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2340, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2341, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 2343, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2342, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2344, offered by for Representative Daniels, a Bill Act an making appropriations. House Bill 2345, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2346, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2347, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act. making appropriations. House Bill 2348, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House

15th Legislative Day

February 22, 2001

Bill 2349, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. (sic-House Bill 2350, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the Department of Human Rights.) House Bill 2351, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2352, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2353, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2354, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to local governments. House Bill 2355, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. House Bill 2356, offered by Representative Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act in relation to liquor. House Bill 2357, offered alcoholic Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act in relation to income taxes. First Reading of these House Bills. The Perfunctory Session now stands adjourned."