30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Timothy Sadler of the First Baptist Church of Royalton, Illinois. Pastor Sadler is the guest of Representative Forby. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Sadler: "Let's bow and pray together. Holy Father, as we come to bow our hearts before Your throne, we thank You for the life that You alone allow. I thank You specifically today for this great State of Illinois and these men and women who sacrificially serve us leaving at times their families behind for the greater good of our great state. Bless their families, provide and continually protect them for our Representatives and their staff. I entreat You to unto them observational integrity and intuitive give keenness to notice the structural weaknesses of our state, then the courage in action to do what is not always popular but rather what is right. Give them wisdom beyond their experience, intelligence beyond their education, and a love for each other and our state that proceeds from Your exalted throne. Finally, Dear God, Holy Scripture submits that if Your people, which are called by Your name, would humble themselves and pray that You would hear from heaven and heal their land. Give us the humility to recognize our moral instability and the fortitude to ask You for Your strength and guidance from the Holy Spirit. Bless these proceedings this hour. These things I pray, in the matchless name of Jesus Christ, my Saviour, Amen."

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

Forby - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that we have no excused absences to report."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that Representative Ron Stephens is excused today. All the Republicans are here."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 116

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Curry, Chairperson from the Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education Committee, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2117 and House Bill 3439. Representative McGuire, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, just one second. Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have made a mistake on our side. Dale Righter should be excused. I apologize for that mistake."
- Speaker Madigan: "So, the Clerk will be directed to make that correction."
- Cross: "Thank you."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative McGuire, Chairperson from Committee on Aging, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 596. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Support Enforcement, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 84. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' House Resolution Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3188. Representative Dart, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 2001, back with the following reported the same recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 591, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2026. Representative Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 305 and House Resolution 67."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke, did you wish to call House Bill 1813? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act regarding taxes.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1813 takes care of a problem that is not unique to our agriculture community, but it is all over the state. Two years ago, we passed a law requiring red dye to be put into diesel fuel if it is to be used for off-highway purposes. As you know, diesel is used for off-highway purposes does not have the motor fuel tax attached to it, so if a farmer is out on the field plowing, he's not on the highway, so therefore, why should he pay a motor fuel tax. I mean, that's logical and makes sense. We had made this change to eliminate a time-consuming reimbursement process through the Department of Revenue, however, there are some instances where it is necessary to use undyed fuel for off-highway purposes. will allow undyed fuel to be used in certain off-highway applications and that'll allow the user to seek a refund under the old system. This Bill establishes a refund provisions for unintended mixing of dye and undyed fuels in excess of 500 gallons, establish a provision average fuel shrinkage due to temperature variation, and provides for an appeal process with the Department violations issued under this Act. And that's kind of what the purpose is is that to make it a more streamlined Department of Revenue for a violation. We have a farmer that has fuel and we call... he calls a fuel company to come in to fill up his tank and they put undyed fuel in his

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

fuel tank, red-dyed fuel in the undyed fuel tank. He pumps it into his truck thinking that it's regular gasoline and they find red dye in it, they're gonna fine him. very simple. We think that'll take care of the problem. Streamlined how our agricultural community can appeal this the Department of Revenue, make it easier. This is supported by the Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical the Illinois Farm Bureau, the Chemical Association, Industry Council, the Petroleum Marketers Association, the City of Chicago, the Illinois Manufacturers, the Chamber, the Midwest Truckers Association, Petroleum Council, Caterpillar and the Department of Revenue. So, we know of no known opposition. I would ask for... ready to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is Third Reading. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Poe for the purpose of an announcement."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to recognize in the gallery a class from the Williamsville-Sherman sixth grade class and their sponsor. So, let's give 'em a hearty welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Soto, did you wish to call House Bill 1095? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1095, a Bill for an Act in relation to

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

child support. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Good morning. Thank you, Speaker. This is Bill 1095.

This Bill amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. Provides that in a court action to enforce child support, under the Code, the Department of Public Aid may appoint an individual to accompany the special process server for the purpose of locating our... or identifying the respondent in the case. The individual may include, but not need to be limited to, a member of the family of a respondent responsible relative from whom the support is sought. Effective immediately. Any questions?"

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, I want to... not sure that I'm opposed to your Bill, but I want to make sure I understand it. You are... This is in the area of serving a summons on an individual that owes child support?"

Soto: "Correct. This is... What this would do is it would appoint... it would allow to appoint a special process server to go out with maybe a Cook County Sheriff and file a copy of the complaint that the petitioner has filled out."

Cross: "So it's... I mean, right now though, it's my understanding the law provides that if someone hadn't paid child support and you're trying to get 'em back into court, ya know, there's a process server is appointed or just has the obligation to serve the individual. Why on earth would you need another person to do that?"

Soto: "Because when you go out... I've been with the Cook County

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

State's Attorney Office, the Child Support Enforcement Division, and my experience has been working in courts as a supervisor. We have a lot of cases where the mother comes in and she says, John Doe lives at 1415 West Ohio Street. Now, when the sheriff goes out there and they're looking for him, they can't identify him because, of course, the sheriff doesn't know who it is. Myself, as a plaintiff, filing this complaint, I can send a friend of mine, Karen Yarbrough, Representative Yarbrough, to go and point out the defendant."

Cross: "What's gonna... Who..."

Soto: "Or the noncustodial parent."

Cross: "I understand what you want to accomplish and I'm not quarreling with that, but who's gonna pay the... Is there gonna be a cost to associated with this second person?"

Soto: "No cost."

Cross: "So, procedurally, what happens? The special pro... Some process servers are appointed. Does the process server then have the responsibility to get this second person? How does the process server hook up with the other person?" "What they will do is... What this would do is get the Soto: special process server to go along with the Cook County sheriff that's gonna be serving this summons. This would be worked out at the time of the intake, you know, interview. So what happens is, I can say, well, my friend, Maria, is gonna be the special process server. Then Maria will... I will give that information to the intake unit at the Illinois Department of Public Aid, give them her name, address, and maybe a week or even a few days before they go out... the Cook County Sheriff goes out to serve, they would have the number and they would work this out, so that they can go out together."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Cross: "All right."

Soto: "It's a very good Bill."

Cross: "I think the concept's very good, Representative. I'm just trying to... I'm a little concerned and I know we need to move on today. We have a lot of Bills. A little concerned about the logistics and I wanna make sure that... I'm gonna support your Bill."

Soto: "It's a good Bill."

Cross: "I agree with you, the concept is good. I'm a little worried about the logistics and I trust that you... that those... you've already worked all those out."

Soto: "Yes, I've been there for 19 years. I mean, I know that this is needed in the Child Support Enforcement Division."

Cross: "All right. So, but there's nothing in your Bill that the person appointed as a special process server or process server can go out on their own without this second person if they want to?"

Soto: "No, they can't go out on their own. They would have to go out with either a Cook County Sheriff, which usual... he's the one... the sheriff's office is the one serving these complaints."

Cross: "Is the sheriff's office... Have you talked... Is the sheriff's office okay with this?"

Soto: "No, I haven't spoke to the sheriff's office. But once in a while if the assistant state's attorneys request this, they contact the Cook County Sher... I mean, sorry, the sheriff's office and it's done."

Cross: "Let me ask you this, again. And I know what you're trying to do. A sheriff's officer is generally trained to serve pro... be a process server and they've been to school, they carry a gun, they supposedly are covered in, you know, have taken self-defense courses, et cetera. What

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

if something happens during this attempt to serve a... serve the defendant, the person that owes child support? What if the new person that's coming along gets hurt? What if, you know, there's an acc... what if there's a shooting or... And what kind of liability does the sheriff's department have or the state have if this new person coming along now to... And I understand again, I'm not trying to give you a hard time, the concept. What if that person gets harmed during the course of the service?"

Soto: "Well, this has been going on for years since the State's Attorney's Office has been in existence. That has never happened. And I don't want to think that it ever will. It's up to the individual who's the... appointed the special process server to either sit in the car and point the person out or get out and point the person out."

Cross: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

Soto: "Thank you."

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

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wirsing. Mr. Wirsing, did you wish to call House Bill 3305? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3305, a Bill for an Act concerning children and family services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3305 is a issue that brought to us by DCFS and there's

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

two parts to this Bill. One is, it allows the department to better administrate benefits received by wards of the state, and number two, it clarifies subpoena powers. Those are the two issues relative to House Bill 3305. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I would answer any questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Brosnahan: "Representative, I just had a couple questions. Is this a DCFS-drafted Bill? Is this a department Bill?"

Wirsing: "Yes, it is."

Brosnahan: "The only question I had, why the change? Why are we... why is it no longer a savings account or individual account?"

Wirsing: "Currently, any child that's under the, you know, the legal auspices of DCFS and any dollars that is attached to that child, whether it's income or whatever, those accounts are individual, now. And we're talking about this 5,000 individual different accounts that DCF has to keep track of, relative to children under their legal realm, and they have to keep track of those accounts separately, those money accounts. What this says is that those dollars would go into one account and then through just simple paperwork, they would keep track, you know, who owns those dollars, if you will. That's simply what it's doing. It's trying to clarify... clean up a lot of extra work, if you can imagine having 5,000 different banking accounts under their realm."

Brosnahan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Representative Crotty seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Crotty: "I would like the House Members to help me welcome the 8th grade chorus that'll be entertaining us today in the rotunda from Oak Forest, the Kerkstra Middle School, that's up in front. Nice to have you here. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Garrett. Representative Garrett, do you wish to call House Bill 296? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 296, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 296 basically allows for disabled persons to be included in the Senior Citizens Real Estate Tax Deferral Act, which allows persons 65 years or older who have a total household income of less than \$25,000 to defer all or part of their property taxes and special assessments on their principal residence. This Bill would simply add that disabled persons would be included in that measure. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross. Mr. Hannig in the Chair."

Cross: "Thank you. Representative, you're amending what Section of the statute?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Garrett: "There are two Sections, hold on. Section 10, of the 35

Illinois ILCS 200/15-170, Section 15-170, the senior citizens homestead exemption."

Cross: "Okay. And what's the... What does that provide for now, with respect to home... the seniors? Is that the provision where if you're 65 years or older..."

Garrett: "Yes."

Cross: "...and you live in your home..."

Garrett: "Yes, you can defer your property taxes and the ma... Do you want me to go through it? The maximum reduction shall be 2,500 in counties with 3 million or more inhabitants and 2,000 in all other counties."

Cross: "Do you have a definition in your Bill for what a... for a 'disabled person'? Is that defined, Representative?"

Garrett: "Yes, we do."

Cross: "Can you give us that definition?"

Garrett: "Quote, 'disabled person means a person unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable, physical, or mental impairment that; one, can be expected to result in death; or two, has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.'"

Cross: "If... In the event someone is disabled, as well as over age 65, would they be eligible for two exemptions?"

Garrett: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in... Why would... Does your Bill specifically provide for that?"

Garrett: "Representative, the way the Bill would be interpreted that, if you are 65 years and older, you can defer your property taxes and assessments and... or if you are disabled. And that would, of course, be for those people who are under 65 years of age."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Cross: "I'm sorry, you're... this... you're only talking about the Tax Deferral Program?"

Garrett: "Yes."

Cross: "I'm sorry, I was thinking of the Exemption Program,
Representative. I apologize. Have you talked to any of
your local governments concerning... It seems like there
could be a negative impact upon local governments from a
cost standpoint, at least for a limited amount of time.
Have you talked to any local governments about that?"

Garrett: "I have. And actually, the Department of Revenue is neutral on this Bill. I was actually just reading a summary of the number of disabled people who own homes, and less than 10% of the homes that are owned by people are owned by disabled people. So, there may be a small impact, but nothing that would amount to too much."

Cross: "I understand the Department of Revenue's neutral, but I'm asking from a local government standpoint, have you talked to any school districts, your mayors, your township governments? This will have some impact... I understand what you're doing, but this will have some ne... will have a negative impact on local governments..."

Garrett: "Right."

Cross: "...and I'm just curious if you've talked to them and what their position is."

Garrett: "I have sent copies of the Bill and asked for their input and asked if they had any problems and I have not heard anything negative. Nobody has a problem with this, at least in my district."

Cross: "Okay, Representative. Thank you."

Garrett: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Hannig is in the Chair.

We had this Bill on Short Debate. We've had the Sponsor

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

speak in favor of the Bill, and now we had one person speak in opposition. So now we're going to recognize Representative Garrett to close."

Garrett: "Thank you, Ladi..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Cross."

Cross: "I know we're trying to all respect the Calendar today and I... and we can appreciate that. I think Representative Mulligan had her light on and I suspect that was the only other person that had her light on. I don't think we want to get to a point where we're asking that everything be taken off Short Debate today. We want to move the Calendar along as much as you do, but I would at least think we could get around that issue of us going to... eliminating Short Debate if you could rec... perhaps, recognize Representative Mulligan."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Cross, we'll be happy to do that. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have two questions, if the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative Garrett, do have any income limit on what it... for disabled people? I mean, if you're a millionaire, are you going to get your property taxes deferred if you're disabled?"

Garrett: "There is not a limit on this, but the state would recoup, of course, all money that was deferred. So, it's not like there would be any loss to the state or to the..."

Mulligan: "I'm sorry, say that again."

Garrett: "There is no loss to the state or to the local taxing body because the property taxes are simply deferred. There is no income level at all for the disabled people."

Mulligan: "So, if you're a millionaire who's disabled who has a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

thriving business and you live in a home in your area where the property taxes are, you know, half a million dollars, we're going to defer their tax? Don't you think you need to put some kind of limit it?"

Mulligan: "And is there any restriction on if parents of a disabled individual can transfer the home to the child so they would get their property taxes deferred, when actually they're the people that would own the property? Representative, on the surface this seems like a good idea, but I think it's not the same as a senior citizen; number one, because disabled people, you know, quite bluntly, are going to be deferring their property taxes perhaps for a much longer time. And the other thing is, they could be... have quite an income and... or they could have been disabled in an accident where they received a large claim. I think that there should be some limitation on this and, you know, I think what we're looking to do is to help people that are disabled and it costs them a lot and they have a lower income. I don't think we're looking to defer property taxes for people that are quite able to self sustain themselves."

Garrett: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Garrett to close. Excuse me,

Representative, are you finished with the questions?

Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "No. Quite frankly, I think that if we're prepared to move this Bill out, which we probably will because of the fact that it mentions disabled people, that it should be on the record that this Bill needs something to be changed in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the Senate because it is not adequate in the form it's going out of here. And these questions should have been asked in committee and an Amendment should have been offered for this Bill because, I think, it's much too large. So, I think that something needs to be done with it."

Garrett: "No. Representative Mulligan, I'm sorry, the information that we gave you is incorrect, there is a cap of 25,000. I can read it to you."

Mulligan: "Okay, fine. That's all I wanted to know."

Garrett: "Okay, yeah, and I'm sorry for that misinformation, but they are capped. Everybody's capped at 25,000."

Mulligan: "All right. And would there then be something that would say that you can't transfer, as a parent, you can't transfer your home into the name of a child, or an adult child that lives with you that's disabled?"

Garrett: "There is a cap of 25,000, but there isn't... you know, the transfer... situation is not... the provision is not there."

Mulligan: "Okay, but I still see that there could be a problem if parents transfer their home to an adult child who does not work, and does not make that 25,000 and then they're allowed to defer their property taxes. Just so it's on the record so someone looks at it before we pass a law..."

Garrett: "Yeah."

Mulligan: "...that basically has a loophole in it. Thank you."

Garrett: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Now, Representative Garrett to close."

Garrett: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is a very important Bill. Many residents of the disabled community have come to me and asked for this provision. Other states, many states, have the same kind of provision. And I hope that

- 30th Legislative Day

 we can support the disabled community. And I urge you to

 vote 'yes'. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Klingler, on House Bill 2161. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2161, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me. Representative Winkel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to welcome the students who are with us today from Judah Christian School, they're from Champaign, up in the gallery. Give them a warm welcome. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. And now, Representative Klingler, on House Bill 2161. This Bill is on Short Debate."
- Klingler: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was brought to me by constituents whose 14-year-old daughter was killed in a traffic accident in a car that was driven by a 15-year-old boy who was on a driver's permit. In addition to the fatality, another person was also very seriously injured. The driver, as I mentioned, was 15 years old but three months later, went to the Secretary of State's driver license facility in Springfield and was able to get his permanent license. At this time, charges are still pending on issues of reckless homicide and reckless driving, and the trial would be held in Sangamon County in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

April. This Bill would say that, for a person who's a juvenile, who's driving on an instruction permit, if he... if that person is involved in a traffic accident in which there is a fatality or a serious injury, that the permanent license should not be issued until those charges pending are resolved, so that the trial would have to be completed before that person on the driver's permit would be able to get his or her license. And I would ask for support for this Bill."

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Berns, for what reason do you rise?"
- Berns: "Speaker, I rise to introduce to the General Assembly the
 Heritage Junior High School class representing students
 from Homer, Allerton, Broadlands, and Longview in Champaign
 County, Illinois."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, would you read House 2157 for Representative Crotty?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2157, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

 Representative Crotty."
- Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill allows those Chicago teachers that were told that they could only have an opportunity to an early

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

retirement buyout in 1993, while the rest of the state had the buyout in '93 and '94. This now allows these teachers to be able to access the '94, if it would have been allowed for them, but they were told it was not, it would allow them now to get the benefits as if they would have retired in '94. I think this is a fair Bill. Even when I was a school board member and would enter into negotiations with the teachers union, when I would tell the teachers that they would only be able to get that retirement buyout in this particular year, I certainly would never come back the following year and offer it again. I think that's very unfair to do that to the teaching staff, especially this is only for the Chicago teachers, while the rest of the state was able to have that window for two years. I would entertain any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 2157. Does anyone stand in opposition? Representative Black."

Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to move the Calendar along. I don't know whether I stand in opposition until I can ask some questions."

Speaker Hannig: "So, please proceed. The Lady will yield."

Black: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield? Thank you very much.

Representative, I have some qualms about making any pension legislation retroactive. Let me ask you a question. For example, we may or may not pass this year the alternative pension formula for those highway maintainers covered under the Teamsters contract. Now, if I'm an IDOT employee and I retired five years ago... And let us assume that the alternative pension formula becomes law, say effective July 1st, will that enhanced pension be available to those IDOT workers who retired prior to that pension enhancement?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Crotty: "No, I don't see that at all. Ιf I'm given the opportunity to retire and you're telling me that this is my option. It is not going to be given in the following year, so now I'm making that decision based on the information that you're giving me, that this is it, do or die, you take it now or you can go on for a multitude of times, years yet, we may not be offering this. But these teachers were told that this is it. For the Chicago teachers, we're only going to give you until 1993 to decide. So those teachers... If they would have realized, and I think all of us know this, if you realize that this is going to be offered, again in '94, you certainly would stay that extra year to increase your years and your amount of dollars that would go into this pension. But those persons that you're talking about, Representative Black, was given five years ago this opportunity and perhaps now, and perhaps not, there's going to be another package offered. That's completely different than this Bill."

it may be different in kind, but not necessarily Black: "Well, Did the Chicago Teachers Pension System act in good faith on the '93 ruling? I mean, did they act... You have no evidence of intent to defraud or that they simply did not tell the truth to those who took the retirement option in '93. And obviously, something happened in '94, and it was offered again. I mean, those things happen and unless you can tell me that there was a deliberate intent misinform, that happens quite often in pension legislation. You retire when you think you are ready to retire. Then if a pension enhancement becomes available a year, or two, or three, or four years later, as far as I know, this Body has seldom ever said... gone back and said,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

well, we didn't think the alternative rate formula would ever pass, so those of you who retired under the old SERS system, there's no reason why we couldn't pass a law and let you all jump into the alternative rate formula, which could be a 200 to \$300 a month difference in a pensioner's monthly annuity. I just don't want to set a precedent where if you do this for the Chicago Teachers Union, as sound a reason as you may have for it, I don't want the proverbial door opened to where every pension system, those annuitants who retired prior to an enhancement, or prior to a formula change, would come back and say, hey, you did it for the Chicago Teachers Union, how can you not do it for me?"

Crotty: "And I understand everything you're saying, but I think this is a very..."

Black: "I'm glad you do, because I'm not sure I do."

Crotty: "Oh my gosh, now I'm worried. And... But I think this is a unique situation, and I'm not going to say that one party or the other purposely tried to deceit the other one. what I'm trying to say is, obviously, they have looked at this, the Chicago Teachers Retirement Board, and they feel that this should be rectified. And I'm saying that in all... When you talk about fairness in negotiating, I truly believe that that means if you... your word everything. And if you say to a body that this is what you're offering, and you're not going to offer it the following year. Many teachers have asked me when I was a board member, well, Represe... you know, Maggie, are you going to be offering this in the next couple of years? And when I say 'no', then that would be, I think, really a true injustice on my part to come back and offer the same thing the following year, because then, I've not allowed those

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

people to make the best decision for themselves in their pension. So, this is coming from the same body that has offered this. The City of Chicago, the Mayor Daley, is for this. So obviously, when they look back, maybe they feel like they shouldn't have done that to those teachers in '93."

Black: "Well, and I can appreciate and understand that. been an administrative decision of the Chicago Teachers Retirement System, I would much prefer that they have... would have worked this out in their own system, i.e., a lump sum payment. But they're not doing that, they're coming down and asking for a substantive change in pension And once you come to the General Assembly for a substantive change in pension law to, shall we say, grandfather people who took advantage of one plan and then a plan... a similar plan, a better plan comes after that and then every group is liable to come down to the General Assembly and say, well, we acted in good faith. We had no idea there would be a similar plan and we want to be covered under the better of the two plans. And I certainly understand that. My last question, though, what... do you know at what level the Chicago Teachers Retirement System is funded? Is it fairly solvent? Is it at 50% or 80% of payout?"

Crotty: "I thought it was 75%..."

Black: "Okay."

Crotty: "...but I'm told..."

Black: "Yeah, I really don't know. I was just curious..."

Crotty: "Yeah."

Black: "...because this will, of course, add about \$65 million to the accrued liability to the fund."

Crotty: "Representative, I just wanted to mention to you, too,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

that I think the last statement that you had made... When you get my age, sometimes it gets fuzzy. But they have to come back to the State Legislature in order to ask."

Black: "I understand that."

Crotty: "Okay."

Black: "That's the inherent danger."

Crotty: "So, I mean, that's the only reason why their here."

Black: "Yeah."

Crotty: "Otherwise, if they didn't have to, they would do this..."

Black: "Right."

Crotty: "...on their own. And this does not do anything to the state budget. This comes directly out of the Chicago Teachers Retirement System. So, they're just asking."

Black: "Okay."

Crotty: "At this time, no impact to the state. But just to be more fair to the teachers in 1993 that made the best decision that they could with the information that was given, although the information was not..."

Black: "All right."

Crotty: "...really up front and straight."

Black: "I appreciate the answers to your (sic-my) question. And I... Again, I... It's a difficult issue. I just have some fears. I don't want to be put into a position where I would have to tell a group that, look, I just can't go back and include you in the new pension enhancement. My only fear is this may open the door for that and then it would weaken my position to say, you chose to retire two years ago from your IDOT job and if the alternative rate becomes law, I don't think I could go back and include you. You retired in good faith. The Teamsters negotiated your retirement package in good faith. Two years ago I don't

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

think anybody would have had any idea that an alternative rate formula may have been adopted or may be adopted at some point to IDOT workers. And that's the only thing that I'm afraid of with your Bill is that it may set a precedent that other groups would say, well now wait a minute, if you can do it for one group... even though you could argue the position that I think the Chicago Teachers Retirement System is probably the most actuarially sound of all of the pension systems in Illinois. So, you know, some of them are not that well funded. I appreciate what you're trying to do. I just do have some reservations about the message it may send to those in the other systems who chose to retire at a certain point in their career, as well. I thank you for your very forthright answers."

Crotty: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crotty to close."

Crotty: "Thank you very much. And although, I strongly feel the same way as Representative Black does, this does not open up a can of worms. Every retirement buyout, people realize that in the years to come that there will be another buyout. But I know that persons that are told in one year, this is your only time and then in the following year, that some body comes back and has the same package. Then, I think it does set a precedence when you are bargaining, that you bargain in good faith and you stay true to your word. So, I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

hereby declared passed."

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a special guest who will be addressing the House of Representatives. And I'd like the staff to retire to the rear of the chamber. And we'd like the Members to take their seats. So, if staff could retire to the rear of the chamber, Members take their seats. very pleased to have with us today the South African Ambassador to the United States of America. Sheila Sisulu, throughout her career, has been particularly active in the field of education. After the first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, Ambassador Sisulu became the advisor to the Administer (sic-Minister) of Education, she was responsible for advising the Minister on special projects including youth, health, AIDS, gender, and early childhood education. She facilitated the process of establishing a youth commission in the office of the deputy president. She was appointed counsel general at the South African consulate in New York in 1997, and in 1999, President Nelson Mandela appointed her as South Africa's Ambassador to the United States of America. I'm very pleased to present to you Ambassador to the United States of America, Sheila Sisulu."

Ambassador Sisulu: "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much for those warm words of welcome. I am deeply honored, distinguished Members of the House, to have been given this opportunity to speak with you today. Before I proceed with my prepared speaking notes, I would like to do some housekeeping. I checked before whether Mrs. Ryan or the Governor are around and I was told they're not around, which gives me permission to talk about them behind their back. I would like to say, I always thought that we South

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Africans were warmhearted, which we are. We are beautiful from inside. We love people, we love our country, we love But I think the experience I've had in my short visit here with the Governor and Mrs. Ryan housing me at the Mansion and meeting some of the Members who came last night to the reception, I think we have tough competition in the area of being warm and welcoming. That's how I feel about the welcome I have received both from the Governor and Members that I met yesterday and other people that I've met in this state. Mr. Speaker, you have a wonderful First, I'd like to say, I bring greetings from my state. President, President Thabo Mbeki. And I will talk briefly about the issues that are important to us as a people and are important to the government of South Africa. I would like to talk a little bit about the trip that was taken by Governor Ryan almost a year ago. this trip was not only important for Illinois, through what was... what is now an established office, original trade office in Johannesburg, which is my home town, and the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with USAID. also, my recent information is that there are two companies that are about to close and sign agreements with companies in South Africa. And I think that delegation, the results and the fruit are beginning to be enjoyed. said earlier, our country thrives from relationships of people, people with people. What we have achieved in the short seven years of our independence has to do with the fact that we have a leadership that we wanted to follow where they led us, which is to reach out to each other as one people, one nation, with many cultures in one country. Through the negotiations that we had, through the process of reconciliation that we went through, and are still going

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

through, we are very pleased that we are making strides and can teach the world that peace and hope t.hat. we reconciliation is possible through truth telling and truth So, I also want to say that beca... while we seeking. value people to people contact, we undergird that through interactions in the area of culture and education. For us, such important contact was made with the people of Illinois from the state of Abraham Lincoln. I'd like to encourage you to use the good offices of our Consulate General in Chicago. And I'm here with my colleague, Albert, I mean, sorry, Carl, who is accompanying me from the office. Не works very well for our country in this area. We will also continue to make good use of the State Regional Trade Office in Johannesburg to further build the people to people bridges in the sphere of trade. One of the current areas of focus for my president, alongside the President of Nigeria and the President of Algeria, is to develop a program called the Millennium African Recovery Program. They were mandated by the Organization of African Unity to work on a program of development for the continent. This program is anchored on our determination, as Africans, extricate ourselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a rapidly globalizing Our leaders are taking responsibility for the program and for insuring its successful implementation. The call to the rest of the world is to join and support this African initiative. I'm pleased to report that the initiative is receiving overwhelming support, not only on the continent of Africa, but also in the developed world. Closer to home, former President Mandela, and now President have made a move to improve South Africa's Mbeki competitiveness in the global economy. This has not been

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Opening our industry and our economy has cost us. Sometimes it has cost us jobs. But, we know that we have to bite this bullet for the short while and that, when the tide turns and we have positioned ourselves globally, will be able to be... to bring back new jobs. Our economy today ranks 30th in size in the world. It is the largest the African continent. At the moment, our growth is at 3% this year and projected to be at 4% next year. target is 6%. We think that at 6%, we should be able to reduce the unemployment rate and improve the quality of life of our people. I think many of you are aware that Africa is beset with the scourge of HIV and AIDS. South Africa has one of the biggest problems in this regard. however, have a leadership that is committed to dealing with the scourge. And our program, which the UNAIDS recently described as the most comprehensive in all of the continent is in its sixth year of implementation. cornerstone is prevention. Our point is, unless we prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS, unless there is a cure, the only sure thing that we can do is to prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS. I'm pleased to say our education program, in been found to be effective. regard, has American-based foundation, the Kaiser Family Foundation, did research a year ago and found that the young people in our country who are at most at risk said... 80% of said they're aware and they know about HIV and AIDS and how it is transmitted. Disappointingly, however, we found that less than 20% felt that they had to change their behavior in order to protect themselves from HIV and AIDS. anybody who has worked on the antismoking campaign knows how all of us are finding it difficult to get people to stop smoking. And even if it means we throw them out in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the snow, they stay in the snow to have their fix. And in this case, we're dealing with a very difficult issue where it involves the private behavior, behavior of people in their private lives, away from public scrutiny. We... Talking to young people, for whom death is a word that does not quite exist because they think they're invincible. so, the difficulty of getting young people to change their behavior in their private lives in order to protect themselves from the disease that could kill them is quite a tall order. But I'm glad to say I think, also, there have been signs that we are succeeding, even if it's to a small And that sign, for example, is the fact that for the first time this past year the government public supply, free supply of condoms, ran out. And parliament had to give us an extra 60 million to give the health department, an extra 60 million rand, to purchase additional condoms, which means people are taking them and hopefully, using them. Unfortunately, I cannot say that the numbers of new infections are showing the same kind of downward trend as we would like. But in some parts of the country, pleased to report that actually in the latest survey, there is actually a downward trend. What you may also be aware of and which I need to clarify for you is the fact that we are locked up in a court case in South Africa with some pharmaceutical companies. Both in... of South Africa and internationally, the contestation is over an act of law that was signed by President Mandela three years ago that would allow our country to import medicines from the companies that are selling their medicines to us at higher prices than they're selling in other countries. The pharmaceutical companies are concerned that we are in violation of World Trade Organization agreements. We don't

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

think we are. And I'm glad to say the U. S. Government, the previous administration, and thankfully, the present administration, has come in support of our position that the way we have crafted the law, it is not in violation of the WTO. The matter is before our courts and we hope that we can still find accommodation between ourselves and the pharmaceutical companies. And I am, again, very thankful to be here. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. And I was practicing... the Speaker's daughter was practicing her Zulu on me and she thinks it's very poor, I think it's very good. She could say 'sawubona', which means 'hello'. And we exchanged greetings. So, with... Just to give you one word of Zulu that you can keep. And Lisa, I hope you are here and can remember this one which means 'stay well', 'nisale kahle'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 3214? Representative Mathias."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3214, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3214 creates the offense of theft by advertising. It would prohibit someone from putting a flier in your newspaper while it's on your driveway. This actually came out of an incident that happened in Pekin, Illinois, where a hate group actually put hate literature and distributed it into fliers on peoples' driveways into their newspapers. I would urge this Body to support this Bill and urge a 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is...

Excuse me, Representative Hoffman, do you have a... do you

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

stand in opposition?"

Hoffman: "I'm not sure."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, would you please proceed, then?"

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Representative, please... would you please explain, once again, the provisions, of the theft provisions in this Bill? I couldn't hear, I apologize."

Mathias: "That's fine. This would prohibit someone from inserting an unauthorized advertisement into a newspaper or periodical with the intent to redistribute this to the public. So in other words, if someone delivers your newspaper on your driveway and while your newspaper is still on the driveway, someone else comes by and puts an ad inside the newspaper, they're really stealing the advertising services of that newspaper."

Hoffman: "So, the only concern, I believe that it was raised in committee, if I'm not correct, is the broadness of the Bill. I don't have any problem with the intent of the Bill. But I think that it should be worked on in the Senate because there is an exemption of persons who insert the attachment with the consent of a publisher or authorized distributor of the newspaper. The question is, what if the paperboy puts an advertisement in there, don't forget that I'm your paperboy, give me a call if there's a problem with service or anything of that nature, without specific intent... without specific authorization by the publisher of the newspaper. So, I don't think that's the intent of your Bill, to get at that problem. You're talking about something else, is that right?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Hoffman: "So, would you be willing to at least look at trying to

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

address that issue with regard to the person who is actually delivering the newspaper being able to put something in there regarding that service of delivery?"

- Mathias: "Oh, yes, yes. Yeah, well, there... Remember, you can have the consent of the distributor or the publisher of the newspaper. So, if the boy wanted to distribute something and he got permission from his distributor, there would be no issue."
- Hoffman: "Well, generally, I guess what I'm saying is, is we could potentially be criminalizing the act of a paperboy who, under his own initiative, without calling up the publisher says, hey, I'm going to put this in there and puts a flier in there, I'm John Jones, paperboy, and if you have any problems with your service, please call me, paper services deluxe, and does it on his own. And I don't think that's what you want to do."
- Mathias: "That certainly was not the intent. It was really to get to the hate pieces that have been delivered in... throughout the state."
- Hoffman: "Well, I would just ask if you could potentially exempt that type of action, we'd be fine. We'll vote it out... I don't think there's any problem voting it out of here. If you'd talk to the Senate Sponsor and take care of it, I would appreciate it."
- Mathias: "I will certainly talk to the Senate Sponsor. Thank you..."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Mathias: "...for your suggestion."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority,
is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill

1804. Representative McCarthy."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1804 eliminates the electoral boards on the municipal, the township, and the educational district The business of these boards will be handled by levels. the county electoral boards except in the areas covered by a local board of election commission. The following cities are covered by a board of election commission, there's eight of them across the state: Aurora, Bloomington, Chicago, Danville, East St. Louis, Galesburg, Peoria, and Rockford. This Bill is identical to House Bill 2336 which, in the 91st General Assembly, passed on a vote of 111 to 1 on March 26th of 1999. The Bill passed the Elections and Campaign Reform Committee on February 28th of this year, unanimously. The main job of these electoral boards is to decide on challenges to nominating petitions or petitions to put referendums on the ballot. These challenges do not come up very often, but when they do they put the board members in a potential conflict of interest. The boards are traditionally made up of the chief executive of the board, the secretary of the board, and the senior member of the board. Many times they are asked to rule on petition challenges to their opponents in an upcoming election. Other times they are required to vote on referendum questions on issues that the board has recently addressed. No matter how objectively they rule, they cannot avoid the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

appearance of impropriety. I truly feel the members of these boards will welcome this change. I ask for your favorable consideration of House Bill 1804."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

And Representative John Turner, do you rise in opposition?"

Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I'm opposed or not. I
 do have questions for the Sponsor..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, the Sponsor will yield."

Turner, J.: "...if he will yield."

Speaker Hannig: "He will yield."

Turner, J.: "Representative, the electoral board that you are creating, is that a new concept in our statutory scheme or are their electoral boards doing the type of work you're talking about?"

McCarthy: "No, the Bill actually eliminates the electoral boards on those three levels and allows it to go to the county electoral board. These electoral boards are in practice today."

Turner, J.: "Wait a minute, your Bill eliminates the electoral board?"

McCarthy: "It eliminates the electoral boards on the township.

Over here, John. About the same seat you have, almost."

Turner, J.: "I can hardly see that far away."

McCarthy: "Okay. It eliminates and on the municipal..."

Turner, J.: "All right. Start again, it eliminates..."

McCarthy: "...municipal, township, and educational district electoral boards."

Turner, J.: "It eliminates those?"

McCarthy: "Eliminates them. On questions that they would usually handle, it will now go to the county electoral board."

Turner, J.: "So the county electoral board will then take the place of those three you just mentioned?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

McCarthy: "Correct."

- Turner, J.: "Do all counties have a county electoral board in place under our statutes?"
- McCarthy: "Yes, they do. They do by statute. These boards don't meet that often, but anytime there's a objection to a nominating petition, an objection to petitions to put an issue of public question on the ballot, if people object to them, these electoral boards have to rule on them. And when it's a very local question, many times the same people who voted on, like a change in a rule in a school district are then asked to rule on the petitions and it just comes up looking like it's an improper situation."
- Turner, J.: "I was under the impression that the State Board of Elections actually ruled upon objections to petitions and the like. Do they not fit into the scheme of things under your statute?"
- McCarthy: "This would not change any of the like... objections like our nominating petitions would still go to the State Board of Elections. These are only on matters of... like municipal, township, or educational district level that these boards would be eliminated and the county board would take over, the county electoral board. That's different than a board of election commissioners."
- Turner, J.: "Why would you think that the county electoral board would be in a better position to make rulings as opposed to the more local or more singular electoral boards as relate to the specific local elections?"
- McCarthy: "I think the answer is, I truly feel that they are in a position to be much more objective. Many times these very local electoral boards, while they can be very objective, that we put these people in a bad position where they have to vote on something many times that they just recently

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- handled on their own board work. So I just think as far as... I mean, I'm not saying they're all made... these decisions are made improperly, but the appearance of impropriety is certainly there."
- Turner, J.: "Are there instances in your district then where the local electoral board has been unfair or biased in some fashion and not been objective? And is that why you're proceeding with this measure?"
- McCarthy: "Well, I would not want to say that they have been unfair. I just want to say that the appearance is there and that even members of these boards would welcome these changes. In the case of one of my local..."
- Turner, J.: "Well, is your legislation in response to a certain situation that has arisen either in your district or in another district where someone has alleged that there has been impropriety? Impropriety on the part of the board?"
- McCarthy: "The original legislation was brought up by Representative Giglio, I joined in support of that two years ago. He had a township election board in his district where the incumbent slate was ruling, three members of the incumbent slate, were ruling on petitions of a slate of opponents. So, he brought this Bill forward at that time. In the meantime, I've had a school district in my area that went from neighborhood schools to grade centers. After the school board voted on it, a group of local citizens put together a school board drive to say, let's at least have a referendum question on this, an advisory referendum. There was a challenge to their petitions and the local school district who had just voted on the change then revoted and threw this question out. And so, I mean, I don't know if they were improper, but it certainly looked that way. Just last week, Worth

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Township in the Southwest side of Cook County, the incumbent slate... three members of the incumbent slate ruled to throw the challengers off the ballot in this upcoming election April 3rd. So, I mean, they may have been made completely on the facts, but I think the members of these boards are put in a bad position. I think the county electoral board has a lot more expertise in this because these don't come up that often. But I think in the chance when they do come up, that many times incumbents are ruling on the petitions of the people trying to oppose them. I just think it's a good thing to say, let this go to the county electoral board. Nobody opposed it on the countrywide or even on the municipal township or educational district level."

- Turner, J.: "Representative, would you agree that at least some extent then, your Bill if passed, would usurp or eliminate local control from municipalities and townships and instead place that control at the county level? And is that what you want to do?"
- McCarthy: "I would say that on issues that come before the electoral board, which are basically two things, objections to petitions for nomination, or objections to petitions for public questions, I think the fact that the county board... county electoral board can be much more objective. I think it's a wise move, so I would move it away from them."
- Turner, J.: "What if there's an objection at the county level? For example, someone's running for county board."
- McCarthy: "The county electoral board already handles that."
- Turner, J.: "Well, why would they not have, if there is an..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your five minutes have expired.

 Could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"
- Turner, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize we were on the

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- timer. When did we start going on the timer? Is that something you just did for this particular Bill?"
- Speaker Hannig: "We're going to do that for the rest of the time, at least that I'm in the Chair, Representative, for all the Members on both sides."
- Turner, J.: "I would move then, that this be taken off Short

 Debate. I'm joined by a requisite number of persons on my

 side of the aisle."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Bill is off Short Debate, so if we have..."
- Turner, J.: "Do I have any time left?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, do you want to ask just one or two more questions, we will be happy to grant you some time."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was, you have raised the query as to whether or not these local boards can be fair and objective in ruling upon a municipality or township question regarding a ballot. So that I think it begs the question, why would the county board be relied upon or why would they be objective in ruling upon petitions, or ruling upon ballots at the county level? I think you can make the same argument either way, don't you?"
- McCarthy: "I'm sure you could. But I just think that the fact that it's removed a couple levels makes them appear more objective. I didn't say that there was improper behavior, I just said there can be the appearance of impropriety. And I can tell you that most members of these local boards who are put in this untenable position would be happy, I would think, to remove themselves from that."
- Turner, J.: "Is there any opposition to your Bill?"
- McCarthy: "None whatsoever. And it passed unanimously from committee."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Turner, J.: "Are there any proponents of your Bill?"

McCarthy: "Just myself."

Turner, J.: "Just yourself. Are the county officials..."

McCarthy: "I'm sorry, Citizen Action..."

Turner, J.: "...on the board, are they paid?"

- McCarthy: "Citizen Action of Illinois registered as a proponent in committee."
- Turner, J.: "The persons who serve on the electoral board or the board at the county level, are they paid or compensated in any fashion?"
- McCarthy: "They are already members of the county board. These boards are made up of the chief..."
- Turner, J.: "But do they get paid for making the decision whether or a not a ballot... or whether a person has the sufficient number of petitions to stay on a ballot or whatever the question that is becomes before them. Are they paid?"
- McCarthy: "I think they're paid whatever their regular salary is for their position on the board. These are board members, they're not paid anything extra for this, I don't believe."
- Turner, J.: "How about the persons who serve on the boards that you're going to eliminate at the township level, or at the municipal level, are those persons remunerated in any fashion for their service?"
- McCarthy: "They don't get anything extra for being on this electoral board, I know that. They... Different municipalities pay different things to their mayor or to their trustees, sometimes it's just expenses. But it would not change it in any way whether this board is there or not. Many of these bo..."
- Turner, J.: "Do you know if the county clerks have taken a position... the County Clerks Association, on your Bill?"

McCarthy: "They have not."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- Turner, J.: "Have you talked with any of the county clerks or their lobbyists as to whether or not they have read the Bill or do you know whether they are even aware that it's in existence?"
- McCarthy: "Well, in committee, there were representatives of a few county clerks who saw no problem with it. They didn't think it... It doesn't come up that often, but when it does it puts certain people in a bad position."
- Turner, J.: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan, do you rise in support or in opposition?"

Mulligan: "I rise in opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Five minutes, Representative. Proceed."

- Mulligan: "Representative McCarthy, in the situations that you describe, such as someone that is... would be voting on someone that would be running for their same position, why couldn't you have introduced the Bill to just eliminate that person as having a conflict of interest?"
- McCarthy: "Because, you know, the board is made up... Many times people do ask out of this, and then it just goes to another member of the board. There is a set procedure for if a person opts out, it goes down to the next member of the board, to the next member of the board. Many times it gets down... In the case of my local school district, it got down to the last member of the board, finally said, okay, I'll sit on the board and I'll vote on it. Because they knew that... The others felt that they were put in an improper position. So, I just thought this was the quicker way... these questions don't come up that often. The representatives of the counties didn't see any problem with handling these things. They felt it was more objective,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

and I felt it was more objective."

Mulligan: "Representative, if you were to lose this kind of decision from a board, can't you go ahead and take it to court?"

McCarthy: "Yes, you may."

Mulligan: "All right."

McCarthy: "You can take it to the Circuit Court, if you wish."

Mulligan: "So, you do have another recourse if you are... feel that the board was not, or was partial, or divisive in the tactics that they used on voting on something like this?"

McCarthy: "That is true that they can take it. But that's one of the benefits of this Bill, it eliminates that problem with the people being forced to take it to the Circuit Court because they felt they didn't get a justifiable hearing. So, we want to unclog the courts as much as we can. of these people are forced into a position, even if they are questioning whether their position challenge should or should not have been honored. But because of the fact that the people, in many cases, that ruled on their petition challenge are the exact same people that they're running against in the upcoming election or they're not running against because they were tossed off the ballot, so these people almost feel compelled to take it to the Circuit Court. I think we have a better chance if they went to a county board that they could look at as being more objective, that they would be less likely to clog up our courts."

Mulligan: "Representative, if you... you live in Cook County, I take it, from where your district is."

McCarthy" "Correct."

Mulligan: "And how can you say in my half... in my part of Cook County District, that someone who comes from my local

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

municipalities would feel that taking it to the county would be an impartial place to take it? I don't feel that it would be..."

McCarthy: "I think it would be much... Well, I mean, that would be your judgement. But I certainly can't say..."

Mulligan: "Right. When the county is..."

McCarthy: "If they..."

Mulligan: "...is controlling and particularly, in the political system, it's controlling, why would I... would my local municipalities want to take this to a board that is county run rather than a local area and take away the local control, when we get no response from the county on many issues? Why would we think that we would get an impartial response on this?"

McCarthy: "I think because these people have more experience, for one thing. These people are used to judging petitions and challenges to petitions more so than a local municipal board, which may never do this in 20 years and all of a sudden, it comes up on a certain election or on a certain question of public policy. So, I think that the local boards would see the wisdom of this and it wouldn't force them to put ... in a decision-making process. In my local school district, they would be happy to have this removed 'cause they felt that they were justifiably removing these questions from the referendum. You know, are not allowing the questions to be put on referendum. But they have all said to me that they thought if another board had made this decision, it would have been a lot easier on them because the exact people who opposed them on their original decision to change the school district were the people who were bringing this petition forward and then were forced to rule, again, against the same people."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Mulligan: "Representative, I don't think in certain counties, and Cook isn't alone in that, but in certain counties where the dominance is Party controlled by one Party, that you're gonna get an impartial view. And I think there's a better way of going about presenting a board, whether it's a balance of who would be put on it. And I think that at any given time, it could go against the person who's having their petitions or whatever reviewed. And I don't think that this is a good way to do it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross, do you... Excuse me.

Okay, Representative Black, do you rise in opposition or in support?"

Black: "Well, I'll tell ya, Mr. Speaker, I'm torn, but I think I must reluctantly rise in opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. You have five minutes, Representative."

Black: "I can't even get started in five minutes, Mr. Speaker. Surely, you're not going to hold me to that, are you? Well, then you've already taken six seconds off. All right. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I won't belabor the facts that have already been made. I have a inherent distrust of centralizing political authority into one body. In my area of the state there is a county board that, up until three or four years ago, had no Democrats on that county board, not one. Conversely, I know of several counties they do today. around me that have all Democrats on the county board and no Republicans. So, if you are running for municipal office in a small Republican-controlled city or village and your electoral dispute ends up at a county board on which sits absolutely no Republican members, public there perception would be, I'm not gonna have a very fair hearing. You always have recourse to the courts. But I

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

think the system that we've had seems to work rather well. There were some disputes in my area on the upcoming municipal election that were handled quickly and expeditiously by the local election authorities. Thev didn't have to take it to the county, which in some cases, are miles away. You may not have any representation from your community that represents the Party I just have some inherent difficulty in represent. And thinking that if you consolidate all of the electoral objection process into one political arena, that being the county, that you may very well... And I don't think deliberately, but perception would be, why bother? I'm not gonna go to a county board where 26 of the members are Republicans and one is a Democrat and I'm running for a local office on the Democrat ticket, I'm not gonna get a fair hearing. They don't understand what's going on in community, and the opposition Party has an overwhelming majority. I think it would inhibit someone from pursuing an objection, an electoral objection. I'm not aware that the current system is broken to any great degree. again, I have... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you would have to look at your own area and see if you are, in fact, comfortable with taking all of the electoral... locally-driven electoral questions and issues to a body controlled by and run by the county government. I don't think that kind of centralized power is necessarily good government, good public policy. I don't think it streamlines anything. I don't think it speeds up the process at all. And if you really think you're hearing wasn't fair, you always have an appeal recourse. So, I can appreciate what the Sponsor's trying to do, but having been in this business for a number of years, I'm very, very

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

suspicious when we try to centralize political authority into any one body. I think the current system has served us rather well, and I think it will continue to serve us rather well. And that's why I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "So, under the rules of Standard Debate, we've now had three that spoke in opposition, one that has spoken in favor. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of this Bill? Representative Fowler."

Fowler: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Spea... Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Fowler: "I rise in very strong support of this Bill, based on the 14 years that I served as county clerk of my county. county electoral board is comprised, as I'm sure you're all aware of, of the county clerk who by virtue of his office, is chairman of that committee by the State's Attorney and by the circuit clerk of that county. And I think if you had any responses from most of the townships regarding this Bill, they would be in favor of it. Because so many of those people are not familiar with the process on these hearings, they would rather not do 'em at all, I think they would rather that somebody else would do them. And I know we held several of those while I was county clerk, and there were very, very few of them in my area, in my district, where the other local boards, of which you're seeking to do away with, held these hearings. So again, I am in support of this. I do not feel like that the boards that are being eliminated, especially in my district, would be opposed to this Bill. So, I do stand in strong support of it. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "So, under the rules of Standard Debate, we have

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

one more who can speak in favor. Does anyone rise in favor of this proposal? If not, then Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments.

There was a vote of 111 to 1 on this two years ago. I believe the... if most things hold true, it was probably the Representative..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative."

McCarthy: "...from Danville who was the one..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative McCarthy.

Representative Lindner, for what reason do you rise?"

Lindner: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, that I didn't hear something he said at the beginning that I'd like to ask again."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, please proceed."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Lindner: "I heard you mention Aurora in your opening statement, but I didn't hear what you said. Could you tell me what you said about the City of Aurora?"

McCarthy: "I just listed the eight cities that were covered by a board of election commissioners and Aurora was one of them.

There's eight of 'em across the country, Aurora was one of the eight."

Lindner: "All right."

McCarthy: "And the Bill does not apply to them, then and the board of election commissioners."

Lindner: "It does not apply to them?"

McCarthy: "They would still make the local decisions, correct."

Lindner: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Biggins: "Mr. Speaker, I rise with the purpose of asking the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, please proceed. Last, let you ask one question."

Biggins: "Representative, you mentioned that this applied to a township electoral boards."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Biggins: "And you mentioned specifically Worth Township."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Biggins: "Is the supervisor of that township..."

McCarthy: "I mentioned that in comments, yes."

Biggins: "Is the supervisor of that township on the electoral board... election board?"

McCarthy: "Yes, he is."

Biggins: "Now, I noticed the Sponsors of this Bill are fine, Southside Irish."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Biggins: "And I'm a... happen to be a West Suburban Irish. But, is the supervisor of Worth Township carry the name 'Murphy'?"

McCarthy: "I believe he does."

Biggins: "And it is a he, it's not Mrs. Murphy, then?"

McCarthy: "It's a Mr."

Biggins: "It's a Mr. Murphy. This Bill wouldn't be directed at activities Mr. Murphy engaged in as township supervisor of Worth Township, would it Mr. Mur... Sponsor?"

McCarthy: "It would not. This Bill was introduced two years ago, and I joined Representative Giglio on that time, as the chief cosponsor. The Bill was really initiated by a local school district where I've talked to the members of that school board who wished they didn't have to form the electoral board to rule on the question of public policy.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

The Worth Township example was an example that just came up in the last couple weeks that I had no understanding that it was gonna come forward at the time the Bill was introduced, even at the time the Bill went through committee. But since it was in our local paper recently, that three members of the incumbent slate voted to remove the challenger slate, I thought it was an excellent example to bring forward at this time. I would bet that those members of that board, I haven't spoken to them, but they probably felt they were in a very uncomfortable position removing the opponents, although it's a very welcome position. But I bet they felt it very uncomfortable to be put in that position. And if the petitions were done that badly, I'm sure the county electoral board would have agreed in their decision and then it would have been a step removed from them and they would of felt more comfortable with the outcome."

Biggins: "I'm just concerned this is trying to overthrow the results of a decision by electoral board. I think we ought to get on.... get over it and let's move forward and let's go... get along here. So, thank you for answering my questions."

McCarthy: "Well, that decision was made before the effective date, so it wouldn't have anything to do with that decision, to tell you the truth."

Biggins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "I thank you, I appreciate the questions and the comments. As I said earlier, this Bill did pass approximately two years ago, 111 to 1. I really feel this streamlines. These local people are not... do not have experience in this. I think it is a wise move to eliminate

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

these boards. It does not take away the challenge that you have through the Circuit Court that you have today. If you don't like the decision on the county electoral board, you can still go back and address it in the Circuit Courts. My hope is that there will be less appeals to the Circuit Court because these people will feel that they got a much fairer hearing. I especially appreciate the comments from the former clerk, from our Representative from Harrisburg, and I'd ask for a favorable motion (sic-vote) on the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is

favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', and 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1957, for Representative Moffitt."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1957 is initiative of the township officials of Illinois. It is permissive, and if it is enacted it would be an opportunity to... for townships to provide property tax relief by possibly lowering levies or could help prevent from raising levies, causing them to go any higher, or reduce or eliminate the need for borrow. What it does is it allows interest to be transferred from a fund that has an adequate balance to funds that need additional, additional balance. It protects interest that's been earned on pensions, tort immunity, or interest that's been earmarked or designated

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

for another purpose. So it's just empowering townships to be able to transfer interest, and it's only interest, to a fund that's in need of additional funds. As they say, it would be an opportunity to actually give some property tax relief. I'd be happy to entertain any questions that you might have."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1957. Is... and this Bill is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in opposition? Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Once again, Mr. Speaker. We just have a couple of questions to clarify for the Members, if that would be okay?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Hoffman: "Yes, what townships funds would have an accumulation of interest in the fund? Are there any specific funds we're talking about here, that were... that makes this a necessity?"
- Moffitt: "As I indicated, it's permissive, and it's probably going to vary, Representative, from township to township, what funds have really a very healthy balance and which ones are in need of some funds from some other source. It's going to vary with the township. The different townships use different funds. There's... pretty common that they have a town fund, a general assistance fund, a road and bridge fund, an equipment and building fund, a liability fund, a cemetery fund. Those are some pretty common funds. But they're not all going to be the same, which one has a surplus or extra funds and which one does It gives them the flexibility to transfer interest and interest only, but they cannot transfer interest on the protected funds that I mentioned."

Hoffman: "And do any other government entities have this ability

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

now?"

Moffitt: "Representative, I'm not sure if others do. We're not aware of anything prohibiting this, it's a... that there'd be any problem in that respect. But I didn't... this is only in reference to townships, so I don't know if other units of government can. I was of the opinion they could, but I cannot name them, so I don't want to answer that without some more research."

Hoffman: "Well, the only concern, I guess, would be for people who would a... first of all, let me just tell you I generally support the concept because it would make sense. Why would we keep a surplus in one fund, when it is needed in another? Because the option then, if you don't transfer funds, would be to increase the taxes on the fund that's deling... that, that doesn't have special money?"

Moffitt: "Right, or borrow."

Hoffman: "However, some would say the opposite. Some would say that, well if there's additional money that's laying in an account, shouldn't we have a tax reduction for the taxpayers in that township?"

Moffitt: "But if, if you reduce it on that one and go out and borrow for the one that's low, or raise the levy, then you haven't saved the taxpayers any money if you're doing it that way. It would just be a wash in the situation that you're talking."

Hoffman: "So the only thing that you're saying here is, is if there is deficiency in one fund, rather than go back to the taxpayers and ask for additional money in that fund, you could use money that just arbitrarily, or is sitting in another fund. You could transfer it."

Moffitt: "It's only interest."

Hoffman: "I understand that."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- Moffitt: "It's only interest. Right, you could transfer that from a fund that had an adequate balance."
- Hoffman: "Which would thereby take the burden off the taxpayer, because you wouldn't have to go back to replenish the other fund."

Moffitt: "Right."

Hoffman: "Okay."

- Moffitt: "Right, it... in actual fact it could be property tax relief. It could help them reduce the need to borrow, or reduce the need to raise the levy. It could actually help them lower a levy."
- Hoffman: "Well, thank you. I'll support the Bill."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Representative Brunsvold in the Chair.

 Further discussion? Seeing none, Mr. Moffitt to close."
- Moffitt: "Thank you very much. I think this just empowers townships to be able to actually benefit our taxpayers.

 Appreciate a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1957

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

 voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

 who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

 record. And on that question, there are 115 voting 'yes',

 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having

 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

 passed. On the Calendar appears House Bill 1911.

 Representative Collins, Representative Collins. Mr. Clerk,

 read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Hannig: "Representative Hannig is back in the Chair, and on that question, Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- presenting House Bill 1911. It simply says, what we gonna do is extend the word 'relative' to extend it to second cousins and godparents for the child to be considered to be placed in foster care."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 1911. Is there any discussion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates, she will."
- Black: "Representative, is the a... I'm just not that familiar with the relationship status of a godparent. Are they, in fact, a relative that would be recognized by the courts or by a genealogy expert and should they, in fact, be on the list of relatives eligible to be foster parents? What, what is a godparent? Isn't it an honorary title that you may bestow on a good friend, or something of that sort? It's not actually a blood relative is it?"
- Collins: "To answer short, yes. But the definition for this Amendment, DCFS definition for a 'relative', we will consider the godparent as a relative, so the child can be eligible to be considered, placed, in that home."
- Black: "Is there any documentation in the child's records or the family records that would indicate who is actually a godparent? What is to prevent someone from showing up at a hearing and saying, I'm the child's godparent? Is there any... where would this be listed, because I don't think it's an official title that's recognized by family or blood?"
- Collins: "No, well it has to be someone that the child knows, someone that the child has previously lived with or stayed with, and someone that the parent has defined as godparent.

 It can't just be anyone. And then we're not saying that

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

you have to place that child with that person."

Black: "Right."

Collins: "It's just that a lot of times, that the child has a relationship with a godparent or a second cousin, and we want them to be considered. All the other standards will be the same, but we want to now say that they can at least be considered, so that they may be placed in that home."

Black: "And I have no problem with the second cousin part, because obviously, that is traceable and discoverable. But was this, is this the language from DCFS, I mean is this their language? Are they..."

Collins: "DCFS has not opposed this language. What has, what happens and the reason why this came about is because a lot of times, in our community, and I used to work for DCFS and what happens is, when you go out and you take custody of a child, sometimes the parent has already given the child, or the child is living with a godparent or a second cousin, but they can't be considered, because they're not a blood relative, but this child has a significant relationship with that family and that person has been in the family a long time. So they're considered a relative, yet they're not a blood relative, but they are considered as a relative, in the eyesight of the child and the family, and the history of the family."

Black: "Well, how would a scenario like this be handled by DCFS?

Let's say there were two biological parents involved in a hearing and each of them had told somebody else in their frame of friendships or acquaintances, each of them had told somebody, you're the godparent of my daughter, you're the godparent of my daughter, and you are, and you are. So there are four god... four godparents show up at a hearing and say, I'm the child's godparent, her father said so when

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

she was born. Somebody else shows up and says, wait a minute, I'm the godparent of the daughter, her mother told me that I was her godparent the day she was born."

Collins: "No, It's just a matter of this. If... we're saying that if the child has previously lived with this person, she's the godparent, because of the child is living there or has lived there in the past. So we're not saying that anybody can just come up, that's not what the Bill is about. It's just saying that this child had a previous relationship. It can be documented and proven that this child has had a relationship with the godparent. You can bring witnesses in that say, yes, this child lived with that person, and now we want to be considered. Now, we're not saying that this person is the best placement, we're just saying to extend the word relative to consider this child as a relative... as a possible placement, not saying that it would happen, 'cause she may... she still has to meet all the criterions, the LEADS check, CANTS check and all those other things."

Black: "So, your Bill does not say that a godparent has a superior claim. The agency, DCFS, would still have to do a due diligence background check, and the godparent may or may not be selected to be the foster parent, depending on what the agency thought was in the best interests of the child."

Collins: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay."

Collins: "We're just saying that we want them to be considered, as a possible relative, when considering all relative placements."

Black: "All right. Is there any issue of separation of church and state in your Bill, since you... the specific term

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

'godparent' is involved? There, there might be some people who would take offense of that. It may not be politically correct to call them a godparent."

Collins: "No, it's no statute in the Amendment."

Black: "Are you sure?"

Collins: "Yes."

Black: "'Cause I don't want to get into a separation of church and state argument here. I mean, I've been here when the ministers were chastised for using various biblical references in their invocation. I, you know, perhaps it should be, religious parent."

Collins: "The Department does not look at religion, when they are considering placement, but it will be..."

Black: "Well, that's way I'm wondering if the word 'God' should even be in there. See, we may be running afoul of the separation of church and state clause, which I believe is Article IV, Section 3, paragraph 2 of the United States Constitution, as also embodied in the Bill of Rights and also in a case of Supreme Court case, I think the cite was DeWeese v. Preston, 1988 as I recall."

Collins: "Okay. It's really the word 'godparent' is a cultural thing, is another word, because the child is not related, so they came up with another term, but it has nothing to do with the church and the state. It's just another language that the community is using."

Black: "All right, well thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen I've been here perhaps too long. I remember when freshman were given Bills to carry on their first attempt at the General Assembly, and they were reasonably complex Bills, like what should the official state dance be, or what should the official state insect be? Now we let freshman come down

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

here and carry very complicated Bills for their first attempt to pass something out of this chamber. Now we have a freshman bringing us a Bill that invokes the word of I don't know where this is leading, I have no idea. I would defer to people on that side of the aisle, who are much more cognizant of these kinds of separation of church and state powers that I am. But I know there are, I'm sure there are dozens of case cites that we could get into. Perhaps this person should be referred to as a, a close-friend parent or a religious parent or a decent human being parent. But I just, I'm not sure that freshman Legislators should be allowed to carry their first Bill and then you invoke the word of 'God' in that Bill. thought at one time it was against the House Rules. many things have changed over the years, Mr. Speaker and I long for the days, when first Bills that people were given to carry were relatively simple. And now this is a very complex Bill and I must commend the Sponsor. She did an excellent job of obfuscating and confusing me, one of the best jobs that I have had done to me in years. congratulate her on that. This is a very complicated Bill. I don't even know who my first cousin is, let alone my second cousin and God forbid, if I have a godparent, because I'm sure he or she would disown me. I rest my case."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And before I go on, we've been trying to obfuscate Mr. Black for some time over here, but we haven't gotten away with it yet. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Lang: "Representative, this is your first Bill isn't it? We

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

didn't hear you."

Collins: "Yes."

Lang: "Okay."

Collins: "This is my first Bill."

Lang: "That probably explains the smile on your face. So I'm concerned about this cousin business. So I, my whole life, have been having conversations with my mother about first cousins and second cousins and third cousins, three times removed and all that. What is a second cousin?"

Collins: "A second cousin is right after the first cousin."

Lang: "That was very enlightening, Representative. Can you, do a little better?"

Collins: "All right. You know, like you have a mother and a father, right and then, their children are your first cousins. So those children of those children are your second cousins."

Lang: "No, the children of my parents would be my brothers and sisters. They would not be my cousins."

Collins: "The children of your first cousins, those children that your first cousins have."

Lang: "Right."

Collins: "Now, your second cousins."

Lang: "Ah, so what's a first cousin?"

Collins: "Your father or your mother's children."

Lang: "My father and my mother's children are me."

Collins: "Your uncle, your uncle's I mean, your sibs, like your sibs'..."

Lang: "My sibs, into the microphone, Representative."

Collins: "...Kids, your sibs' children."

Lang: "So, my uncle's children and my children are first cousins?"

Collins: "Yes."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Lang: "Not my brother's children and my children. It's my uncle's children and my children."

Collins: "No, no, no. Your brother and your sister, all of those children would be first cousins."

Lang: "So..."

Collins: "Your first cousin would be your mother's and father's children. Your, your mother's and father's brothers' children, are now your first."

Lang: "So, so wait, so wait, so, so..."

Collins: "Are now your first cousins."

Lang: "What if I don't have a brother? Can I still have a cousin?"

Collins: "If you had a sister."

Lang: "If I had a sister, I can have a cousin, but I need a brother or a sister to have a cousin."

Collins: "To have a first cousin."

Lang: "You sure? All right. Let me try a different...

Representative Dart and I now think that we're related,

we're not sure."

Collins: "Your parents... your parents need... your brothers and sisters are your brothers and sisters, but if your mother and father have brothers and sisters and they have children, then they would be your first cousins."

Lang: "Ah, okay. So, all right, so..."

Collins: "And their children would be your second cousins."

Lang: "And their children are second cousins."

Collins: "Right."

Lang: "Are we all straight on this now everybody? All right, now
I have another question. What is this business about twice
removed, where does that fit in here? What is a second
cousin twice removed, and can that person be a foster
parent under your Bill?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Collins: "No, we don't have anything in a Bill about that."

Lang: "All right, that's fair. So, with all this talk about cousins and godparents and all, what's your Bill do?"

Collins: "The Bill just simply extends the word 'relative' to include second cousins and godparents to be eligible to be considered as placements... for placement."

Lang: "If somebody doesn't have a godparent assigned to them when they're born, can they get one later in life? So if somebody doesn't have a godparent at the age of 8, when you're trying to make them a foster child, can godparents be named at that point?"

Collins: "No, it has to be someone that the child already has a relationship with, or who have, they have already stayed with. It can't be a new person coming up saying. They would have a relationship already developed."

Lang: "So, there was no opposition to this Bill in committee?" Collins: "No."

Lang: "The Third Cousins Association of Illinois does not oppose to this, because you're discriminating against them?"

Collins: "No."

Lang: "All right. Well, I, like Mr. Black, feel that you've been trying to confuse us, but we're going to think your Bill over, Representative. Thank you for enlightening me on what a second cousin is."

Collins: "All right."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft, is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Hoeft: "This is a DCFS Bill?"

Collins: "Yes."

Hoeft: "So, if the cousin is once removed, can DCF place them

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

back? I'm getting confused. Once removed, is there twice removed or when do we put them in foster care?"

Collins: "See, we didn't talk about once or twice removed, in the Bill, those terms are not in the Bill."

Hoeft: "Our effort in the state is to bring families together, not remove them. She's ignoring me, Mr. Speaker, like most everyone else."

Collins: "I'm trying to see who is talking."

Hoeft: "Over here."

Collins: "Okay."

Hoeft: "All right?"

Collins: "I'm sorry, would you repeat your question?"

Hoeft: "No."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill, I wholeheartedly rise to commend the Sponsor for this Bill. Having traveled across this state and hearing so many horror stories about the difficulties that families have had in keeping their young people, I think that this is at least one of the ways that we can help to keep our families together. I would suggest, in fact, I urge that all of my colleagues vote 'yes' for this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Reitz: "Representative. She sat down, she gave up on the Bill already. Does this Bill apply to the whole state? The whole state of Illinois?"

Collins: "Yes."

Reitz: "Have you taken into consideration like getting into cousins and that in Southern Illinois or... I realize you're, you know, you're from the city, but have you spoken

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

with anyone on that or..."

Collins: "No, I just spoke with DCFS and they represent the whole state."

Reitz: "So this Bill would adv... I would probably advise everyone from Southern Illinois to take good look at this Bill, 'cause I really think this has nothing to do with, like Representative Black's Bill, a couple of Bills that he has."

Collins: "No, no."

Reitz: "Okay, well thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Okay. Close? I would like to ask for each and everyone of you all support for this Bill, House Bill 1911, so that the wards of DCFS and for those taken into custody can at least be considered to stay with relatives or people that they know. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm shocked and appalled that my name was used in debate. And I'm just getting tired of being the brunt of jokes about a Bill I'm carrying. And I just want to tell Representative Reitz, you aren't gonna get my goat."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1911 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fowler, for what reason do you rise? Representative Fowler."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Fowler: "I rise a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "State, state your point."

Fowler: "I'm happy to have here today, from one of the schools down in my district a group of kids from the Jobs for Illinois Grads. They are accompanied by the teacher, Jill Bonwell, and I'd like to give them a good House welcome, they're sitting up here in the balcony. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Brady, are you ready on 3314? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3314, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I bring before you today House Bill 3314. This Bill provides for the entry into the Law Enforcement Agencies Data System or commonly referred to as LEADS, for the recording of no contact orders issued by the court and would be entered by the appropriate law enforcement agency or personnel. This would provide law enforcement officers as much information as possible when dealing with domestic situations on the street. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for your 'yes' vote on this particular House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3314, and on that question, Representative Black is recognized."

Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, I see on board and in the analysis, what is LEADS?"

Brady: "LEADS, LEADS"

Black: "Well, I know who leads, but what is LEADS?"

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Brady: "Well, that would be a mistake."

Black: "So, there's a mistake on the board?"

Brady: "I'm sorry, on the board, LEADS meaning the Law
Enforcement Agency (sic-Agencies) Data System,
Representative."

Black: "And we're not supposed to have any contact with that agency?"

Brady: "Actually..."

Black: "How can we do our job?"

Brady: "No, we would like to have contact in and with that agency for our officers out on the street, on no contact orders."

Black: "And what is a no contact order?"

Brady: "A no contact order is generally a 72-hour cooling-off period, issued by the court in domestic situations."

Black: "Where, where did you go, Representative Brady? I don't see you on the jumbotron tran?"

Brady: "I'm trying to stay in your line of fire, Representative."

Black: "Your seat is vacant. Oh, there you are, okay. Ah, there we go, looks much better. The vacant chair will not have any ghosts voting. So, is a no contact order the same as a order of protection?"

Brady: "No, it is not, Representative."

Black: "What's the difference?"

Brady: "The difference is that order of protections is usually runs somewhere around a 30-day period, by the court. The 72-hour period is simply that. It's issued by the court and it is not presently being entered into the LEADS system, where orders of protection are."

Black: "I thought the LEADS system dealt only with children."

Brady: "No, it can deal with any type of order that's issued by the court, as long as it's entered in by the law enforcement agency or if a circuit clerk, if the particular

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

county has access to enter in that information theirselfs."

Black: "Is the State Police okay with this Bill? I mean it's their system."

Brady: "Yes, yes they are. We talked at length, regarding this Bill. The date may be in question that they would prefer to see this start in Jan... excuse me, July because of some changes that they're making to LEADS system. But it is generally entered in throughout the state, by the sheriff's department of that particular county, where the order is issued by the court."

Black: "Are you aware of any attempt to... is the state police attempting to dismantle the LEADS system and go to something called an IWIN system?"

Brady: "I reach?"

Black: "IWIN."

Brady: "IWIN."

Black: "I's I-W-I-N."

Brady: "They did not indicate that to me, Representative, when we were talking."

Black: "All right, all right. Thank you very much , Representative. Mr. Speaker, if you would take my advice under advisement, I'd like to go back to the old days, when freshmen Legislators carried Bills about whether the Rathskellar should be renamed. I tired of these complicated, multifaceted Bills being carried by freshman. This is a very complicated Bill. The speaker did a very good job of hiding the fact he doesn't have a clue what this Bill does. Just to further make my point, Mr. Speaker, I surveyed all the freshman, an anonymous survey, asking them to sponsor legislation on what the name should be for the Lincoln Presidential Library, three of them wrote back, it should be named after Grant and one sent me

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

back, that it should be named after John Kennedy. That's the quality of the freshman class and you're letting them carry, substantive Bills. This is a dangerous precedent, that didn't use to be that way. And I look forward to Representative Brady being here and answering questions on this Bill, because I don't think that he knows what the LEADS system's all about. But we'll find out here shortly. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Brosnahan: "Representative, I read your Bill and I applaud your intent on the Bill. I know Representative Black mentioned Illinois State Police. According to out analysis the Illinois State Police, they're opposed to this Bill, because they're in the process of updating their LEADS system?"

Brady: "They initially were opposed to the Bill, but they have since taken away that objection to the Bill, because it is actually entered in by the sheriff's department of the county in question. Also, they ask that we make it from a timing standpoint, July 1 to implement this particular Bill."

Brosnahan: "Okay, now have you spoken with the sheriffs' association? Are they in favor of this Bill, they're proponents of the Bill as well?"

Brady: "Yes, they are, and I did speak with them."

Brosnahan: "Okay, now when I saw the Bill, the effective date is still, it's an immediate effective date. So how have you worked that out? You said that this is not going to take effect."

Brady: "Well, it was the request by the State Police that we try

- 30th Legislative Day

 and change the effective start date on it. And that's something that we are going to work out."
- Brosnahan: "Okay, okay, it's something that you just take can of in the state Senate. If you have to change the effective date, you just do that across the hall. Okay, thank you."

Brady: "Yes, Sir, that's entirely possible. Yes, Jim."

Brosnahan: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jerry Mitchell."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Brady, this is your first Bill, is that correct?"
- Brady: "What would give you that impression, Representative Mitchell?"
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, the fact that you've totally confused Representative Black, who is in a... you know a real good..."
- Brady: "Then I, apparently have done my job, I guess."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, I don't know, but this is a Brady Bill right? And you've got lead?"

Brady: "LEADS."

- Mitchell, J.: "And I understand you were a target? Is this a concealed carry Bill?"
- Brady: "It is not disguised to be a concealed carry Bill. No, Representative."
- Mitchell, J.: "What's it disguised to be then, Representative Brady?"
- Brady: "Actually, it's an attempt of trying to help the officers out in the street on domestic violence."
- Mitchell, J.: "I see. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the moment. I don't know whether Dan realizes this, but in honor of the Brady's long tradition in the House, once they've introduced their

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

first Bill, it's always been the established practice that they buy pizza when we go late. And I understand we are going to go late tonight, so I've done some research for House Members, and buy the way Dan, I want triple cheese, no green peppers, and no anchovies. But you can call Representative Brady's secretary at 782-1118 with your pizza orders before 3:00. She's already said that Dan left the message that he would be more than happy to pick up the tab. Thank you, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Representative. We're going to have that up in the gallery, later today with Representative Black and I."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Where are you Representative? Well, oh you're over there.

Sausage and mushroom for me, please."

Brady: "Thank you, Representative."

Lang: "Representative, I, I'm look... this is your first Bill?"

Brady: "Yes, I think we've come, came up with that. Yes, it would be."

Lang: "So, so I'm reading the Bill and it talks about the victim of an offense is a family or household member. You know that portion of the Bill?"

Brady: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "How does this mesh with Representative Collins' Bill about the second cousins?"

Brady: "This would be a third cousin issue, actually, Representative."

Lang: "It seems to me like you're poking fun on your own Bill,

Representative."

Brady: "No, I'm just merely trying to get in the spirit of

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 things, Representative."

Lang: "Well, let me ask you a question. You know one thing that's important in this chamber, and I think that we'll all admit to that, is that we be serious about our own legislation."

Brady: "I agree."

Lang: "And so I'm wondering if this does cover a second cousin."

Brady: "Actually, it does not define second cousin,

Representative."

Lang: "Would it,... You put your order in? The secretary's not taking the orders. We called. Representative, so it does, or it doesn't cover a second? What if the second cousin is the household member? It says it covers a household member."

Brady: "Well, actually, it does not cover specifically cousins or household... second cousins. But I believe that the court would issue the 72 hour of no contact order to the perpetrator involved."

Lang: "Representative, would you like to take this Bill out of the record and give us the appropriate family tree, so we can figure out what direction you want to take this with these family members?"

Brady: "No, I'd rather just work on this pizza issue."

Lang: "Well, oh, you see, again you're not taking your own Bill seriously, Representative. Do you just want to take it out of the record and amend this to Representative Collins' Bill in the Senate, because it deals with family members, apparently?"

Brady: "I don't believe so at this time, Representative.

However, I do certainly appreciate your strong suggestion of that."

Lang: "Well, you'll hear a lot of strong suggestions from me out

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

here, Representative, thank you."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brady to close."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleagues in the House. I present to you House Bill 3314 to help law enforcement officers to enter in no contact orders, so the officers on the street can have the same data that is presently there in the LEADS systems, for no contact orders. And I ask for your 'yes' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 173. Representative Brunsvold."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 173. A Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Back in 1994, then Senator Babe Woodyard, Mr. Black's Senator at that time, and I passed a Bill creating a conservation foundation. This foundation was set up to take private money, and that is an important point. This foundation takes private donations, individual and corporate donations, and uses those funds for DNR purposes. The people to the board are appointed by legislative Leaders and they work with the Department of Natural Resources on what projects to fund and not fund. Legal counsel in 1999 issued a legal opinion saying that the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

under the Procurement Code, the Public Investment Act, and also the Insurance Code and another... and in a situation where the Insurance Code would not have allowed them to take any money, unless they had more than \$2 million in the fund and had been in operation for 20 years. This Bill corrects that situation. It allows them to... exempts them from the foundation, from enabling... these funds are exempt from the Procurement Code, Investment Act and still allows the DNR to provide some assistance to the foundation and also allows them to take insurance annuities if they have... excuse me, they can't do that anymore, that was taken on the First Amendment, the Amendment that we added. And that is what the Bill does, adjusts the operations of the foundation so they can proceed investing these private funds in DNR projects. I would answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Biggins, are you ready for 509? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 509, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 509 provides that the Cook County Board of Review, who requested this legislation be drafted, is able to destroy or dispose of all complaints and records pertaining thereto, after a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

lapse of 5 years. Current law requires them to store these records for 10 years. The Members of the General Assembly may recall that 1995 we passed a measure that enabled the Cook County taxpayers to appeal their evaluations to the Property Tax Appeal Board. This has necessitated in the Board of Review, the newly created Board of Review, holding on and in having many more tax appeals at the state level and requiring them to hold on to these records for a longer period of time. This has impacted upon them, in the amount of space that they have, for tax appeal activity that creates a lot of paperwork, with lawyer briefs, with appraisals, with counter briefs, and counter appraisals. So this is an attempt, and a measure that will alleviate the pressure on them to store records in expensive space in the County of Cook, particularly the City of Chicago, where they currently store them, and still allow a reasonable period of time for access to records that were used to determine final evaluations. I'd be happy to answer any questions any Members may have."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 509, and on that question, Representative Howard is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Howard: "Yes, Representative, can you tell me why in this day and age we're still talking about paper, when we have technology that will make it possible to store records forever and ever?"

Biggins: "Yes, Representative, as someone who is as astute on the issue of technology, as you've Chaired that committee in the last Session, I understand the source of that question that you ask. Right now, the... until there is better

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

methods of storing and retaining all these records, the only method that the county currently has is the physical paper work load. So, maybe we can agree in the county of board of review, since they are forward thinking, I would guess they'll working on other methods of storage that are acceptable in a legal venue, as well as one of common sense."

Howard: "So, you know no efforts underway, thus far, to move into the third millennium?"

Biggins: "Not a, not... I don't know any for sure, but I'd be happy to go there with you, if we find a way that we can do this."

Howard: "I certainly hope that is the case, that at some point, all of our government agencies will understand how important it is to utilize the technology that's available to us. Thank you very much."

Biggins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman? Representative Hoffman, on 2218. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2218, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2218 has to do with the issue of the licensure of what are called contract carriers. Contract carriers, essentially, perform the function of when a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

rail... a person who works on a railroad, gets to the end the line and many times, they need a ride back to from whence they came. Sometimes the road is long and it's in the middle of the night and they get in vans and the crew together goes back to, from whence they came. contract carriers currently have no licensure procedure. What this simply does, is it's an initiative of United Transportation Union, as well as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. And what it does, is it allows for the licensure of contract carriers. It also insures that there are some reasonable inspections, with regard to the equipment and the vans that they are using. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. What we're talking about here is, I believe, reasonable provisions that are gonna make sure that people who work on our railroads are safe when they get brought back after making a run and are brought back to their home base. I ask for a favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Jay, I understand what we're trying to do and it... this is just a licensure, it doesn't like... for instance, everyone else that does any transporting of people, they keep log books so we know how many hours they've got and everything like that. Is there any rules or regulations being put in place like that?"

Hoffman: "This, what this would do, is it specifically with the issue of contract carriers, would limit the number of hours that they would be able to drive, would limit the number of days that they could do it in succession. Very similar to kind of, some of the provisions we have with CDL's, with

- 30th Legislative Day

 regard to truckers. You know, it's similar, but it's not quite as stringent as a CDL licensure, but it's something I believe makes sense."
- Bost: "Okay, thank you. Thank you and to the Bill. I think the Bill is a very good Bill. It's a safety Bill... It is a safety issue. This just puts some guidelines and controls that will help for the safe transportation of these employees."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Moore is recognized."
- Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."
- Moore: "I'm sorry, Representative, I was trying to look in the legislation. Could you clarify what a 'contract carrier' is defined as in the legislation, please?"
- Hoffman: "In the Bill, the... what it is, it's individuals who are contract out to carry as employers and in this particular instance, what we're talking about is individuals who are contracted out to... what'll happen is, like a railroad, okay? The railroad will hire a contract carrier, and that contract carrier, 'cause usually isn't a railroad employee, okay? So they will contract out. If it was... generally, if these were run by the railroads, there wouldn't be a problem. But they contract these out and they get these firms then, who have no standards, no licensure. Many times they'll drive hours on end and it's really an issue of safety, to not only the motoring public, but also the people who are forced to ride with these contract carriers."
- Moore: "This sounds like an excellent safety measure. Could you just clarify for me, would landscape contractors be

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

included in this Bill, if they are transporting people who are going to be servicing facilities?"

Hoffman: "No, they would not be included."

Moore: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Poe, we're going to read 267. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 267, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Poe."

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

House Bill 267 is a Bill that we passed out of here last
Session. This is the Teamsters' Alternative Formula Bill.

This is something that many of us has talked about this for
several years and this is a Bill that would take care of
those highway maintainers out on the highways. Their
chances of having a fatality are seven times greater than a
state policeman and we think it's time that those people
get the same pension benefits. So I'd like to ask for a
favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes'

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 583."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 583, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education scholarships. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Lang: Perhaps no issue has been on the minds of Illinois residents more often than how they're gonna to pay to send their kids to college. As I told you, when we started to debate this Bill a few weeks ago, as I have traveled the state, this is a question asked of me more often than any other, 'Representative Lang, what can we do to... in State of Illinois to help send our kids to college?' is a Bill that would go a long way toward helping middle class and other families in the State of Illinois pay for their childrens' college education. Ιt builds in it requires kids to get college accountability and scholarships for good grades. It says, if you're an Illinois resident and you want to go to college in the State of Illinois, at one of our public universities or community colleges, if you could get a B average and keep it, we will pay for your college education for you. very simple and straightforward Bill. To those that have been concerned about this Bill, I've spent a good deal of time with many of you and alleviated some of you concerns. Some of you have talked to me about the MAP Program. Well, the MAP Program, MAP Program has only been able to help 18% of the kids in Illinois that need it. There've been an additional 47 hundred students who received a one-time thousand dollar award from the MRS Program, which means that over 80% of our college students received neither a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

MAP grant nor an MRS award. There are 700 thousand Illinois kids that could be going to college in the State of Illinois, with a little help from the state. They need our help. There is no reason to believe, since we draft the budget, that helping this program will jeopardize any other program. And because of that, and because of the thousands of... or not thousands, hundreds of calls I've received in my office and many of you have as well, I would urge your strong support of this legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "The Calendar shows this Bill on the Order of Short Debate. And Representative Monique Davis is recognized."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Davis, M.: "Representative, if Senator Fitzgerald's daughter or son went to college in the State of Illinois, would they get a scholarship if they got all B's?"

Lang: "Representative, the answer is yes and I know the point of this. Some will say that, why should the very richest of the rich get this aid? And I think my answer to the question is as follows, the very richest of the rich comprise a very, very, very small minority of the people that live in Illinois. Many families in Illinois, certainly the families in my community, mostly comprise families where they can write the check for a college, but really can't afford to write the check for college. I can think to my parents, they sent me to college. They paid for it. I did some part-time jobs, but they managed to scrimp and save. My mother worked a second job, et cetera, et cetera and they sent me to college. Why should the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

quality of life of middle class and lower middle-class Illinoisans have to suffer, when we're in a position to help the kids all across Illinois? So, while yes, the very, very richest of the rich would get a college scholarship and maybe they don't need it. It's such a small tip of the iceberg that I think it has no impact."

Davis, M.: "Representative, what about the student, who not only goes to school but perhaps is a mother of two kids, who works and also attends school, and just can't get all B's? He or she might get mostly A's and B's, but they might have to accept a C or two, because they're life style is one of hard work. In other words, they don't come from Naperville, where all of the equipment in the school is absolutely perfect and all the resources are available. What about people who've had to pull themselves up from their bootstraps, when they really only even had one boot. They may not get all B's, Representative. Are you saying they cannot take advantage of your scholarship Bill?"

Lang: "Representative, there's a couple things to say about this. First, if you were to purpose a Bill to give all students who can get into our universities free tuition, I would vote for that Bill. But I think it's a budget buster, first. Second, I don't think it can pass, and third, I don't think it builds the accountability in we're But beyond that, the students that you say looking for. have to work, so they can go to school, if this Bill passes, they won't have to work to go to school. don't have to take those part-time jobs. They can study, get good grades, without going to work."

Davis, M.: "But they, but they would have to have all B's, is that correct?"

Lang: "They would have to have a B average."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Davis, M.: "And what about the student, Representative, who's never seen a microscope, who's never seen a pair of weights or scale in their school, because a school just never provided it for them? Which group of students do you think is more advantaged here? Do you think those who already have advantages would be more advantaged? Or do you think that student who's working really hard to catch up, keep up and be competitive...?"

Lang: "Representative..."

Davis, M.: "Would have the advantage?"

Lang: "Representative, if the Bill said that only B students can get into the University of Illinois, I would agree with you. We're talking here about students that have already been accepted into the university. These are students, who are bright students, C and D students don't get accepted into the University of Illinois."

Davis, M.: "We're not talking about C and D students, We're talking about students who, Representative Lang. perhaps, didn't have the advantaged background that all of your all B students might have had. We're talking about students who may be working students. They may attending a streetcar college, where you go to school, you get mostly A's and B's, but you just got to take home a C every now and then and be glad you passed the course. You were up late studying. You were taking care of your And I just don't think you intend to be that children. kind of person who would risk, risk taking money from the needs group. So far, in the State of Illinois, we provide dollars in scholarship on an at-needs basis, is that correct Representative?"

Lang: "Representative, I think Illinois has some of the need...

the best need-based scholarship programs in the country and

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

I don't have any intention of jeopardizing those. Your comments indicate that you think the state budget is prepared in a vacuum. We pass the state budget. If this Bill were to pass, you and I would join together to make sure that need-based scholarship programs are not affected."

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 52,

 I'm joined by seven people on my side on the aisle to

 request this Bill be taken off Short Debate."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Bill is now on the Order of Standard Debate.

 We've had one speak in favor of the Sponsor and one against. Representative Davis. Would you like to speak, Representative Black?"
- Black: "Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker. If I can find my notes."
- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, pardon me. Representative Davis.

 Okay, why don't we let Representative Davis finish her remarks. Her time had expired."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you very much. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I know that this Legislator has the best intentions in the world. His intentions are that extremely bright students or hardworking students who get all B's will be given scholarships from the State of Illinois. But the effect of this Bill is placed under the heading of high stakes testing to move certain people out of the university system, totally. We believe that our system of giving scholarships and grants to students who are at need is certainly meeting the needs of the State of Illinois. There are all kinds of grants out there. We have... there are hundreds of grants and scholarships given to people who are A and B students today. This is a Bill that will

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

change the tenor and who is in the colleges in the State of Illinois. It's really under some of our new President's initiative and it's to reward those who already have. know his intentions are noble, but this Bill risks the money that now goes to students who need scholarships. you look on the Internet, you see all kind of foundations and corporations, even the Sara Lee Corporation, who gives scholarships for a year or more to students who are A or B students and we cannot risk those dollars, currently going to students at need, to provide all-free dollars to people who are people who are very wealthy, people who have not asked for scholarship dollars and people who are doing very well in seeing that their children get a four-year college education. I'm surprised, I'm really surprised that this legislation did not, in any way, make room for a student who was working and who eventually got a C, and would be totally denied the benefit of this scholarship. And I really urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, now Representative Black. You've taken the Bill off Short Debate. Would you wish to speak?"

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "In favor or opposition?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Please proceed."

Black: "And would request a verification on this, should it get the requisite number of votes to pass."

Speaker Hannig: "And you'll be granted one, Representative."

Black: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I think Representative Monique Davis has probably summed up
all of my concerns on this Bill and I think, has done so
more eloquently than I could ever hope to do. On it's

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

face, this is not an easy Bill to oppose. But if you look the Monetary Award Program that we fund to the tune of about \$350 million a year in the State of Illinois, and if you'll look at out very spotty history of how we have funded various other financial aid programs, for example, the Veterans Tuition Waiver. For many years in this state we only appropriated enough money to send 30 or 35% of what that waiver cost to our colleges and community colleges and universities. Our Merit Scholarship Program, there were years when we didn't fund any of it. All they got was a letter congratulating them on being a superior student and that they were eligible for a financial award, a financial aid award, if the General Assembly would fund it, and many years we didn't do so. If you'll look at some of the notes on this Bill, the financial aid professionals have indicated to us that the beneficiaries of this Bill, very good intentioned and a very good Bill by an outstanding Sponsor, but they tell us that the beneficiaries will primarily be from families who make \$75 thousand a year or They point out that this is modeled after the Georgia HOPE Scholarship. Keep in mind that Georgia finances their scholarship program, that's almost identical to this, exclusively from the lottery, 100% of that scholarship program is funded by the Georgia State Lottery. The inherit weakness of this program is there is no funding Illinois is the second-highest ranked state in the nation on offering need- and merit- based college financial aid. Something else that happened to Georgia after this Bill, after this Bill passed in Georgia. And for those of you who have taught, stop and think about this for a second. Georgia suddenly saw a huge inflation in grades after the HOPE Scholarship was created. Teachers were

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

under some pressure to bump grades up, so that their students could qualify for the scholarship. Now you could, you could balance this out if you had a need-based provision in this as well as the academic provision. But doesn't, it doesn't have that in there. This legislation, and make no mistake about it, tuition is a big part of the college cost, but all of you who have been on a college campus know, there are meals that you have to eat out. There are entertainment things that you want to take advantage of. You have to have some pocket money, and many people don't have that luxury. So you take a part-time job so that you can go to the pizza parlor, you can go to football game, you can go to the Superbowl party. part-time job, and keep in mind, while you're in college and the course load is much more difficult then many of us found it to be when we were in high school. If you're required to take a part-time job to meet living expenses, housing costs, and your average falls below a B, you lose the very scholarship that helped you get into that college in the first place. And you have nothing to fall back on. You've not filed a family financial statement. You're not currently receiving the Monetary Award Program. the fact that you may have to go to work to help you meet college expenses may cause you to lose the very scholarship that got you in the door in the first place. Again, I echo Representative Davis' remarks. This Bill, on it's face, is a difficult Bill to oppose. Ιf it could blend some need-based criteria as well as the merit-based criteria, we might then, have the best of both worlds. But the bottom line, and I know Representative Lang is absolutely serious about his attempt in this Bill. But a funding source is of primary importance. Do you take money away from the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Monetary Award Program, which is need-based to put into the merit-based program? Do you take money away from the Veterans Tuition Wavier Program and put it into this of program? None of those, none those would satisfactory to anybody on this floor. So, it is with the... it is simply with a deep sense of regret that after having looked at this in comparison with all the other need-based programs that Illinois offers, almost \$430 million worth of college financial aid will be offered through the Illinois Student Assistance Commission in this fiscal year, as Representative Davis said. We do a pretty good job and we try to balance it out on need as well as merit. This does not reflect that difference and it..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, did you wish to bring your remarks to a close?"

Black: "Yes, I'll just summarize by saying, it's because of the inability to distinguish between need and merit, that I reluctantly will vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. Not to belabor this, because many of us did speak on it when we had floor debate before, but I just like, would like to echo what Representative Black and other speakers have made. And remind people that the model for this in Georgia, was trying to, the HOPE Scholarship, was trying to solve a very different problem. We are not Georgia. We have an outstanding needs-based scholarship program, the MAP grant, which we need to protect and I just... I think with all due respect we do have a merit-based scholarship that we just put more money into and I would urge you not to support this Bill, with all due respect to the Sponsor."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, now we've had three that have spoken in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

opposition, one that has spoken in favor. Does anyone else rise in support? Representative Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In full respect for my colleagues, that are opposed to this legislation, I have discussed this Bill with Representative Lang and talked to kids in my district. And pure and simple it just... it doesn't say it's antineeds based, it says that if you go to college, if you work hard and you get grades that are 3.0 or above, you have a shot at a scholarship. You don't have to get a second job and a third job. You don't have to send all your time working outside of you're there for. You know, in education we want the best and the brightest, but sometimes the best and the brightest have to drop out simply because they have to have extra jobs that make them spend their time, that they could spend studying, if they had an incentive. Who's says to say in those other states that those grades didn't go up because the incentive was there for them to study? This Bill does not penalize people with need, it gives them the same opportunity to get the grades as anyone else. So, in speaking with my colleagues, I rise in support of this legislation and any legislation that simply says to kids, go to school, work hard and you'll be rewarded. you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, now we've had... we have room for one more to speak in support. Does anyone else wish to rise in support? Representative Collins and Miller, you have your lights on. Do you wish to speak in favor of this Bill?

Okay. Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis, M.: "My name was mentioned in debate twice and I just merely wanted to say that there's nothing in the Bill that

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

requires these students to remain in Illinois and provide Illinois any service, whatsoever, once they have received these scholarships. And that's another valid point. We do have a teacher's incentive scholarship, but that teacher is required to teach in the state for five years, or each year that he or she received this scholarship from the state. But this Bill is merely, I would say, a give away. We urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think no Bill that I've worked on in the time here in 13 years has given me more phone calls to my office. I've had at least 200 phone calls to my office from some of your constituents on this matter. Not a single call was in opposition to the Bill. And for those of you that say, well of course, everybody wants money, I've had many calls against the President's \$1.6 trillion tax cut. But all of my calls are for this Bill. Let me also say that for all the discussion about needs-based scholarships and I'm the first one to want to make sure we don't lose those, over 80% of our college students in the State of Illinois get no aid, This is a Bill for the families of Illinois. whatsoever. Don't let you're families down. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes' and 36 voting 'no'. Representative Black has made a request for a verification. Do you persist Representative Black?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, that would simply waste the chamber's time.

I withdraw the request."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman withdrawed his request. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bassi, are you ready on 3574? Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3574, a Bill for an Act concerning carnival and amusement rides. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I bring before the House, House Bill 3574 which makes three modifications to the Carnival and Amusement Rides Safety Act. The first change is to the definition of 'amusement ride' to exclude water slides and other water amusement devices. The second one requires the payment of permit and inspection fees at the time of application for a permit to operate is filed. The third change, empowers the Department to issue a stop operations order, when an owner or operator is operating a carnival ride or attraction for public use, without it's first being inspected by the Department and/or without the requisite insurance coverage required. This is the Governor's Bill and is an initiative from the Illinois Department of Labor and actually stems from a incident in my district in which a three-year-old child died as a result of injuries sustained at a go-cart track, because the track was not in compliance with the changes that we are proposing. I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being... Okay,

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- Black: "Representative, if you take water slides out of the inspected devices, and those can be very dangerous if they're not maintained properly, is there someone else doing the inspection for water slides and that's why Labor wants to take it out of its jurisdiction?"
- Bassi: "Yes, as a matter of fact, the Illinois Department of

 Public Health regulates most of the water slides, they

 would now be regulating all of them."
- Black: "Okay, that's all I want to know. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Delgado, we're gonna call House Bill 1985. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1985, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Delgado.

 Representative May, for what reason do you rise?

 Representative May, are you seeking recognition?"
- May: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. At your convenience, I just wish to be recorded as 'yes' on Bill #583."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will record your intentions. And now Representative Delgado."
- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1985 will do the following: it allows direct Medicaid reimbursement, to licensed clinical physiologists, licensed clinical social workers, and licensed professional counselors. Basically, what this Bill will do, will lift

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the restriction on direct reimbursement of licensed clinical physiologists and other licensed professional counselors in the Illinois Public Aid Code, which right now is resulting in the impediment on these practitioners' ability to practice as independent professionals. I'll be open for any questions at this point."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Winters, are you ready on 3113? Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education student assistance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3113 creates a scholarship to be awarded to any college-bound high school student who has taken the Prairie State Achievement Exam and has received an excellent in all five academic areas. This will be the first year that the Prairie State Achievement Exam will be given. Rather than a possibility of grade inflation, which was one of the flaws of Representative Lang's Bill, this one will be strictly on the examination that is done by the state. It is a small incentive of \$500, a one-time grant. The estimated fiscal impact, the maximum, will be \$7 million, probably a more realistic number'd be in the 2 or \$3 million range. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

And on that question, Representative Hoffman is recognized.

Do you rise as a opponent or proponent, Representative?

Representative Hoffman, do you speak in favor or in opposition?"

Hoffman: "Well, we just have some questions to make that determination."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, please proceed."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Representative, I guess what I... what our concern would be, what the cost would be and if this will affect any other current loan or grant scholarship programs?"

Winters: "As I mentioned, the potential fiscal impact from ISAC is that there were 7 thousand students who scored at top 5% of the state on the ACT test. That was for the merit-based scholarship that we already have. They made the estimate that probably the same number of students would academically achieve the five different areas. actually think it will be fewer students than get the merit-based scholarship. It's a parallel, but what we're looking at instead of the ACT, we want to make sure that the high school seniors that are taking the Prairie States exam, which starts this spring, will actually take that exam seriously. There's been some concern that, in fact, they may blow it off, we don't care, let's see if we can harm our high school and our teachers by failing in specific areas. We want to put the incentives into the law, so that they realize that this, this exam actually does have some good incentives."

Hoffman: "The Prairie State Achievement Award Scholarship program, now that's, that's the one where they're taking

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the ACT at the same time?"

- Winters: "No, the ACT is a separate... that's a nationally norm-based. The Prairie States Achievement exam is the one, that we have developed in the Legislature that will test the different academic areas of the state done by the State Board of Education. This spring will be their first time that it's rolled out statewide."
- Hoffman: "And it was my understanding, though at some point, we were talking about if you were to take this test, at the same time you'd be taking the ACT. Now, are you familiar with that concept?"
- Winters: "Well, I'm presupposing, I guess, that the ACT, I believe, is normally given after school hours, either on a Saturday or after school. The Prairie State exam would be given during the academic day. Now, it would be possible for some students to receive the merit-based from the ACT, being in the top 5% of the ACT exam or the SAT and this one, also. But they're taking two separate tests, tests somewhat different areas. They could double up, but many students in fact, might excel in the ACT and not do necessarily very well in the social sciences, for instance, where they might score extremely well in the math and engineering portions of the ACT. They might qualify for one and might not for the other. We won't know until we've actually had some test data back from the State Board."
- Hoffman: "Well, I guess the only concern... I don't quarrel with the concept of insuring that the best and the brightest have academic assistance. However, I think the debate on the previously Bill is applicable to this, also. Because, this is not a need-based scholarship at all. It's, it's so... If Representative Lang's Bill becomes law, not only would they get tuition free, which I support, if... cause

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

they most likely, if you're in a... if you do well on this test, you're gonna have a B or greater average. And so they'll get their free tuition plus they'll get a \$500 grant and I guess the concerns of many are at what point do we take away the need-based programs and totally focus on only the high-end achievers?"

Winters: "Well, that's the point where I think that this Bill is probably targeted a little bit more correctly. Because, one, the fiscal impact is much less. We're talking in the range of 5 to 7 million maximum versus the previous Bill, which is in the 2 to \$3 hundred million range. We can afford this one, I question that we can the previous. other thing that we're doing with this, is we're not leaving it up to the purview of the high schools teachers. In other words, if they have a favorite student that they want a help out with an A average, so that they qualify, that's within their power, and we then see parents and students begging for that last grade, so that they can qualify for the B average. This one is more of a test that will tell very objectively whether or not you're doing an academically superior job, and reinforcing the importance of that Prairie State Achievement examination."

Hoffman: "If I might, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Hoffman: "I would just like to point out to individuals on this side of the aisle, if you believe that the last Bill... or had concerns about the last Bill taking away need-based money for people who are in need of college scholarships, this probably raises the same concern. I don't quarrel with what the Representative's intent is. I don't quarrel with fact that maybe it would give scholarships to high achievers. As a matter of fact, I personally voted for the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

last Bill. But what we're doing here is, once again, we'd be taking (sic-giving) \$500 to people who, academically probably, are going to get a scholarship anyway, in some shape or form. I think that we should be very careful and watch..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, would you like to conclude your remarks? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Just finally for the people on this side of the aisle, who are concerned about the last Bill, I think this would raise the same concerns. And I'm not sure that it would actually provide a benefit, financially, to the people who really, really need it, need it in this state in order to attend post-secondary education."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. Again, with all due respect to the Sponsor, I do think that we need to be concerned about spinning off new programs when we have very fine merit-based scholarships that exist right now in the state budget. And also, again, a needs-based scholarship that is critically important to provide access for minority students, as well as any low-income students in the state. So, again, with all due respect, I would urge you not to support this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Davis, M.: "Representative Winters, where are you?"

Winters: "Right here, behind you."

Davis, M.: "Oh, hi there. In giving this scholarship is there anything that would require the student to remain in Illinois for any particular period of time and be a contributor, either work wise, or tax wise?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Winters: "They certainly have to stay here during their college career when they're using the money. But, just like almost any other scholarship that we have, other than medical school, those are the only ones that I'm aware of that require a post-graduation tenure in the State of Illinois."

Davis, M.: "Is there a budget appropriation at this point for this Bill?"

Winters: "There is not."

Davis, M.: "Well, Representative, where will the money come from?"

Winters: "Obviously, from the growth of the economy as we're seeing such a strong economy. That's up for negotiation.

We hope to pass it out for continued discussion. It is not in this year's budget. But we think if we put the enabling legislation in place, then we fund it next year."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "First, I'd like to commend the former Sponsor of that legislation, offering scholarships to students who get B's. And I commend the current Sponsor who wants to offer scholarships of \$5 hundred to students who get a particular grade on a test. Now, we know on the surface, this sounds very good and very noble, and we all want our students to do exceedingly well, and to get all A's and all B's. Unfortunately, that does not happen for many of us. There are many contributing members of society in the State of Illinois who graduated without getting all A's or B's, or passing any of these high stakes tests. One of the objectives of the high stakes test is to decide that only a certain group, at one point, will be educated. That kid, perhaps, who lives on a farm, who went to almost a little one-room schoolhouse and didn't have all of the same

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

opportunities as some of our suburban, urban education centers will not hardly get all A's or B's on a test, and will not be the top scorers in that body, which will eliminate him from the possibility of getting this I agree with those who say let's do what we scholarship. can to even the playing field and to give equal educational opportunity to all. Let's not further the divide by rewarding those who have already been rewarded, by saying, we know you had every advantage, we know you went to the top schools, we know you don't have to work to go to school, you can just study, and here again, you are going to be rewarded. Ι know your intent is Representative, but it does not help the State of Illinois when we push out those students whose advantages have not been equal, when we push out the student who has had no microscope in his school, when we push out the student who has not had an opportunity to use weights and balances in class, but to give another advantage to students who have it all. We'd love to do that. I don't think we should provide that in the State of Illinois' legislation. are a number of private scholarships available, four-year scholarships, thousands of dollar scholarships, to any student who gets A's or B's. And I can name some for you. I can name a number of them for you. But the majority of our students in the State of Illinois come from backgrounds that are not necessarily advantaged. Can they get B's? Of course, they can. Do they get B's? Yes, but all B's? No, they just can't do that, because their background did not lead them to that advantage. Plus, Representatives, do teachers subjectively grade at the same level? Is a B at the University of Illinois the same as a B in Kennedy King College? You know, how do you justify the subjectivity of

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the grades? I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had three speak in opposition. And under the rules that provide that there could be two additional, to speak in favor. Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the last speaker kind of got off on a little different tangent and some of her remarks I certainly understand and agree with, but this is not... this doesn't have anything to do with grades. At this point, if you study hard and get good grades, yes, you're going to do a better job, but this rewards achievement on a Prairie State Achievement Award, which is brand new. You have to do it in all five academic And if you do that, you're going to get a \$5 hundred reward. Well, number one, the cost of this is not going to be that expensive. But what a great incentive for kids in high school that want to go to college to get just a little bit of help. Doesn't make any difference whether they're from the elite and the rich, or from someone working on a farm. And by the way, I don't know of too many one-room schoolhouses left in Illinois. I think those are pretty well eliminated. We have some small schools, small classes, and sometimes they get more help, but this rewards their efforts on a new achievement test that we are trying somehow, someway, to give incentive to kids to take it seriously. I can't think of anything that would make them more serious about their attempt to do well on an exam than to say, if you do well, we're going to reward you with a little bit of help as you continue with your education career. It's a good Bill. It won't be as expensive as the last Bill. In fact, it won't be real expensive at all. But, it certainly does add some incentive to a problem that the State Board of Education has right now. How are we

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

going to get the kids to take this test seriously? I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters to close."

- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is a very inexpensive, but I think very critical statement to make to the students of our high schools that they take the Prairie State Achievement examination very seriously. It is a token monetary award. I've got two kids in college, and I know that \$5 hundred is not going to pay their tuition for one semester. It won't even pay for their books for one semester, but it will make a gesture that we are trying to make the Prairie State Achievement examination a critical test for them, to take it seriously, and I urge the adoption of this Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers, for what reason do you arise?"
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like for the record to reflect, that had I been at my desk, I would have voted 'no' on Representative Lang's Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will reflect your intentions,

 Representative. And Representative Winkel, for what reason

 do you rise?"
- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome the 98 students from the Urbana Adult Education here today.

 They're up in the gallery."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. And now, Representative

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Fowler. Representative Fowler, we're going to call House Bill 3055. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3055, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fowler."

Fowler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3055 is a Bill that, unfortunately, was brought about by a tragic occurrence down in my district. It resulted in the death of an eight-year-old child. Simply, what this Bill does, it directs that once DCFS has received a report of alleged abuse of a student, that they conduct an investigation into this and that within 10 days of the completion of a report, that they submit a copy of that back to the school where that student attends. It also requires that that become a part of that student's record, and stays with him wherever he goes. In this particular case, the young boy was a student at a neighboring school in a nearby county. There had been reports of abuse toward him there, that was not included in his school record. Consequently, when he went to another county, just probably 10 or 12 miles away, was while in attendance there, that he became a victim of abuse. He ended up murdered, and the body was stuffed in a suitcase, where it was discovered later. There's no known opposition to this Bill. DCFS is onboard with it. And I would be prepared to answer any questions that you might have."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Yeah. Representative, I... excuse me. I think your Bill

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

is a good one. Let me try and make sure I understand some of the things that happen if the Bill becomes law. The school gets a record of the investigation. Now, what does the school do with that? Can it be shared with staff, or is it under lock and key in the student's transcript and records?"

Fowler: "It goes into the student's transcript record,

Representative."

Black: "So, if I understand it, the purpose is then, if the child is taken out of that school by the parents, assuming that the parents are able to retain care and custody of the child after abuse, if so they move to another town, the records then go with the student. The new school that that student enrolls in... is the purpose to alert them to the fact that there may be an abusive relationship, and that they should monitor the child more closely?"

Fowler: "Absolutely. In this case, Representative Black, the child was enrolled at school A, which was only about 12 miles from school B. When he went from A to B, the officials at school B was not aware of the former abuse, and there was no red flags. Well now, under this proposal, they would have a copy of that record and it would alert them."

Black: "Okay. In any of the testimony... Excuse me. In any of the testimony on the Bill, did the agency bring up any of the privacy factors that are so often quoted, as to why these reports generally are not made available to the... even the mandated reporter? Are there any concerns about a violation of a... a potential violation of the right of privacy in your Bill? I don't think so. I'm asking if anybody contacted you on behalf of the agency, or a state's attorney, that indicated they might have some concerns,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

that this information could be misused?"

Fowler: "No. As I've stated, DCFS is in agreement with this Bill. One of their concerns was that if in the course of an investigation something of a confidential nature that was moot to that, such as, possibly, one of the parents had a terminal disease or something, that that would not be made part of the report."

Black: "Okay. All right. Representative, I congratulate you. I think this Bill makes eminent good sense. I'm a little bit jealous. I've had the same kinds of problems, I should have done what you have done and Sponsor legislation. There's nothing that makes a mandated reporter cynical, than to do what we mandate them to do, and then they never find out whether the investigation completed, whether or not anything's been done. And when they call, they're often told, we can't share that with So, they spend the rest of the school year wondering if, in fact, the child is being watched over, hopefully, will be safe. I think your Bill goes a long way toward showing school personnel who are mandated reporters that, in fact, the agency will investigate, investigate, and that they will be able to make certain then, that the child is receiving some kind of oversight protection and care. I think it's a great Bill. I congratulate you."

Fowler: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jerry Mitchell. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he will."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, I echo my colleague's comments.

I, certainly, am supportive of your Bill. However, I do

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 have one question. When the reporting is done back to the

school, whose office will that be reported to?"

- Fowler: "The records custodian, Representative, of that facility."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. In most school districts you'll have the school superintendent's office, and there'll be records stored there. You'll also have the principal's office of a particular school, sometimes you'll have a counselor. And some of our elementary schools even have counselors, now. Which of those folks will get this report?"
- Fowler: "Okay. Whoever is a... designated as the records custodian."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. So, it's going to be a designated person, not one that just simply goes... You know, sometimes I have concerns with the protection of the family. Sometimes unfounded reports reflect badly sometimes as well. And I would hate for some of these reports to become conversation in the teachers' lounge, for instance. Ya know, I know that we'll have a lot of individual be concerned with that. However, that does not weigh anywhere close to the other side, how important it is to make sure that child care providers understand that their reports and reports of others are followed up and are reported on. And I think that's very, very important, especially for our elementary-aged children. And I, certainly, commend you for your Bill. Thank you."

Fowler: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

question, there are 111 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority,
is hereby declared passed. Representative Johnson, we're
going to read House Bill 390. Mr. Clerk. Excuse me.

Representative Myers. For what reason do you rise?"

Myers: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."

Myers: "I would like to call the Body's attention to the back of the chamber. We have 15 students and 2 faculty members. The students are enrolled at Western Illinois University in the Centennial Honors College Program. And they are involved in a course called, Inside State Government. They have been in Springfield today and listened to a number of speakers, including your own, Mr. Tim Mapes, and Representative Ryder, from this Body. And I would like to have the Body help me welcome the 15 students from Western Illinois University here today."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 390."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 390, a Bill for an Act concerning forest preserve districts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 390 is a DuPage County initiative, as it relates to construction of new highways that, potentially, would have the impact of bisecting forest preserve properties. What House Bill 390 does is, basically, it states that if a absolutely new roadway is planned, and if it is planned to bisect a forest preserve, an existing forest preserve, that it would require, first of all, a public referendum approving the construction of such new highway. Further, it would provide that additions or widening to existing

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

roadways that bisect or that go through forest preserve districts would, in fact, require a super majority of the board of commissioners in order to move ahead with that type of widening. This Bill applies only to DuPage County. It has the unanimous consent of the DuPage County Board of Forest Preserve Commissioners. And, as far as I know, there is no opposition."

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

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Yeah. Would this apply to all of DuPage County, or throughout the state?"

Johnson: "Just DuPage County."

Hartke: "What kind of..."

Johnson: "Counties in excess of 750 thousand."

Hartke: "What kind of a problem are you trying to solve?"

Johnson: "Well. You know... As you know, DuPage County is becoming more and more congested, as time goes by. We now have, I think, close to a million people there. And there has been pressure in the past to try to put new roadways through existing forest preserves, and this is to clear this up once and for all. We pass... In DuPage County, to our credit, I think, we have passed a number of very expensive bond issues, people supporting open space. And basically, what it says here is, that 'you know, where we have committed this to permanent open space, you know, if you're going to turn around and then construct a highway through that open space and disrupt it, at least go back to the people who paid for it and request that."

Hartke: "So, this will require a referendum?"

Johnson: "Yes, new construction of a highway."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Hartke: "What about widening and resurfacing and..."

Johnson: "No, that would require a super majority of the board of forest preserve commissioners."

Hartke: "So, just a two-thirds vote of the commissioners...,"

Johnson: "That's right. That's right."

Hartke: "...could vote for improvements, but for a new road..."

Johnson: "That's right. This would not affect easements, and widening, and those sorts of things, where you have the super majority of the board of commissioners approving that."

Hartke: "Does this add the provision about selling or leasing land for..."

Johnson: "No."

Hartke: "That's current law?"

Johnson: "Right."

Hartke: "Okay. I have no further questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, one point for clarification, following up on Representative Hartke's discussion. At some point, I think, in the original Bill, downstate forest preserve districts or conservation districts, had some concerns that it might impact them. It's my understanding that your Amendment..."

Johnson: "The Amendment simply makes this..."

Black: "...clarifies and makes this applicable to the DuPage..."

Johnson: "That's correct."

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

Johnson: "That's correct."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 795, for Representative Scott?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 795, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scott."

Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 795 is a Bill that has passed out of this chamber on, I believe, three occasions before. What it would do would be to lower the compulsory school from seven to six. The reasoning... Actually, this came from an elementary school teacher in Rockford, years ago, brought to my attention that she had several students who were getting to her in first grade that were already substantially behind in terms of the reading and other skills that they needed to be successful in school. And what it did was, it ended up not only being bad for the rest of the classroom, but it was also terribly bad for those individual students. We're spending a lot of money and a lot of time now, on things like early childhood education, on things like Headstart. And it doesn't really make a lot of sense for us to then say, now you've reached the age of five, we'll see you in a couple of years, you know, take some time off. Because from everything that we read, we know that this is an issue where if you let some of these skills deteriorate or you don't continue to improve on them all the time, that you'll end up losing them. And so, I really think, with everything else that

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

we're doing in the way of early childhood education, it makes sense to lower the age back to six where it used to be. This is something, where I'm not sure there... I've never been contacted, by anybody in terms of opposition from any organized group to this particular Bill. And it passed out of committee on a vote of 12 to 2. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill's on the Order of Standard Debate.

Representative Black is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, certainly don't quarrel with the intent of your Bill, but I've noticed a trend, lately, downstate schools, declining enrollment in the grades. But suddenly, we are seeing an influx of children into kindergarten and the primary... the elementary grades. Now, if this Bill becomes law, will we... Do we have any plans to give districts additional money? Because the one thing that would be devastating to a youngster is to be put into a class with 38 kids and one teacher. And I know my home district had to split a first grade last year, and luckily, they were able to hire a teacher and do that. But, I mean, that's the only fear that I have. What happens if you get a large influx into your district or The school district didn't anticipate that. They didn't hire enough teachers, and all of a sudden, you have a primary classroom full of 38, 40 kids. I mean, that would be... I'd almost rather they stay home and watch Sesame Street than be thrown into that thing."

Scott: "That's a good question, Representative Black. There's a couple of answers to that. First of all, under the school

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

aid formula, if there are more children in the classroom, then the districts will get more state aid, as a result of that. The other part of it though is, we're talking about children who could go, but don't right now. And so, the numbers aren't as large as we might think. And in talking to the school districts where I represent one school district, it's a very large one, but I talked to some other superintendents around the area. They don't expect the kind of numbers that would totally disrupt the teacher/student ratios that are there. I think we're talking about, maybe, 10% of the children who could go now, but aren't going right now."

Black: "All right. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Just... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he will."

Hartke: "One quick question, Representative Scott. Would this require... Is kindergarten considered school?"

Scott: "Yes, it is."

Hartke: "Okay, that answered my question."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative John Turner."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he will."

Turner, J.: "Representative, does this affect home schoolers?"

Scott: "Hang on just a second, Representative Turner. I've got a memorandum here, from the Illinois State Board of Education on that very question, Representative Turner. It says that, the Compulsory Attendance Law provides an exception for any child attending a private or parochial school, where they're taught in the... the branches of education taught to children of corresponding age and grade in the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

public school. The Illinois Supreme Court has held, in the case that the term 'private school', in this context, would include home schooling. So, under that definition, they would be excluded from the compulsory school laws. So, in answer to your question, no."

Turner, J.: "If a... Thank you, Representative. If a six-year-old, if your Bill becomes law, does not attend school, is the six-year-old then truant?"

Scott: "Sure, just the same way it could be otherwise. Yes."

Turner, J.: "Yeah. And then..."

Scott: "Just the same way a seven-year-old could be, now."

Turner, J.: "What happens for a small child like that when they're found to be truant?"

Scott: "Well, under the truancy laws that we have right now, which as an aside, probably aren't as effective as they ought to be in terms of bringing children in. What we end up having is a situation where the district would end up having to go to the state's attorney to end up bringing a chronically-truant child into the court system to get a ruling on that. It's probably not the best system when...

Maybe we ought to work on changing that, but the short answer to your question is yes, they could be a truant."

Turner, J.: "You know, Representative, I like your style where you give me the explanation, the long answer, and then you shorten it up to make it simple for me, and just real concise one-word answer at the end of every explanation. I commend you for that. My analysis indicates that there are two known opponents, the Illinois School Management Alliance, and Concerned Christian Americans. Do you know what the nature of their opposition is?"

Scott: "There were no opponents who registered in committee. And the School Management Alliances fairly surprise to me...

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

every other school organization..., because the other proponents, for example: the State Board, IEA, IFT, LUDA, and SCOPE, so it would seem strange that the School Management Alliance would be an opponent. They neither slipped it nor testified in committee, and haven't opposed this. As I said, this is something that's been in front of us, I think, three occasions before, at least, twice, and had never registered in opposition to it then, so I'm not sure about that. And our analysis doesn't have that, so."

Turner, J.: "Okay, but you can say then when you took the Bill through the committee process that there was no opposition slip, nor was there any testimony?"

Scott: "Nobody... Correct."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In support of this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is research which indicates the attendance of a child in kindergarten and first, second grade, is detrimental to the point where you can predict class rank. The way a child starts out is the way a child is going to perceive the importance of education. going to get a fast start, or they are going to get falling I have taken truant children and parents into behind. court for kindergarten, and first, and second grade, and what happens is these people will get into court and they say, we're removing our children from this school. We're removing them from the system. And there's nothing this state can do if the child is under seven years old. Bill will take it down one year. It's critical for us to get the consistency of early attendance. This is something that is needed in our schools. And I strongly urge you to support this Bill."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a tendency, to as much as Bost: I respect him, the former speaker, disagree on this issue. The Sponsor of the Bill, I know he has good intentions. But once again, we've come up and we've decided that we, as government, are going to know our children better than the parents themselves. It might be that a parent might realize that the maturity level of this child is not to the point they want to put them in school, yet. It might be, and this does occur. It happened whenever I was going to school. There were a few students that were a little bit older, whenever I went into kindergarten. It was because their parents decided, that maybe they're not ready, socially, to handle the environment that comes along with being in school. Give us another year, and let us to have the opportunity to raise our own child and make those decisions on our own. But no, we're going to roll back. We're going to roll back one more year, so that now the schools can come in and raise those children a little faster. Give the responsibility to the parents. Leave it the parents. Folks, we do have, though there are those bad parents out there, and we have DCFS to deal with that. automatically assume, from this chamber, that we are so much better, and we understand so much more about the raising of each individual child. I challenge you to take a moment and think about the fact, about your own children. Who knew your children better at five and six years old, than you? Not the government. But now, we're saying that the government... we're going to give the government the power to go ahead and come in and demand that we're going to roll back one more year. And now, at six years old, you no longer have control, we do. And if you don't do that,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

we're going to send the truancy patrol out, and we're going to come in, and we're going to drag your child into school, and you're going to look like a terrible parent, because you made a decision, based on your child's personality. Ladies and Gentlemen, think about this very closely. This may fly out of here, but there's some real problems when we're saying government is better at raising our children than we are. We aren't talking about those that we deal with DCFS. We're talking about parents, like you and I. Think about this vote. I'm going to vote 'no'. And I'll recommend everyone else vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, to the comments of the previous speaker. I don't think that anybody here, at least I'm not saying that government is better at raising our children. And I don't think this Bill has anything to do with saying that government is better at raising our children. All this Bill is saying is, that government is better at teaching our children. And that study after study shows that the earlier we get children into early education, the better their lives are, the more they learn, and the more productive they become. So, to even categorize this as in to interfere with the parent/child way trying relationship is wrong. This is just to insure that children get the kind of early intervention, and early childhood development that they need. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scott to close."

Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank the folks that have spoke in favor of the Bill. And I also want to talk just very briefly about something that was said in opposition to it. We're not saying at all that the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

government's better at raising people's children. That's certainly not the intent of this at all. But what we're saying is in... with what Representative Hoffman said, that we've got all of this body of information that says, that children... what children learn at the earliest age is the absolute most important thing... the most indicator of how they're going to do academically later on. Now, I agree with you. I know, Representative, that there are people who emotionally aren't ready to handle school, and that could happen at age 6, that could happen at age 12. But there are alternatives for parents who feel that And the parents who are very involved with their children are taking steps that way. They can school them at home if they want to, before the child is emotionally ready to do that. I've known of cases where people have taken children who have been to school, out, after they've been there for a few grades, let them get their confidence back up, and then put them back in. There's nothing in this Bill that would prohibit that from happening. And in answer to the home school question, they're not only exempt from this, but most of the home school parents that I know are starting much earlier than age six even, certainly than age seven, to try to work with and school their children. This isn't aimed at them in any way. This isn't aimed... in fact, it doesn't even apply to them under that memo that we've got there. So, we're not talking at all about trying to make government raise children, more. talking about is trying to take those children, and often, and in talking... in fact, I just had a teacher come up to me the other day, a different teacher than the one who brought this to my attention first, who said, you know, it's really a crime, that in this state children don't have

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

to go to school until age seven. Because, it's not the parents who are very, very attentive and very good to their children and realize there's an emotional need to keep that child out. The parents who are keeping their children out, in many cases, are the ones who don't care and the parents who aren't actively involved in their children's education. And those are the children that the grade schools are seeing coming in at age seven with less than kindergarten skills, and are now of an age where the rest of their peers are in first grade. They're already a year behind. may be as much as two years behind, already. That's what we're trying to aim at with this particular Bill. why the educational associations are supportive of this, because they see this as a way to try to help bridge that gap with some of the children who absolutely need it the most. I think it's a commonsense way for us to try to do And again, we're definitely not trying to socially that. engineer. We're just trying to say what's the best way that children can learn. For all of those reasons I would ask for an 'aye' vote and support for this Bill, in the way that it's been supported by this chamber in the past. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', and 19 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2088."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2088, a Bill for an Act in relation to sexually violent persons. Third Reading of this House

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner."

Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate calling my Bill. House Bill 2088 is an initiative of the Attorney General. It amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987, and the Unified Code of Corrections, permits the inspection and copying of juvenile court arrest records for evaluating persons under the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act. It also provides that the trial on the petitions filed under such Act to be commenced no later than 120 days after the probable cause hearing. It further provides for an Amendment to the Custodial Sexual Misconduct Act by including employees of secured detention facilities, against sexually violent persons. I'd by glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Brosnahan: "Representative, correct me if I'm wrong, but under current law, the only thing that they can disclose as far as the mental health records, are if that treatment is provided in connection with the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act. Is that true?"

Turner, J.: "Representative, I'm sorry, I could not hear the first part of your question."

Brosnahan: "Under current law, is the only thing that's disclosed right now of these mental health records, it's only disclosed if those health records were taken in connection to the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act?"

Turner, J.: "Yes, that's correct. And what this Bill does is allow for juvenile records to be disclosed, as well, when a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

decision is being made whether someone needs to be held because they are still sexually violent, after they've been convicted of an offense, as you know, in the Criminal Code under the sex provisions. So, it does expand that."

- Brosnahan: "Okay. So, who are expanding... expanded..."
- Turner, J.: "Yes, it expands the information that is available to those who are making the decision whether or not the person must continue to be held, and also expands that information and makes it available to those who may be defending on a person's right to be released from custody, inasmuch as they may be trying to prove that they're no longer sexually violent."
- Brosnahan: "Okay. Now, I'm assuming that the State's Attorneys'

 Association is in favor of this Bill? They're proponents
 in this Bill?"
- Turner, J.: "I have not heard from the State's Attorneys'
 Association on this particular matter. Again, it's an
 initiative of the Attorney General's Office. My
 presumption is that they would be in favor, but I can't
 make that statement. And I don't recall, Representative,
 that they put in a slip at the committee hearing."
- Brosnahan: "Now, John, I had another question. And, you know, pardon my ignorance on this. I kind of forgot about this. But in a discharge hearing, petition for discharge, does the state still have the option of requesting a jury trial or is that just solely the defendant's right?"
- Turner, J.: "Both the state and the defendant have the right to request a jury trial."
- Brosnahan: "Okay. And another thing this legislation does then, it changes the Speedy Trial Act in a way as far as... this person will no longer have to be brought to trial within 45 days, it actually extends it to 120 days. Is that

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 correct?"

- Turner, J.: "Yes, it was found that the 45 days was not practical. And I'm sure you can relate to this as a former prosecutor, yourself. It was just impossible for the prosecution, or for that matter the defense, to gather all the information that was necessary in order to have a fair hearing. So, it does allow for the commencement of the proceedings 120 days after the probable cause hearing rather than 45 days, thereafter."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Representative. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. I would urge everyone to vote 'yes'."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate, but the Chair will recognize Representative Cross for some questions, and then we'll close."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had more than enough debate. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Hannig: "And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Novak, we're going to read House Bill 2. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2, a Bill for an Act in relation to alternate fuels. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me. Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"
- Osterman: "Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to vote 'aye' on that

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

last Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "We'll have someone from the Clerk bring you...

You're recorded as 'not voting', Representative. Do you wish the record to reflect...?"

Osterman: "That I voted 'aye' on that last... or would like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you. And now, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. House Bill 2 is the collaboration of many months of work that started about a year ago with Representative Feigenholtz and the Illinois Clean Fuels Coalition, which is made up of... in business and industry around the State of Illinois, including the Farm Bureau, the corn growers. Essentially, what this Bill does is provide for incentives to create the fueling infrastructure in Illinois that we so desperately need, to allow and provide for the clean fuels; such as E85, which is 85% ethanol blended with a 15% of traditional gasoline, compressed gas, natural gas, biomassed-derived fuels, to be marketed in Illinois and sold in Illinois to vehicles purchased by our citizens that have what are characterized as flexible-fuel engines. We were happy earlier this year when the Governor, in his budget address, committed \$2 million for the proposed FY'02 Budget, to get this clean fuels Bill program off the ground. Right now, the... there are only about 13 fueling stations in the Metropolitan Chicago Area, which includes the collar counties. And essentially, if I wanted to buy one of these vehicles and try to purchase, let's say, E85 fuel, for example, I would have to drive 35 miles west to Mr. Rutherford's district to buy E85 ethanol. So, what we're doing here, is... it's an idea whose time has come, is for us to get serious about advancing the marketability

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

and use of clean fuels in Illinois. You know we've just legislation to abolish and phase out MTBE. passed Representative Curry sponsored that Bill. Everybody in here voted for it, overwhelmingly. And that MTBE... with that legislation becoming law this summer, we hope, that that's going to create another incentive for the use of more ethanol in this state, and other clean fuels. it's essentially this, is that the vehicles are out there. There's thousands of vehicles on the road, right now that are sold by Ford Motor Company, Daimler Chrysler, and And there are other businesses that want General Motors. this idea to advance, such as the City of Chicago, Chicago Transit Authority, numerous businesses and corporations that have fleets of vehicles, the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, the Kankakee, I mean, the State Farm Bureau, the state corn growers, the environmental community. real win/win situation for us to provide these incentives, so we can have the infrastructure. Even the petroleum marketers, even those guys that sell traditional gasoline in this state, support this Bill, because they would be eligible to receive grants to construct fueling stations at their gasoline facilities around the State of Illinois. So, once again, it's a good idea. We think this time has come. We're glad Governor Ryan is onboard, and we've got 65 Sponsors signed up for this Bill. So, I think we're off and running to a good start. I'd be more than happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Bill is on the Order of Short Debate.

So, the Chair recognizes Representative Black. Would you like to speak in opposition, or just ask some questions?

Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, one question.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Representative, you mentioned in your remarks that the Governor was onboard. That was the question I was going to ask you. I know, in committee, you had indicated that you were negotiating with the Governor's Office on certain fiscal items...,"

Novak: "Right. Right."

Black: "... so I assume that, that has been worked out?"

Novak: "Right. Well, not yet."

Black: "Still negotiating?"

Novak: "The Governor's committed... in his speech, he committed \$2 million, Mr. Black."

Black: "Okay."

Novak: "The original Bill was for a five-year program, would cost about 25 million over five years. Okay? We stripped that out. We stripped all of the references to state finances out of the Bill, and the design is to move this Bill over to the Senate. Senator Mahar has agreed to pick it up, the Chair of the Environment Committee, create a Conference Committee Report and hold on to it, and when the budget's finally put together, plug all the financing mechanisms into it."

Black: "Representative, two other questions, if you wouldn't mind. Does an automobile today, would require an expensive retrofit to burn an 85% blend, ethanol?"

Novak: "No."

Black: "That's what I thought."

Novak: "Ford Motor Company has been working on these for a number of years. They're part of this coalition, Daimler Chrysler, and General Motors. Right now you can go to a dealership, and probably in Danville, or Champaign, or wherever, and probably Kankakee, and go to a Ford dealer and ask to buy a Taurus, or a certain van with a flexible

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

fuel engine. They don't cost anymore money, and you could use traditional gasoline. You could use gasohol. And let's say your tank is half empty, and you pull into an E85 fueling station and use 85% ethanol, it doesn't make a bit of difference. It all blends together."

Black: "All right. Could, as far as you know, someone who had a four-five-six-seven-eight-year old car, could they burn an 85% blend?"

Novak: "You have to have a flexible fuel engine. And next year, as an example of the popularity of this Bill, is that all Ford Explorers, probably the most popular SUV on the road, all Ford Explorers in Illinois will have the flexible fuel engines offered in their models."

Black: "Okay. One last question, Representative. Are the pharmaceutical companies in support of this legislation?"

Novak: "Pharmaceutical companies?"

Black: "Well, I look up on the board, and I see that Parke-Davis have signed on as a cosponsor."

Novak: "Parke-Davis, yeah. Do they make..."

Black: "Lilly, and all the others onboard?"

Novak: "I don't know. Do they make Viagra, Parke-Davis?"

Black: "I have no idea what they make. I thought maybe they made ethanol, that you could take as a supplement."

Novak: "Okay. I hope you're up to that occasion."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had one speak in favor. Do we have anyone that wishes to speak against? Representative Parke?

No."

Black: "Now, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, one other question..."

Speaker Hannig: "Sure."

Black: "...has been called to my attention, by staff..."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

Black: "Will this... This Bill will not exclude any county, all counties will participate?"

Novak: "Correct. It'll be a statewide endeavor. It'll be administered by DCCA."

Black: "All right. I appreciate your answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "I stand in favor of the Bill. I don't want to go through what we went through last summer. And many of the experts are already saying that we might. OPEC has already met a week or two ago, and decided to restrict production by a million barrels a day, which may very well cause gasoline prices to increase as the summer driving season approaches. I commend Representative Novak for taking proactive action. It's long overdue. We have piddled and fiddled since OPEC came on the scene in 1971, and we have ridden a roller coaster of gasoline prices. We have been held hostage by the OPEC nations, who have restricted production and increased production, and what have you. It is time that have an energy policy in this country. And if the Federal Government can't do it, or will not do it, then Illinois can take the lead. And I for one, look forward to the time when I don't have to drive... I think the only E85 station, anywhere near me, is in Gibson City. It's time that we take a proactive stance on renewable, alternative fuel energy. And all of us should join Representative Novak in cosponsoring this Bill. And if the Federal Congress won't act, or can't act, then, at least Illinois can become a leader in saying, enough, enough being held hostage by foreign oil producers. We have a natural resource that we grow in Illinois, that can be used as a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

fuel. And it doesn't have to be a 10% blend, which is what we've been told for years, it can be an 85% blend. And only then, when that happens, on a widespread basis, will I think we see some competitive forces at work with the oil industry, and perhaps, we can getaway from \$2, \$2.25, or as some of the experts are saying, \$3 a gallon gasoline, this summer. I commend you, Representative, and I'm proud to be a cosponsor."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in opposition? No one is standing in opposition. So then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Journal to reflect that I meant to vote 'yes' on House Bill 2088. It was two Bills ago. I, erroneously, voted 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Journal will so reflect. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 831? Representative O'Connor."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 831, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative O'Connor."

O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This legislation would increase the penalty for violation of the Illinois Firearms Straw Purchase Law. Existing law makes a purchase with intent to deliver a firearm to a third party illegal where such delivery is barred by State or Federal Law, or false information has been provided to the Federal

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

ATF on the firearm transaction record. What this legislation would do, would add a mandatory ten-year sentence where the gun is used in violation of the Cannabis Control Act, the Controlled Substance Act, or used against a law enforcement officer, or in the commission of a felony. It's immediately effective. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1064 for Representative Stroger?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1064, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1064 would allow a Member of the General Assembly to move some of his money from the State Employees' Retirement System into the General Assembly Retirement System. And I will answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hartke: "Representative Stroger, what Member of the General Assembly or former Member does this apply to?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Stroger: "I don't have my expert whispering in my ear, so I can't tell you."

Hartke: "Really. Okay. I just... You're sure you don't know?"

Stroger: "On advice of counsel, I am told not to answer that question."

Hartke: "Well, I think, Members want to know."

Stroger: "Let's see now, who could it be? It will affect any current Member who has money..."

Hartke: "Okay."

Stroger: "...in SERS, that they can transfer."

Hartke: "Oh, okay."

Stroger: "So, it could qualify more than one person. I don't know. I don't know where other people have worked, to be honest with you."

Hartke: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate, but the Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we may need a little time on this to sort through what's going on here. I would request that we take this off Short Debate. And I'm joined by all the requisite number of Members, I'm sure, on my side of the aisle, who'd raise their hand to support that Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "The Bill will be on the Order of Standard Debate. Representative Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Cross: "Representative, has anyone given you an estimate of the cost of this Amendment or Bill?"

Stroger: "It's minimal cost, because there's very few people who'll be eligible."

Cross: "You aware of any opposition, Representative?"

Stroger: "No. I am not aware of any opposition."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Cross: "You didn't hear of any opposition in committee?"

Stroger: "No."

Cross: "And you didn't hear of any opposition in between committee and today?"

Stroger: "No."

Cross: "And you weren't given any... aren't aware of any opposition as you stand here today?"

Stroger: "What?"

Cross: "And you're still not aware of any opposition?"

Stroger: "No."

Cross: "What is the... How many Members are there in the State

Employee Retirement System, if you know?"

Stroger: "About 81 thousand."

Cross: "Do you know what states... Can you give us the states they live in? Are they all Illinois residents, or do they live throughout the United States?"

Stroger: "Most live across the United States. It's approximately 100 and... it will be several hundred, that's right. So, it's like 260."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Let the Chair just mention, that our Lieutenant Governor, Corinne Wood, is with us today. She's over on the Democratic side of the aisle. And we're glad to have her there. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates that he will."

Parke: "Representative, how many Members came to you and asked you to put this Bill in?"

Stroger: "Actually, no Member asked me. Staff asked me to pick it up."

Parke: "How many Members will this affect?"

Stroger: "I don't have a... specific figure, but it will affect

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 several people."

Parke: "Do you know what the cost, to the General Assembly Retirement Plan, will be?"

Stroger: "I don't have an exact number, but it should be a small cost."

Parke: "It will allow Members of the General Assembly to use this as service credit for full pensions won't it, if they stayed in for 20 years? And this is what we call a window?"

Stroger: "Yes. Yes."

Parke: "And so, therefore, some Members of the General Assembly who served in some other governmental entity that was under the State Employees' Retirement System, can now use that credit towards going into this Plan, our General Assembly Retirement Plan?"

Stroger: "Yes."

Parke: "And are they paying both the state's share and the Member's share?"

Stroger: "Yes."

Parke: "So, therefore, do you have any idea the average cost to the General Assembly Member, that would want to utilize your Bill?"

Stroger: "No. We don't know the cost, yet."

Parke: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Parke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Sponsor's doing this for people he doesn't even know, doesn't know how many it's going to affect, doesn't know what it's going to cost the system, doesn't know what it's going to cost the individual Member, but he wants us to vote on this. I am not comfortable with this. I think that it ought to be part of a comprehensive pension package that's presented to us in its entirety, and

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

let us take another look at this. But I would suggest that you, to the Members who choose to... not to vote for this. And if we were able to defeat it, to put it in an overall pension Bill, probably at the end of Session, and let us judge the overall package in terms of its fiscal impact to the General Assembly Fund, to get an idea of how Members are actually going to be involved in this, so that, when we vote for this overall package, we'll have an understanding of where... how it's going to affect all of approach... First of all, I'm This piecemeal us. surprised, that it's on the floor, because we, so far, last couple of years, have not allowed these kinds of Bills to come out, that it's folded into one major Bill. So, I'm going to vote 'no'. I'll suggest that the Body may want to send this back to the drawing board to be included in a comprehensive pension Bill at the end of Session. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stroger to close."

Stroger: "This Bill will affect some people that I... and I suspect I know all of 'em, I just don't know who worked for the State Employees' Retirement System. Under the current law, you can take your State Employee Retirement System money and transfer all of it into the General Assembly Retirement Fund. This would just change the law to say, that a current Member could take some of their money and transfer some of it. So, right now, we do have a window. I believe this is a appropriate Bill, and would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

question, there are 64 voting 'yes', and 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Erwin, for what reason do you rise? Excuse me, Representative. Let me recognize Representative Soto. For what reason do you rise, Representative?"

Soto: "I want to vote... I have a potential conflict, but I'm voting, anyway. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record will so reflect. And Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise?"

Fritchey: "I'd like to let the record reflect, that I intended to vote 'present' on that Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. The record will so reflect. Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, my button was not working correctly. It did not reflect me as being here, on the vote."

Speaker Hannig: "And you wish to vote how?"

Brady: "I wish to vote 'no' on the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record will... The Journal will reflect your intentions, Representative."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "And now, Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. If I could have my colleagues' attention for one minute. I hope you will join me today in recognizing a distinguished former Member of the Illinois Legislature, a Senator, for many years, not Carol Ronen who is still with us, but also, the former Controller of the State of Illinois, Dawn Clark Netsch, who we're honored today to have the Controller of Illinois, Dan Hynes, dedicate the Dawn Clark Netsch Training and Technology Institute. And I think it speaks to what a great job Dawn

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

did in modernizing the Controller's Office, and doing an all-around great job. And we're happy to have you with us, again. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome back to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 180?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 180, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 180 is the Bill that many of you have heard about. If you haven't heard about it, you probably haven't been watching the papers as close as we do around here. House Bill 180 has been referred to as the Scott's Bill. It is a Bill that is similar in legislation to an Indiana law, that requires motorists while on our highways, if there is emergency service personnel that are in the act and in the line of doing their duty, or stopped alongside of the highway, or in a lane of traffic, it requires them to move to the furthest lane away from traffic and reduce speed. It is also, the Bill itself, above and beyond that, has graduated penalties, that if you are intoxicated and are the cause of an accident involving an emergency service personnel at one of these scenes, it's three steps if injury... if damage occurs, is one level, injury occurs, it's another, and death, another. I want to thank the Members of the House. This has 42 Sponsors. I think it's a shame that our general... the general driving public doesn't realize the importance of realizing that our emergency personnel are working in a particular lane of traffic and to calm down, slow down, move to a lane where it is safe for those people that are doing their job to continue to do their job. The name of the Bill is the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Scott's Bill, and it has to do with Scott Gillian. On the 23rd of December, Scott was working in his job when moving around to the back of the fire apparatus he was struck by an allegedly... a driver who was allegedly under the influence of alcohol. Scott passed away. This might... This Bill by itself won't stop incidents like that from happening, totally, but maybe it will raise the awareness of those drivers on the highway that we're very serious about them calming down, slowing down, and allowing these emergency service personnel to do their work. This initiative was pushed forward by the Lieutenant Governor, and there were several Legislators in the House here, that had similar legislation. I just happened to be the one lucky enough that we advanced this particular Bill, and most of those are cosponsors. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

So, does anyone stand in opposition? Representative McKeon in opposition? No. Representative Osmond in opposition? Representative Black, do you stand in opposition? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, not in opposition, but to ask the Sponsor a question?..."

Speaker Hannig: "We'll let you ask the Sponsor a question."

Black: "With the indulgence of the Chair?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah. Please. Please."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Bost, two questions have come up in my district. The Committee Amendment added to the definition of an 'emergency vehicle', one authorized by law to be equipped with oscillating, rotating, or flashing lights. And we have changed on at least two occasions already this Session, the vehicles that can use flashing,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

or oscillating lights; one, would be the privately-owned vehicle of a volunteer firefighter. Now, does that now take that privately-owned vehicle into the category of an emergency vehicle?"

Bost: "Representative, if that vehicle is stopped along the side of the highway, rendering assistance, yes, it will. Even if it would be a personal vehicle, and that... the flashing light is working, yes, it would."

Black: "Would the definition include a private vehicle on the side of the road with its flashing warning lights on?"

Bost: "No. It does not."

Black: "All right. That now... The second question, that has come from my district, most of our roads are two-lane roads. And the question was, if you are... if an ambulance is overtaking you on a two-lane road and the shoulder is, as you and I know from our districts, maybe 18 inches wide, they're not sure what they're supposed to do. Are they supposed to come to a stop in the traffic lane, which may not be the best thing; get over as far as they can, or simply slow down to the point, where the ambulance or firefighter, or the fire vehicle, can safely go around them on a two-lane road? And this question was raised, to me, by a law enforcement person that said, I'm not sure how to treat a vehicle on a two-lane road, regardless of which way the emergency vehicle is going. Now, he was talking about moving vehicles, not stopped vehicles."

Bost: "Right. Right. This is... This deals with stopped vehicles."

Black: "Okay."

Bost: "The legislation, from what I understand on the question that you had and it doesn't pertain to this piece of legislation, is just simply to move and reduce speed to

- 30th Legislative Day

 March 21, 2001

 allow the vehicle... the emergency vehicle to pass at a safe distance."
- Black: "Okay. Now, on a two-lane road where there may have been an accident, you have a fire truck, an ambulance, and a police car, I assume, that this law would say, you stop unless you are told to proceed on the two-lane road by an emergency officer. It is not up to you to determine when you might go through the accident scene, correct?"
- Bost: "That's correct. And if it's in the case of a fire, the head fire personnel is in charge of the scene at that time."
- Black: "All right. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, we've had one speak in support, and one speak in somewhat in opposition. And so, Representative Bost to close."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I thank you for your support on this Bill. I'm going to ask for your 'aye' vote. If you'll notice around the gallery, we've got... today is Illinois Firefighter Day, and this is kind of appropriate. You know, this Bill deals with all emergency personnel. Around us are those men and women who work everyday to provide and help us in situations that we get into, to try to make our lives a little safer. This Bill... And we might recognize them, and thank you very much for being here. This Bill simply helps to try to keep safe those people that work very hard to make our lives a little safer and a better place to live. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

question, there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hamos, for what reason do you rise? Representative Hartke, for what reason do you rise?"

Hartke: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Hartke: "Occasionally, we are honored down here with individuals who act and serve us here on the floor as honorary Pages. It's been my pleasure today to have a young lady by the name of Paige Hatfield from close to my district, who has served as a Page and so forth. It just happens to be her 10th birthday today, as well. So, please welcome her, and thank her. And we have a little cake that her mother brought down for several of us. It's not a big cake, but if you'd like a piece of cake this afternoon, why, join Paige or let her know, and she'll bring you a piece of cake. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 328?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 328, a Bill for an Act in relation to

State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 328 is a Bill that creates the Human Voice Contact Act. And what this Bill attempts to do is, originally, it required that state agencies must provide a live person to answer calls coming during the normal business hours of that state agency. This exempts hot lines and emergency lines such as that, but it gives the taxpayer of the State of Illinois a better chance to talk to someone when they call a state agency, particularly here in Springfield. We had discussion on the Bill in committee. We also had an Amendment, by

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Representative Franks, that took away some of the criticism that DHS had. And I believe, without question, we have agreement on the Bill. And I would answer any questions, you may have. And if not, why I would appreciate your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "And this Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Is there anyone that wishes to speak in opposition? There being... Representative Black, do you wish to speak in opposition?"

Black: "I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. He'll yield."

Black: "Representative, your Bill says, that 'requires a human voice contact'. What other kind of voice is there?"

McGuire: "Recorded, I think. I know that's still human, but what we'd like to do... we'd like to have someone answer the phone that can talk back and forth, rather than just the recorded voice."

Black: "All right. So, you're not... Let me just ask you a question. Is the Bill clear on the fact that they cannot use a synthesized voice, go through all the options? I don't have any problem with what you're trying to do, but some of these people are very creative. And they can say, well, our answering system is a human voice, and it gives you a nice recorded message, and 4 thousand extensions, if you want to stay on the line that long. Your intent is to get away from those automated systems and have somebody answer the phone who can then transfer you to the person you want to talk to. Right?"

McGuire: "Correct. That's what the Amendment does."

Black: "And, I think, that makes eminent good sense. You and I,

Representative, can generally get through to an agency, one
way or the other, we have a phone number that'll work. It

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

is to me... It is the heighth of idiocy when a taxpayer calls a state agency and gets a five-minute recorded message. If you know the extension of the party you're calling, push it in there, or if... the name, spell it out numerically. They're not calling because they know who they want to talk to, they're calling because they got a confused letter, or an income tax intercept, or something else, and they go through this repeatedly. And then by the time they get to your office or my office, they aren't very happy people to begin with. This makes eminent good sense. I would hope that you expand it, if possible, in the Senate, because even legislative Bodies now have voice And that drives me crazy. If I want to talk to Senator so and so, I need to talk to Senator so and so, not a voice-mail message, that they aren't there. I'd like to, at least, have somebody tell me, how I can get ahold of them, when they're in the office, or what number I need to call. I think this makes eminent good sense, and I'm sure the constituents and the taxpayers of the state will give you an outstanding Legislator award, should this become law."

McGuire: "Thank you, Representative Black. I couldn't have done it better myself. And does that sound like you'd like to be a cosponsor? Silence, when not required to speak, does not constitute acceptance. Right?"

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting... 111 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Clerk, read House Bill 3336. Representative Rutherford. Representative Rutherford, we're going to call your Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3336, a Bill for an Act concerning public monies. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. A lot of our smaller communities and their banks have the opportunity to receive funds from public treasurers. And the more funds that are deposited, obviously, the more funds that are available to be disbursed through their loan program. This legislation would expand the collateral that public treasurers can... I'm sorry, the banks can use to collaterlize funds from public treasurers, whether it's local or the state. And there's a number of provisions that it expands, such as a collateral pool guarantee, it would expand for the home loan banks, Federal Home Loan Bank, recognition from both Chicago and Des Moines, and additional others. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3105. Representative Mary Flowers."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3105, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3105 would require the ICC Commission to

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

adopt rules for an enhanced enrollment process of a program called lifeline. This rule making will permit the ICC, and the departments to consider ways to improve the enrollment in lifeline by working together on marketing, and some type of application in which people on Medicaid, and food stamps, and IHEAP (sic-LIHEAP)... People who Medicaid, food stamps, and IHEAP (sic-LIHEAP), can easily enroll in the program. lifeline is a program designed to make telephone services more affordable for low-income consumers. Eligible household received a discount of... for telephone services, up to \$10.20 a month. Households who are eligible to receive this, would be households that receive Medicaid, food stamps, Social Security, and some type of public assistance, and low-energy assistance Lifeline is primarily funded by the Federal program. Universal Service Fund. Funding is also provided by individual contributions through check-off on telephone There's no state funding in this program, and I bills. would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3105."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Is discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the who wish? record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, we're gonna call House Bill 2301. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2301, a Bill for an Act in relation to families. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2301 amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act, provides that a petition to modify or terminate child support, custody, or visitation shall not delay any child support enforcement litigation or supplementary proceeding on behalf of the obligee; including, but not limited to a petition for a rule to show cause. The main reason for this Bill is to not have any stall techniques so that child enforcement can go forward."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the who wish? record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 this Bill, voting 'no'. And having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brunsvold, we're gonna call House Bill 1696. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act concerning natural resources. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "This... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

This Bill is a very simple Bill. It really codifies policy that the DNR is doing right now, as far as qualifications for personnel that have arrest authority. And those items listed there on the Bill are already policy requiring college in related areas, also swimming skills, et cetera. So, basically, it's really nothing new except codifying what the presently is going on in the Department of Natural Resources. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano, are you ready on House Bill 1954? Out of the record. Representative Lawfer, on... you ready? Representative Lawfer, on House Bill 1972? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1972, a Bill for an Act concerning library districts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Under the library Bill, currently, trustees of the library require 50 signatures for a petition. I have a request from a very small, rural library district from the trustees of that who said that because of the need to get 50 signatures that it did prevent or defer some people running for that office. The Bill changes the number from 50 to 20. For example, in Stockton, where this request came from, the mayor only needs 35 names on the petition, and of course, that's a paid position, whereas the trustees are not. I would ask for a favorable vote on this legislation and would be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1972. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Parke, do you rise in opposition?"

Parke: "I rise in clarification."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Ask... the Gentleman will yield."

Parke: "Thank you, thank you. Representative, the Illinois

Library Association spoke for or against this Bill in

committee?"

Lawfer: "There was no testimony but they were in favor of it. I

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

did talk to them in regards to this. They felt that this would enable more people to seek that... those positions, especially, in rural library districts."

Parke: "So the State Library Association is not opposed?"

Lawfer: "That's correct, to my knowledge."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2011. Representative Yarbrough's first Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2011, a Bill for an Act in relation to identification. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker for announcing that this is my first Bill, and Members of the House. House Bill 2011 amends the Illinois Identification Card Act and the Unified Code of Corrections. It requires that the Department of Corrections to provide an identification card to persons released from prison. It authorizes the Department of Corrections to charge a fee not exceeding the cost of producing the card. It authorizes those persons to exchange the Department of Corrections Identification Card for a standard Illinois Identification Card for a fee of \$1. I'll entertain whatever questions you may have."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2011. And on that question, Representative Lang."

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

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Lang: "Representative, did I hear the Speaker say that this was your first Bill?"

Yarbrough: "I believe that's correct."

Lang: "And you even admitted that yourself, didn't you?"

Yarbrough: "I certainly did."

Lang: "Well, just for not hiding from us, we shouldn't irritate you at all, but we will anyway. So, tell us again what your Bill does. It's something about a card. This is not a credit card that we're issuing to prisoners, is it?"

Yarbrough: "This is not a credit card for prisoners. It's a card that will help them to reintegrate into the community. It will give them the ability to go the Secretary of State's office and get a State Illinois Identification Card."

Lang: "So this Bill would require the Secretary of State to issue an ID card for anyone who applies for it upon release, is that correct?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Lang: "How will these prisoners be told that they need to ask for the card?"

Yarbrough: "That will be something that they will do in the Department of Corrections."

Lang: "Does the Bill require the Department of Corrections to give them this information?"

Yarbrough: "Yes, it does. Not necessarily require, but they will be given this information and if they present themselves to get the card, then they'll be given the opportunity to do that."

Lang: "Now, the Bill requires a fee of \$1?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Lang: "Where they gonna get that dollar? They're just walking out the door from the prison. How they gonna get that

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

dollar? Are they gonna borrow it from you,

Representative?"

Yarbrough: "Absolutely not. I believe that they make some nominal amount of money during the course of the time that they're in prison."

Lang: "Representative Ryan would like to give you the first dollar to give to the first prisoner. You can get it from him when we're finished."

Yarbrough: "I'd be happy to take it."

Lang: "Where will this dollar fee go, Representative?"

Yarbrough: "I believe it goes to the Department of Corrections."

Lang: "But they're gonna pay the dollar to the Secretary of State?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Lang: "They're gonna pay it to the Department of Corrections."

Yarbrough: "Yes. When they go to the Secretary of State's Office, they'll have to pay there."

Lang: "Well, now you lost me. So the person leaves prison, they want this ID card."

Yarbrough: "Right."

Lang: "So, their first stop is the Secretary of State's Office where they 're gonna ask for this card, probably even before they get a hot meal 'cause they need this card badly. And they're gonna give them the dollar at the Secretary of State's Office. What fund has been created to get those dollars to the Department of Corrections?"

Yarbrough: "They get \$50 upon their release from prison. They certainly can spend it any way they'd like. But with the identification card they can take it to the Secretary of State's Office and present it and get an Illinois Identification Card."

Lang: "But they have to pay the Secretary of State the buck,

30th Legislative Day right?"

March 21, 2001

Yarbrough: "No, they pay the dollar to the Department of Corrections."

Lang: "Before they leave."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Lang: "So, then now they leave with \$49 and a receipt for a dollar, right?"

Yarbrough: "Yes, that's correct."

Lang: "All right, now they take the receipt and they go the Secretary of State's Office and they say I want an ID card, here's my receipt, right?"

Yarbrough: "They will have a Department of Corrections card that they can present to the Secretary of State's Office. And along with the prescribed fee, they will be given the opportunity to apply for an Illinois Identification Card."

Lang: "So, did Secretary of State think this is a good Bill?"

Yarbrough: "He thinks it's a great Bill."

Lang: "Doesn't he want at least half a buck out of that dollar for this trouble?"

Yarbrough: "He just wants to help people get back into society and be able to get a good job."

Lang: "So this is not a budget buster for the Secretary of State's Office?"

Yarbrough: "No..."

Lang: "We've been hearing a lot lately about the problems of the budget of the Secretary of State's Office. You're sure this won't harm Mr. White in any way?"

Yarbrough: "No, I think this will help his budget.

Lang: "Now, what are these folks gonna do with these ID cards when they get them?"

Yarbrough: "The same thing that anybody else would do that would have an identification card. They can use it for

30th Legislative Day

identification for cashing a check, for anything else that they would need to use it for."

March 21, 2001

Lang: "Will there be a picture on the card?"

Yarbrough: "Absolutely."

Lang: "So, these folks that are just leaving prison and running right over to get these cards, will the guys have time for a shave before they take this picture.?"

Yarbrough: "They have up to 30 days to turn that card in."

Lang: "Oh, so it doesn't have to be right away."

Yarbrough: "No, they can actually get a meal first."

Lang: "All right. Well, I think you answered my questions.

Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will yield."

Black: "Representative, this ID card, will it have predominantly displayed the Department of Corrections on it somewhere?"

Yarbrough: "I would think so, since that's where it's coming from."

Black: "And would it have on there convicted felon, served 25 years assault and battery?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Black: "But anybody who sees the card will know immediately that this person has been in prison, right?"

Yarbrough: "Probably will have the Department of Corrections on the card."

Black: "Representative, are you sure you want to do this? Do you realize that you are stigmatizing people? I mean, I know the intent of this Bill, but stop and think of this. Perhaps you should take this out of the record and we could

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

talk a little further to the Department of Corrections. I'm not sure this Bill will do what some people have told you it will do."

Yarbrough: "I think this is a great way to get people back into society. I've talked to both the Secretary of State's Office and the Department of Corrections who told me they've been trying to do this for 21 years but the two Departments were having trouble talking to each other. So I was able to get the two Departments together to sit down and talk about this issue."

Black: "Well, okay. If you think that. You may live in a different neighborhood than I do. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Now, if you'll stop and think about this, I don't know what neighborhood the Representative lives in, but let me give you a scenario. Someone's been in prison for 25 years, they get out they want to go buy a six-pack. They go into a liquor store and the clerk says I need to see some identification. Oh, here. Here's my card, I just got out of Joliet, for murder. Now what do you think that clerk's gonna do, say welcome back? I doubt it. The clerk will probably say I can't serve you, I don't know what the law is on a convicted felon. Or let's say this, you go to a grocery store and you've been able to open a checking account. No, you probably wouldn't have been able to open a checking account. You go to the bank and they say, we'd like to see some identification. You whip out a card from the Department of Corrections that shows you just got out of Stateville. And they said, oh, what were you in for? Oh, I wrote bad checks. Oh, well of course, we welcome you at our bank. You won't get a checking account. You won't

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

be able to get served in the liquor store. So then you go to enroll your children in school. Do you have any identification? Yes, yes I do, would you like to see it? Here look, the Department of Corrections. And the school principal will say, oh my god, what were you in for? served 10 years for child abuse. You're not enrolling your child in my school. This person has been stigmatized. the very least, we should insist that the card not have reference to the Department of Corrections. This is a gross invasion of privacy. Can you imagine what you're going to go through? You want to rent a car, you gotta have ID. You go to a car rental lot. Somebody says I have to have some identification. Yes, here's my card, Menard, just got out. What were you in there for? I stole Well, sure I'm gonna let you rent my car. Toledo. These people will be discriminated against. Thev will be marked for life. I don't think this is fair. Τf you want to do this, why not tattoo a 'P' on their forehead so everybody would know they had been a prisoner. I think this is a gross miscarriage of justice. How would you like show your legislative ID card at a convention of people with common sense? They wouldn't let you in. For heaven Do we really want to subject someone who just got sakes. out of prison to the indignity of showing an ID card to try and get back in society? That in fact, I just came back from a wonderful trip to Chester and while there I visited TAMMS. And I also spent some time at St. Charles and But I'm out and here's my ID card to prove it. The person is not going to be welcomed warmly in any neighborhood that I represent. I daresay that if they take the ID card to the Secretary of State's Office to try and get a driver's license, that person's gonna put the 'out to

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

lunch' sign up immediately and go back and tell the manager, there's a convicted felon out here that wants a driver's license. I'm not gonna go out and give that person a driver's test. We're marking these people for life. Good heavens, have we come to this? If they have served their time, erase the dime. You shouldn't have to carry an ID card to show that you've been in prison for number of years. The least you could do is just give them a card that says, Hi, my name is Gary, what's yours? stigmatized them by putting the Department of don't Corrections on their ID card. I'm not sure this is at all what the Representative wants. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, somebody needs to get a hold of this chamber. These kinds of Bills didn't used to come up for first But I stand foursquare for the rights individuals not to be stigmatized by having to carry a card that brands them as a recently released guest of the State of Illinois at one of our fine penal institutions. I'm not sure this is a good idea."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and the House chamber. I just wanted to speak on behalf of this Bill to say that a lot of the people... I have one of my friends who's a parole agent and they have problems trying to get the parole agents ID. This will be a way of them just going down to the Secretary of State, exchanging the ID, one ID for another without trying to find the birth certificate, without trying to find a Social Security card, without trying to get all these other things. I thing you need three pieces of identification before you can get a state ID. With this card, it just enables them to get one ID card. They don't have to have any other identification but that prison ID

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

card and then they can get a state ID card. I don't think they'll be able to get a driver's license, anyway. Because once they're convicted, they can't have that, right? They just want to have a state ID card. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lou Jones."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Jones, L.: "Representative, the card that you're taking from the Department of Corrections and trading that in for a state ID, am I correct?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Jones, L.: "On the state ID that you receive, there is nothing on there referenced to the Department of Corrections. Am I correct?"

Yarbrough: "Absolutely not."

Jones, L.: "I think the purpose of the Bill, and correct me if I'm wrong, because what has happened when inmates get out of Corrections, even before some of them get all the way home, they are stopped an ask for ID. And they don't have ID to show. And I think the purpose of this is to give them a state ID so they can have ID for employment and for other ID purposes. The actually ID that they receive or whomever they show it to does not indicate that they have just been released from the Department of Corrections. Am I correct?"

Yarbrough: "Representative, the card coming from the Department of Corrections is a temporary card, emphasis on temporary.

It's a card that will have their photo on it as well as their signature on it, and as well as other information that will identify who they are. They will be able to take that card to the Secretary of State's Office and exchange

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- it. It's not meant to be a permanent card and certainly the Department of Corrections cannot issue a card that doesn't have something to say where it came from in the first place."
- Jones, L.: "Okay. And Representative, one more question. In order to get a state ID, don't you have to have a picture ID?"
- Yarbrough: "You have to be able to... normally, you have to have about four pieces of identification to show who you are.

 And one of those things is a picture identification, something that has your picture on it. This will provide that information."
- Jones, L.: "This will, correct me, this will provide the part of the... that the Secretary of State asked you for a picture ID. And because a lot of the inmates have just gotten out of prison, have been released from prison, they don't have an ID. This provides for a piece of the identification that they need to get the state ID. Am I correct?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Jones, L.: "Thank you. I think it's a fine piece of legislation and I urge everybody to vote, vote 'aye'."

Yarbrough: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Yarbrough to close."

- Yarbrough: "From the very first step out of prison an ex-offender faces the frustration of bureaucratic obstacles that foreshadow the futility of his freedom. I believe that this Bill... I don't believe it'll stop crime on our streets, but giving an ex-offender identification will help them with a vital first step in being productive member of society. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there 114 voting 'yes', and 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Klingler, are you ready on 2143? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House 2143, a Bill for an Act concerning education.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2143 is an initiative that was brought to me by the vocational center in our area. And it is also an issue that Senator Todd Sieben is carrying an identical Bill in the Senate. The vocational centers, such as the one in the Capital Area Vocational Center, are actually owned by 14 districts and they are not able to apply on their own for technology grants and items that they need that they simply can't get from all the school districts. For instance, the Capital Area Vocational Center here mentioned that the computers that they're using are actually computers that the State Board of Education has discarded. So they need to update their equipment. We worked and negotiated with the State Board of Education and narrowed what they're trying to apply for to three areas: that is technology grants, school maintenance grants, and other competitive grants administered by the State Board of Education. would ask for support for this Bill. Again, it does affect vocational centers throughout the state. It was strongly supported by all the vocational centers and the State Board of Education."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Chair recognizes

Representative Monique Davis."

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative, could you tell us what 14 school districts can take part to this... can you know, get this grant?"
- Klingler: "When I indicated 14 school districts, the vocational center in this area is supported by 14 separate school districts. I don't know if I can name all 14 off the top of my head, for example, Springfield, Chatham, New Berlin, Divernon, school districts in this area. Because there's not enough need in any one school district to have such a center for vocational and career training. So school districts in certain..."
- Davis, M.: "But Representative, we don't have the vocational center in our school district. There's no vocational center. So my question is why did you just select those 14?"
- Klingler: "There are only, I believe, 14 vocational centers in the state. I said our school district is owned... our vocational school, vocational center is owned by 14 individual school districts. But all vocational centers in the state... "
- Davis, M.: "Are there any in suburban Chicago?"
- Klingler: "Hang on one second. There were representatives from the suburban Chicago area and I don't have their names.

 Representative Osmond has just indicated, yes, there are some in his area. Again..."
- Davis, M.: "Representative who?"
- Klingler: "Osmond. The specific vocational centers that have supported this Bill..."
- Davis, M.: "The person you just mentioned is from a western suburb. He's not from a Chicago suburb. He's far west."
- Klingler: "The specific school districts, vocational centers that have signed in support are the Capital Area Career Center,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the Bloomington Area Vocational Center, the JoDaviess-Carroll Area Vocational Center. But again, it impacts all the vocational centers not just..."

Davis, M.: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

- Davis, M.: "You know, I really respect the Legislator and I certainly appreciate an effort to get grants for certain school districts for vocational centers. But we don't even want to pass legislation for microscopes for some schools which costs about \$340 a school, for those who need it, not even for those who already have it. So how can we, in good conscience, select 14 school districts to partake of special grants. Now, I'm sure that everybody in this room would appreciate getting grants for vocational centers in their area. So we... I cannot, in good conscience, select to give to just 14 school districts with what should be statewide. Are we only trying to provide vocational education for a certain group of people? I mean, is that right, Representative Klingler?"
- Klingler: "Representative, what we're trying to do is allow all vocational centers throughout the state to be able to apply for grants. We are not restricting any vocational center. I think you misunderstood when I mentioned the number 14. That was not the number of total districts, that was an example of how ... my local vocational center is owned."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, my analysis tells me that 14 school districts will benefit from these grants. It's undetermined the number of grant index that exist. The Capital Fund grants money according to this index will only be provided to those who have vocational centers in their area. And if you don't have one then you can't apply."

Klingler: "Representative, individual school districts can

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

already apply for all of these grants. Your school district, any district in the state can. The only ones that cannot apply are vocational centers. And Representative, the reason why I was concerned about this is so many of our young people, in fact really the majority, do not go on to higher education and we're trying to provide career training and technology training and vocational training. And yet they're not able to get the equipment to keep up-to-date for those students who are not going on to college."

Davis, M.: "Well, Representative, to the Bill. I would support this but I think it just leaves too many school districts out. Only 14 school districts will benefit from this and we are providing the opportunity for special grants to only..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close? Your..."

Davis, M.: "...Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. We're providing grants to only 14 school districts and I just think it sets up an unfair, unequal situation again. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Osmond: "Representative, I stand in support of this legislation.

Lake County, which most Representatives know is just north of Chicago, we have a number of high schools in our district that do use the Lake County Vocational Center. Do you happen to know the number up in our area that belonged to Lake County? I think we have nine different high school districts in Lake County alone that does this.

Representative, does this increase grant money to construction, the overall amount of grant money set aside?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Klingler: "No, this Bill, this Amendment, does not include school construction money. It is again focused at technology grants, maintenance grants and certain other competitive grants."

Osmond: "This doesn't create any new special money at all, does

Klingler: "No, it does not."

Osmond: "Does this not just make it eligible for facilities that right now are supported by individual school districts who on their own can get this money who now have to take their money and support this and does this not just increase the eligibility to a different class of schools? This doesn't increase... this isn't a special grant in any way, is it?"

Klingler: "That's correct. For an example, you mentioned other school districts having to help out their vocational centers. Our vocational center needed some computer equipment and Divernon School District, that's actually the smallest school district in my area, gave its grant to the vocational center so it would be able to get some equipment."

Osmond: "But this isn't a... this doesn't create any new grants at all. It just utilizes and expands the eligibility for existing grants that are out there today. Is that not correct?"

Klingler: "That's correct."

Osmond: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. I think this is good legislation. It's gonna enable these facilities that provide a very vital need right now to my area and to many other areas of the state, the ability to access money that we've already set aside for the purposes of education. And I urge all of our Members to support this. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jerry Mitchell."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to clear something that was stated earlier. This certainly will affect many, many more districts than just 14. Whiteside Area Vocational Center, for instance, in my area covers about nine school districts that are combined into that particular, now they call it Whiteside Area Career Center. But the vocational centers across this state, and I'm sure that there are vocational centers even in the Chicago area where students can go and get technical skills they can't in a regular high school. The beauty of this is, is that now that they can apply for grants, it will no longer be the obligation of your individual school districts to dip into their educational funds to pay for what needs to be done at their vocational centers. Right now they're assessed a certain amount of money each year for maintenance, for technology, and that comes from your regular high schools, your regular unit districts in order to fund this. What Representative Klingler has done is given an avenue where they can compete for the same kind of grants as any other schools. Does it expand the amount money? No. But it does take away some of the local obligation and should be able to allow these schools the ability to compete for state money, which again will relieve some of your local burden. I think it's an excellent idea and I wish I'd have thought of it. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Klingler to close."

Klingler: "I would urge support for this Bill that would help so many students throughout the state that are looking for vocational career training for to go into a career out of high school. These career centers are struggling to meet up with the modern needs of technology and this will help

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

them simply apply for those grants. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zickus, for what reason do you rise?"

Zickus: "Just... Speaker, I rise on the point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Zickus: "We're privileged today to have in the House our former Member, Herb Huskey. Herb served in the Illinois House from 1973 to 1982 and he's here visiting again today."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome back to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2199."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2199, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2199 does for county assessors what we have done for every other county office official in the State of Illinois. This would bring the county assessors into the stipend program who act as clerks for the board of review. So, I'd appreciate your support and happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Cross: "Chuck, I'm sure you explained the Bill and I'm not... the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

reason I'm asking, I... we can't hear over here. It's just a little loud."

Hartke: "Well, you weren't supposed to."

Cross: "What? Weren't supposed to, I'm sure. This is..."

Hartke: "This piece of legislation brings into equality all of the county officials in the State of Illinois for what we've done for the county clerks, county treasurers, county circuit clerks, state's attorneys and all those things. It creates a stipend for the supervisor of assessment in the counties, all 102 counties in the State of Illinois, if they act as clerk of the board of review, and they do."

Cross: "Sixty-five hundred dollars a year for all 1..."

Hartke: "That's correct."

Cross: "Are there 102 assessors in the state."

Hartke: "That's correct. Yes, yes."

Cross: "All right. And it comes out of..."

Hartke: "Supervisors of assessment."

Cross: "I'm sorry. Super... I'm sorry. Supervisors of assessment. And it comes out of state funds, not county funds."

Hartke: "Yes, it does."

Cross: "All right."

Hartke: "Yes, it does, comes out of state funds."

Cross: "Once we do it, it'll continue until we repeal it?"

Hartke: "That's correct."

Cross: "And all the other... I think even since we've been here some of the other counties officers... since I've been here the last eight years, we've done it for some other counties."

Hartke: "Right. The sheriffs, the treasurers, the circuit clerks, so forth. So, they're the only officeholder in the county, either appointed or elected, that have not received

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 this stipend."

Cross: "Assuming this passes and becomes law, will they be eligible as a sitting... Well, though they're not elected though, so will they be eligible to re..."

Hartke: "Well, some are elected."

Cross: "Well, some... All right, maybe in some parts they are.

Will they be eligible to receive that stipend this year?

And it's not up..."

Hartke: "It's take effective on becoming law."

Cross: "Okay. I was just... I didn't know if it was something you had to wait for the next term. All right. All right. Thanks, Chuck."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Novak: "Mr. Hartke, can you tell me right now, do supervisors of assessments currently receive any type of an additional stipend or a fee..."

Novak: "Wait a minute. If you are a CIAO, Certified Illinois

Assessing Official I think it's called, you are eligible

for a \$3500 stipend from the Illinois Department of

Revenue, if you are a county supervisor of assessment. Is

that correct?"

Hartke: "If they meet those qualifications, yes."

Novak: "Okay. If they meet... How many CIAOs are supervisors of assessments in Illinois?"

Hartke: "How many are there?"

Novak: "Yeah. How many CIAOs..."

Hartke: "Well, I imagine there are one in every county. And this

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

is for the clerk of the board of review and that would only be one person."

Novak: "Wait, no, wait, wait. The supervisor of assessments is appointed or in some counties they're elected. I think, like Vermilion County, I think they're elected in Vermilion County. Okay."

Hartke: "They're elected in Effingham County."

Novak: "Okay. In Ka..."

Hartke: "They're elected in several counties."

Novak: "In Kankakee they're appointed by the county board."

Hartke: "They could be."

Novak: "All right. Salary is paid for by the county, but as a county supervisor of assessments, they are eligible, provided they meet certain requirements: number 1, if they're a CIAO, to get a \$3500 stipend from the Illinois Department of Revenue."

Hartke: "That's correct..."

Novak: "Aren't they?"

Hartke: " ... because of their skills..."

Novak: "Okay."

Hartke: " ... and their..."

Novak: "Right."

Hartke: " ... expertise and the classes they've taken..."

Novak: "So, to an... so..."

Hartke: " ... to qualify for that."

Novak: "So, what I'm trying to say is you're trying to put...

you're tryin' to give em \$6500 more on top of the \$3500

stipend that those currently are eligible for. Is that

correct?"

Hartke: "This stipend is for the clerks of the board of review and those are the supervisors of assessment."

Novak: "I know, Mr. Hartke. My question is, how many supervisors

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

of assessments in Illinois currently get a \$3500 stipend from the Illinois Department of Revenue?"

Hartke: "They may be paid for other things, but not as clerk of the board of review. Well, that's your question."

Novak: "Okay. As a former county official, the..."

Hartke: "Did you get the stipend?"

Novak: "No, because I left and came down here, but I sponsored the stipend for the county treasurers. And then after that, came the county recorders and now..."

Hartke: "This would be the last one..."

Novak: "Yeah."

Hartke: " ... because..."

Novak: "Yeah."

Hartke: " ... they have all now received their..."

Novak: "Right."

Hartke: " ... stipend should..."

Novak: "Right."

Hartke: " ... this piece of legislation pass."

Novak: "How about the county janitors? Are they gonna get a..."

Hartke: "No, they're not..."

Novak: " ... stipend, maybe?"

Hartke: " ... elected officials."

Novak: "Okay. All right. Again, my question is this, there are a number of supervisors of assessments that are clerks of the board of review, however you wanna... whatever euphemism you want to use, that get a \$3500 stipend from the state. I don't have any problem giving the... with allowing the stipend for the supervisors of assessment, but if they're getting \$3500 now and they're gonna get \$6500 on top of that, doesn't that seem unfair?"

Hartke: "Absolutely, not. Because they have to pass a certain criteria..."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Novak: "Right."

Hartke: " ... at the Department of Revenue in order to receive that..."

Novak: "That..."

Hartke: "I don't think there's a county treasurer that says you have to be a CPA to get the stipend."

Novak: "You're right."

Hartke: "Okay."

Novak: "Okay. So..."

Hartke: "So, they don't want to discriminate against the supervisor..."

Novak: "Yes."

Hartke: " ... of assessment..."

Novak: "No."

Hartke: " ... not making them on an equal footing."

Novak: "Well, if they become a certi... if they become a CIAO, and I think there's one or two other requirements, they get the \$3500. Right?"

Hartke: "If you say so."

Novak: "Okay. No further questions. I think I know where my heart is."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Steve Davis."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Davis, S.: "Well, Representative Hartke, do we give these stipends to the county sheriffs?"

Hartke: "Yes, we do."

Davis, S.: "County treasurers?"

Hartke: "Yes, we do."

Davis, S.: "County recorder of deeds?"

Hartke: "County recorder of deeds and clerks. Yes, we do."

Davis, S.: "Circuit clerks?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Hartke: "Yes, we do."

Davis, S.: "County coroner? County coroners?"

Hartke: "Coroner. Yes, we do."

Davis, S.: "All elected officials?"

Hartke: "It's my understanding that this is the last group of elected county officials that we do not provide a stipend for the State of Illinois."

Davis, S.: "But I know in my county we don't elect the county supervisor of assessments."

Hartke: "You appoint..."

Davis, S.: "Are they elected in certain counties in the State of Illinois?"

Hartke: "Yes, they are."

Davis, S.: "By the voters in the state?"

Hartke: "By the voters of the county."

Davis, S.: "And what about the county supervisors of assessment who are appointed by the county board chairman?"

Hartke: "They will receive this stipend as well."

Davis, S.: "So, they're gonna get 60... Is the \$6500 figure the same that every other elected county official..."

Hartke: "Yes, yes, it is. Regardless of the size of the county."

Davis, S.: "This does not include local township assessors, does it?"

Hartke: "No, it does not."

Davis, S.: "Are they next?"

Hartke: "No. Emphatically."

Davis, S.: "Let me ask you this, Representative Hartke. How about county engineers?"

Hartke: "No."

Davis, S.: "Well, I have a problem with the Bill, I'll be hones with you, because our county engineers I know have asked for the same consideration."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Hartke: "County engineers..."

Davis, S.: "They have asked for the same consideration and have not received it. They are appointed by the county chairman with the consent of the county board. I know in Madison County they are appointed with consent of the... by the chairman and consent of the county board. I don't know that it's wise for the General Assembly to get into the business of giving stipends to appointed individuals 'cause if we give it to appointed supervisor of assessments then we're gonna have to give it to appointed highway commissioners, the appointed people that who are head of the 911 system and where does it quit? Does this affect Cook County at all?"

Hartke: "Yes, it does."

Davis, S.: "One person in Cook County, only one? One person in Cook County."

Hartke: "One person in Cook County."

Davis, S.: "Is it normal for the supervisor of assessment to also be the clerk of the county board of review? Does that happen..."

Hartke: "That is normally the case."

Davis, S.: " ... in every single county?"

Hartke: "Yes."

Davis, S.: "All 102 counties?"

Hartke: "It's my understanding."

Davis, S.: "And the job of clerk of the county board of review, who actually hires that position out? I mean, is that a hired position? The clerk of the county board of review, not the supervisor of assessments."

Hartke: "Representative Davis, I think that the clerk of the county board of review is the supervisor of assessment."

Davis, S.: "Do you think that... wouldn't... So, if they're on

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the ballot, they're on the ballot as the clerk of the county board of review or they're on the ballot as supervisor of assessments or... I'm just trying to get an explanation, honestly, Chuck, because I don't know... I wasn't aware that they were two separate positions."

Hartke: "They are not two separate positions. The supervisor of assessment acts as the clerk of the board of review. Steve, for your information, the county clerk is generally the secretary to the county board. Well, I'm just..."

Davis, S.: "I hate to oppose your Bill, Representative. I just think it's bad policy to start giving people, who in some counties are appointed to a position, a stipend from the State of Illinois, so I'm gonna oppose it. I'm sorry."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hartke to close."

Hartke: "Well, I just think in all fairness that we've done this before in the past and this is the last set of elected officials, appointed officials in the county, that we have not provided that stipend. The supervisor of assessment's position and the clerk of the board of review is probably one of the most important positions in the county. It... He makes sure that there's equalized assessment in the county, levies are done properly, and that all property's assessed equal, so that property taxes are paid fairly by all citizens. As clerk of the board of review, he has much more responsibility when there are appeals to take place. So, therefore, I think that the correct vote is a right vote to award this stipend to our last county officials."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is over (sic-open). Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes' and 43

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2263. Representative Winters."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2263, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2263 creates the Transportation Resources for Innovative Projects Act. It is designed to coordinate between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Transportation to access additional federal money through the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program. Several other states have accessed the JARC funds very substantially, more than Illinois has been able to. We're looking for some of the innovative ways that people can get to work where mass transit may, in fact, not work or we need some other alternative. Be happy to answer any questions on the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Hamos." Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. strong support of this legislation. I serve as the public transit subcommittee chair for the Committee Transportation and have also had a connection with the kinds of innovative projects that we're trying to do at the local level. These issues of how we get people from their homes to their jobs is never... is not always an easy function of building more rail lines or putting in more bus They really do require innovative solutions that routes. are designed by communities to serve the needs of particular employers. For example, in my community we have a hospital that is around-the-clock hospital, willing to

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

hire people, but the shift starts at 11 p.m. and the buses stop running at 10:30 p.m. In the State of Illinois, PACE... is a bus service up in our area that has secured a federal grant for innovative projects, but the state has never been part of the solution. And even the federal money requires a state match and requires somebody on the state level to really play a role and to do something to assist the local community efforts. This is an attempt to do that. And I do seek your favorable support."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Hoffman, would you like to rise in opposition?"

Hoffman: "Well, I need a point of clarification."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Ask your question. He'll yield."

Hoffman: "To the Sponsor. I favor the concept, Representative.

However, I remember... and I'm chairman of the committee and maybe I was busy, but I thought that this was supposed to be held on Second?"

Winters: "We've been trying to work with DHS and DOT to come at some compromise. We don't have the funds found yet, but we haven't been able to work at anything, so we decided to go ahead and run it. We talked to DOT and they have agreed to go ahead and run it."

Hoffman: "Well, that's all well and good and I'm not... I'm tellin' ya I voted for this in the past, I'll vote for it, but you made a commitment to a committee and there are Members of the committee..."

Winters: "I did."

Hoffman: "Hold on. Let me finish."

Winters: "Okay."

Hoffman: "There are Members of the committee and you sit in front of the committee and you made a commitment to some of the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

people on that committee, then make their votes based on that commitment. And I'm not tryin' to... If the commitments are no good around here, then we all should go home. And it's my understanding you committed to hold this on Second."

Winters: "I committed to hold it on Second until we talked to DOT to see if we could arrive at some agreement with 'em. We've already talked to 'em. We're gonna move it forward. If you would like me to hold it and hold an additional meeting with DOT, we can do that."

Hoffman: "Well, we got some time here. We've got two and a half weeks and I'm willing to work with ya and try and help, but I did it... One of the reasons that I think we called it for a vote is, you remember we were very, very rushed that day."

Winters: "Right."

Hoffman: "And I, as a favor to you, as a Representative asked."

Winters: "Let's pull it."

Hoffman: "So, I would just ask that we hold it."

Winters: "That's fine. And you can remove the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. So, Mr. Clerk, let's read House Bill 2994.

Representative Parke."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2994, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance producers. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Federal Government, last year, passed a Bill called the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act that said that they wanted to streamline and uniform the licensing of agents. This Bill repeals the current Illinois Insurance Producer law and replaces it with a new licensing law modeled after the

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

National Association of Insurance Commissioners Model Uniform Producer law while maintaining the position of Illinois' current producer law, not addressed by the NAIC model. The need for a multistate uniform and reciprocity system in producer licensing originated out of the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, which is GLBA, which seeks to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a framework for the affiliation of banks, security firms, insurance companies, and other financial services providers for the other purposes, including providing state flexibility and multistate insurance Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act requires that no more licensing. than three years after the date of enactment, which was November of 1999, at least a majority of the states must enact uniform agent licensing law and regulations, or have enacting reciprocity laws and regulations governing the licensing of nonresident agents. At least 29 states must enact such a law by November of year 2002. That will institute an efficient and streamlined reciprocity Addition to House Bill 2994, provides licensing process. for the licensing of nonresident producers and provides exemptions to the Illinois examination if the producer is holding a current license in another state. This conforms to the requirements of the federal GLBA which provides that in order for states to meet the uniform and reciprocity standards they cannot impose a licensing requirement on an otherwise qualified nonresident that would condition the producer's activities because of residence or place of Mr. Speaker, for the sake of legislative operation. intent, I would like to state that it is hereby stated for the purpose of legislative intent that pursuant to the provisions of House Bill 2994 that the general licensing

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

requirement for employees of an insurer or as an insurance producer who sells, solicits, or negotiates insurance shall not apply to an employee who simply responds to requests from existing policyholders on existing policies, as long as the employee is not directly compensated based on the sale or solicitation on negotiation of insurance. I also would like to call on Representative Osmond for further legislative intent."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Parke, does

House Bill 2994 represent the National Association of

Insurance Commissioners Model Licensing Act for insurance
producers?"

Parke: "Yes, it does."

again for Osmond: "Representative Parke, the purpose of legislative intent, Section 500-20, exceptions t.o licensing, specifically paragraph B-2 (sic-2 (b)) which addresses persons who enroll individuals into group plans. There's new language, not currently contained in the Illinois Producer Licensing statute which would also exempt persons who enroll individuals into group property and casualty insurance products. Is it the intent of this language to provide any exemption only for those persons who on behalf of an employer or association enroll their employees into group automobile insurance plans?"

Parke: "Yes."

Osmond: "Representative Parke, could this exemption be interpreted to allow an auto dealership or other similar entity to purchase group vehicle policies and then permit all of their salespersons to quote, 'enroll consumers who purchase an auto into this group vehicle policy without obtaining an individual producer's license?'"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Parke: "No. This exemption is intended to be narrowly interpreted for enrollment purposes. In this example you cite, those individuals would clearly meet or at least one of the three standards for licensure under the Bill. Selling, soliciting, or negotiating, and therefore, would have to obtain an individual producer license."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Parke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a collaboration for many months working with the Department of Insurance, working with the agency... the trial bar, the financial services industry, also, with the Professional Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois and the Illinois Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors. I bring this on the floor for your consideration to comply with the Federal Law that has been mandated on the states. And I stand ready to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Representative Black, do you wish to rise in opposition?"

Black: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, that kind of spirited debate just really gets my... I'm into it now. I tell you. That Tim Osmond can ask some tough questions, can't he? Whoa. Will the Sponsor of this legislation yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you ask your questions on the record?"

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No further questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Leitch, do you stand in opposition?"

Leitch: "I have a question."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Gentleman will yield."

Leitch: "The Gentleman yield?"

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Parke: "Yes."

Leitch: "Terry, a number of times we have problems with grandfathering. Is there any grandfathering under this licensure or is that an issue as it relates to the insurance agents under this change?"

Parke: "I'm sorry. I'm not sure I understand. Grandfathering, in what regards? This... For their licensing? For their licenses?"

Leitch: "Right."

Parke: "Oh, yeah. Whatever is in here, the agents have spent hundreds of hours workin' to make sure that their interests are protected by this and to make sure it's in compliance with the Federal Law. And so, no agent will lose his... they'll all be in the same pot that they are now."

Leitch: "So, we're not gonna have any of the older agents comin' in..."

Parke: "No, this does not affect them at all."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Parke: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 659."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 659, a Bill for an Act in relation to long-term care planning. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 659 is

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the Bill that creates the Long-Term Care Planning Strategy This Bill was debated at length in the Aging Committee. And what the Bill does, it establishes a committee of individuals knowledgeable in the associated with providing services to the elderly. And the committee shall develop strategies to maximize independence older adults in the home through awareness of alternatives to nursing homes. And it establishes a seniors agenda for independent living project in at least four counties of the state for the purpose of promoting community-based services for long-term in-home care. Rather than bore you with more details, I'll try to answer any questions. The Bill was, as I mentioned, debated quite a bit in Aging Committee and as far as I know, we have a consensus. And I don't know of any opposition to the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1918. Representative Biggins."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1918 deals with the process where a request for an exemption from property taxation has occurred and has been denied by the Department of Revenue.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Currently, the process to appeal this denial is 20-days. This Bill, House Bill 1918, extends that time frame to 60 days which would account for some occasions when those aggrieved taxpayers denied this exemption would be unavailable to meet the 20 day requirement. It also establishes, if needed, a hearing by the aggrieved party. I know that this Bill is supported by the Illinois State Bar Association. I don't know of any opposition. The Department of Revenue is neutral. And I'd be glad to answer any questions any Members may have."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2314. Representative Acevedo. Representative Acevedo, 2314."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2314, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2314 amends the Criminal Code of 1961, provides for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used in the commission of certain firearms and deadly weapons offenses, and used in the commission of certain offenses resulting in great bodily harm, severe and permanent disability or disfigurement. It also provides for the seizure of the vehicle if it is found to contain bomb-making materials. This passed out of the House last year with no problem. I hope to pass it again

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

this year."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Black." Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor

yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, we already have about 30 offenses for which you can lose a vehicle and I generally ask the same question. What if my automobile was used, with my permission, to a good friend of mine, I had no idea that they were going to go out and do drive-by shooting or an armed robbery or something. So the criminal, the people who actually committed the criminal act, could care less if the car is subject to forfeiture and sold at auction. But the owner of the car, who may very well be innocent of anything, even criminal intent, may find that his or her car has been seized by the police and doesn't have recourse to get it back. Is there any protection in your Bill for such a case?"

Acevedo: "Yeah. If you read on page 2, line 31, it starts, 'if the spouse of the owner of a vehicle seized for violation of subdivision of the Illinois Vehicle Code of Section 9-3 of this Code makes a showing that the vehicle seized is the only source of transportation and it is determined that financial hardship to the family as a result of seizure outweighs the benefit to the state from the seizure, the vehicle may be forfeited to the spouse or family member and the title of the vehicle shall be transferred to the spouse or family member who is properly licensed.'"

Black: "All right. It covers spouse and family member. What if somebody just lets 'em borrow a car? I mean, they're just friends. You know, if you and I've known each other for a few years, you come to me and say, I need to borrow your

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

I need to run out to the grocery store. And I say, sure that'd be fine. And so you take my car and either while there or on your way back, you discharge a firearm from the car. Let's say road rage or whatever. If I read the Bill, then my car may be subject to forfeiture and I may lose my car simply because I, as a good neighbor or a friend of yours, said you can use my car, then you committed an unlawful act. I'm not sure I should have to lose my car because of your action. I mean, it says 'spouse and family member' and that's fine and I don't wanna... I, basically, support your Bill. I just think that when we seize an asset there should be ample due process so that an innocent party who acted in good faith doesn't end up in the court system losing a \$20,000 automobile because his friend or her friend did a foolish act while they were using the car with the permission of the owner."

Acevedo: "Representative, I think with all intentions the legislation does state that if it is the only source of transportation and it shows financial hardship to the family, I believe you will be able to reclaim your vehicle."

Black: "Well, I'll defer to your judgement, 'cause I know in the city... at least you have public transportation, but still in all, a vehicle is a very important part of most peoples' lives. And if you think there is adequate due process protection, that's fine and I'll vote for the Bill. But I would hope that you've talk to some of the Cook County state's attorneys people or law enforcement officers to make sure that a nonfamily member also has due process to protect his or her vehicle which may be the largest investment they have. I just hate to see somebody lose a

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

car, lose transportation to work, because one of their friends did something stupid. I'd much rather go after the friend, rather than take the car of an innocent third party. And I think, obviously, that would not be your intent. So, if you tell me that you think there's adequate due process protection, that's fine, I'll accept that. And I appreciate your response."

Acevedo: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black are you seeking recognition?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Black: "It's been called to my attention by my district office and I'm sure many of you have received the same letter. Utility companies in Illinois will begin utility disconnects for those people in arrearage, who fell behind this winter. I'm concerned that we have our federal tax money for the low-income heating assistance program that have come back from Washington, it's in the supplemental, House Bill 371. And I don't know what the intent of the Chair is. I know there's a disagreement between the House and the Senate on the supplemental, but I would ask the Chair to consider... One of the two chambers needs to take some action. There is a over a hundred million dollars in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the LIHEAP account. Now, this is tax money, I grant you, it isn't free money. But if we don't free up this money to these social service agencies in a matter of days, there are going to be tens of thousands of people who will have no electricity by this time, conceivably, by this time next And I know the differences between the two chambers are real and I know that there have been some harsh words But in all due respect to both chambers, I would spoken. hope that the Speaker and the President of the Senate could at least work out something so that the supplemental, at least as it applies to LIHEAP, can get on the Governor's desk because if it doesn't, all of you... all of us in this chamber are going to be besieged in less than ten days by people whose power have been cut off and many of those could be avoided if we could free up the LIHEAP money, Speaker, and I would hope that we seriously try to work something out between the two chambers. If all we can agree on is the LIHEAP money, that at least is a necessary step that I think we need to make in the very near future."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative. I think most of us agree with your position on that issue. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 183 for Representative Beaubien."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 183, a Bill for an Act regarding taxes.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill of somewhat limited application. It deals with overlapping taxing districts between Cook County and the surrounding suburbs, dealing with the issue of apportionment. And what it does is it creates a procedure and methodology for cooperation between the courts and county clerks in remediating an overextension or underextension of taxes in

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

an overlapping taxing body when this month's extension was caused by the use of a prior certified percentage. This Bill is neutral with the Department of Revenue. I've spoken with the clerk of Cook County who's neutral on the Bill and also, the... Jim Houlihan in Cook County and his office also. This is a relatively technical Bill and it provides for the procedures for remediating situations where they've either underassessed or overassessed taxes when the courts become involved. And there are a couple court cases out there that would be affected by this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Monique Davis, we're gonna call House Bill 2140. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2140, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: " ... Mr. Speaker. This Bill provides that it is a petty offense and a fine of \$500 is imposed for a person to knowingly publish or cause to be published in an advertisement or telephone directory without the written consent of the owner of the business. It provides that it's a defense to a violation of this Section that the person who publishes the advertisement does not get the approval of the person whose name is being advertised."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? And on that question, Representative Cross is recognized."

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

 Representative, am I reading this correctly, that from now on whenever any ad gets placed in a yellow pages or in a telephone book there has to be a written..."
- Davis, M.: "I'm sorry. I can't understand what you're saying."
- Cross: "Does there have to be a written document every time someone puts an ad in the paper or yel... telephone directory?"
- Davis, M.: "You're saying, does there have to be written document?"
- Cross: "I'm asking..."
- Davis, M.: "Well, this Bill says that you have to make some attempt to get the approval of the person whose name and phone number you're putting in your advertisement."
- Cross: "So, if I've had an ad in the yellow pages or the telephone directory for the last 20 years and I don't send in a written request this year to the telephone company, there's a good... my ad's not gonna get in there?"
- Davis, M.: "Your ad'll be in, it's fine. You have no problem.

 But if they put your ad in and they put the wrong address and the wrong phone number, then you might want to charge them..."
- Cross: "But you're sayin' there's gotta be written ad and if I'm

 the phone company and I don't get a written request from

 Tom Cross or whomever, they're not gonna put it in."
- Davis, M.: "Most phone companies or businesses request the approval through a fax or a phone call. It doesn't have to be written. Most people make some effort to call you or your office or the business and to make sure the information being published is accurate."
- Cross: "It is... Your Bill is very specific. It's unlawful to knowingly publish or cause to be published in a telephone

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- directory an advertisement without the written consent of the owner of the business. Every owner in the State of Illinois that wants to put an ad in a telephone directory has gotta give written consent from here on out. I'm on page 2."
- Davis, M.: "I see where it says advertisement. It gives you the definition. It tells you the definition of a business.

 Now, where are you reading?"
- Cross: "I'm on page 2 of your Bill, line 4, after the... when you're through with the definitions, paragraph (b)."
- Davis, M.: "We're... I'm sorry. We're not saying it has to be written, but we are saying it's an affirmative defense if they show they tried to contact you and yet, the information in the advertisement was incorrect. Can I explain to you what the intent is?"

Cross: "Sure."

- Davis, M.: "Okay, Representative, there were... there is, as you know, a number of new telephone companies. Some of them are putting out, as old phone companies are, new telephone directories, small ones in communities, perhaps, with just the community information. And one of them did not bother to check information and incorrectly listed two elected officials with incorrect addresses and incorrect phone numbers. So, this Bill is merely asking that if you print a directory and you are not sure of your information, make some attempt to have validity to the address of the person or the phone number of the person."
- Cross: "I'm tryin... Let's forget the defense section just for a moment, Representative. You have now... you now have an obligation or put an obligation on every business owner in the State of Illinois, as well as every company that produces a telephone directory, to put... to have a written

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

consent form from every business owner in the state, that's the small business owner, that's the large business owner. That is gonna create an awful lot of paperwork and I would hate for someone to not gettin' into a telephone directory because the phone company didn't get their written consent."

Davis, M.: "Representative..."

Cross: "That's the problem, I think, you're gonna have."

Davis, M.: "Representative, currently, most telephone companies or advertisers send something to your office or the business's office for confirmation on the information they wish to provide."

Cross: "Let me ask you this..."

Davis, M.: "They already... they already do this, most of them do. They already request that you either signature or fax backed or maybe..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross, could you bring your questioning to a close, please?"

Cross: "Well, if they do that already, why are we doin' the Bill?"

Davis, M.: "Because there's no... currently, there's no offense if they don't. So, we're sayin' for that few who don't or those new companies who don't, they might commit an offense which could cause them to have to pay \$500."

Cross: "All right. Well then now, that's another question. I'll hurry up, with respect to the Chair. Who's gonna pay the \$500? Is it the person that owns the company, 'cause your Bill is not at all... is not clear at all as to who's gonna be charged? And I'm trying to envision the State's Attorneys Office in Cook County or the other 101 counties in the State of Illinois, when they're trying to prepare an indictment, because if this happens and we've got literally

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- thousands of businesses in the State of Illinois and all of 'em want to come to the State's Attorneys Office and say, I think it's time we charged this phone company. Who do we charge? Do we charge the owner? 'Cause do we charge one of the clerks?"
- Davis, M.: "You charge the publisher of the publication."
- Cross: "It doesn't say that in your Bill. And that's the problem. I think you could make an argument. If I was a defense attorney, I could make..."
- Davis, M.: "Excuse me, on... I think, it's Section (d). It says,

 'it is a defense to the violation of this Section that the

 purpose who... the person who published the advertisement

 or caused the advertisement to be published.' So, that

 tells us who will be..."
- Cross: "Well, who caused it? Did the clerk cause it? Did the telephone..."
- Davis, M.: "Well, let me give you an example. Suppose I take your picture and I say this is Representative Cross and he represents blank district and his address is 1234 West 95th Street in Chicago, Illinois. His phone number is 773-45... whatever 9700. And that's what I publish about you."
- Cross: "So, all right. What about it?"
- Davis, M.: "So, this Bill says, you will have a remedy if that happens to you. If that happens to you, Representative, the remedy that you have is the publisher of this publication has committed a criminal offense and they can be charged a fine of \$500."
- Cross: "I..."
- Davis, M.: "And the company can have a defense that they tried to reach you or they didn't try to reach you."
- Cross: "All right. To the Bill. And thank you, Representative.

 I would encourage everybody to take a long look at this.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

You are asking... You're creating an offense that's gonna be impossible to prosecute. You're putting a burden on small business and large business owners around the state, a burden that is gonna... it's frankly, gonna be very difficult Bill to try to enforce. And it's gonna be burden that I suspect most of our small business owners are not gonna wanna have to try to work with. And I gotta tell ya, I sure would believe the phone companies, as well, would not like to see this Bill passed. It may have good intentions, but it is poorly drafted and I would strongly suggest that you look at it before you vote on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Davis to close."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Repre... I mean, Mr. Speaker. I think it's so important that when people advertise your name, your likeness, your phone number, your address, that they make an attempt to make certain this is accurate. Surely, if they have been using this information for years and it hasn't changed, you don't have a problem. But if you have a business and someone determines to put the incorrect address, the incorrect phone number, they can cause you a great deal of harm. And this Bill is simply an attempt to address that which has actually occurred and I just ask that you will give this vote... this a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes' and 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 1958."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1958, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1958 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code by adding the offense of vehicular assault as a Class III felony and negligent driving as a Class B misdemeanor or a Class A misdemeanor on a second offense. It amends the Criminal Code of 1961 by changing the offense of reckless homicide from a Class III to a Class II felony and it creates a statutory offense for road rage. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 269."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 269, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 269 brings the... or allows the winemaker to manufacture up to a hundred thousand gallons. Current, the law states he can manufacture 50 thousand gallons. And it also allows him to have two other businesses besides the original one in Roselle. This is a constituent of mine. There is no opposition. It's agreed to. And I would just ask for its favorable passage."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Madison, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will yield."

Hoffman: "Representative, this has to do with wine and wine makers. Is that right?"

Wojcik: "Correct."

Hoffman: "And, essentially, what we're saying here is that we're increasing the amount from 50 thousand gallons to a hundred thousand gallons that you can make in any given year is... and you can sell that much on your premises? Is that what we're saying?"

Wojcik: "Correct."

Hoffman: "Now, I saw... I don't know if you've seen this, but there's this Rathskellar legislative dining room menu.

Have you seen this?"

Wojcik: "You want me to serve Roselle wine with that?"

Hoffman: "Yeah, we have a Kay Wojcik salad and I was wondering is there gonna be a Kay Wojcik wine that's gonna go with the Kay Wojcik salad, down in the Rathskellar?"

Wojcik: "A very good Illinois Vidal Blanc would go with that, from the Alto Pass Region."

Hoffman: "Is that that dandelion wine or what kind of wine are you talking about?"

Wojcik: "Actually, it's Annie... It's Boone's."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

700."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 700, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 700 amends the Wildlife Code. Basically, it also provides definitions of shareholders as well as members of a LLC, limited liability corporation. The essence of this Bill is to put members of a LLC that own farmland on the same parity as shareholders of a corporation that owns farmland. As a shareholder of a corporation those individuals are eligible for landowners permits. Members of LLCs are not included in the legislative language that was passed back in 1986 and this puts landowners permits... or LLC members on the same category as shareholders that own farm property as far as obtaining landowners permits for deer hunting. So with that, I'd be glad to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Hannig: "On that question, Representative Hartke is recognized."

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Hartke: "Representative Lawfer, I think I understood... Let's say that the corporation just owns 40 acres."

Lawfer: "That's right. If..."

Hartke: "If they just had 40 acres, how many permits would they be allowed?"

Lawfer: "One. That..."

Hartke: "One. If they had a hundred and twenty acres..."

Lawfer: "They're allowed one permit for every 40 acres up to..."

Hartke: "One for every 40 acres."

Lawfer: "Up to a total, I believe, of 15 in one corporation."

Hartke: "So, 15 times 40 is 600 acres. If he owned a thousand,

30th Legislative Day they would be allowed 15 permits." March 21, 2001

Lawfer: "I believe you're right, yes."

Hartke: "What if there were only four members that owned a corporation?"

Lawfer: "They..."

Hartke: "They would still be allowed 15 permits."

Lawfer: "No. If there's only four shareholders of a corporation, there would only be four permits allowed."

Hartke: "All right. How would you determine which of the... say 60 owners of 600 acres, who would get the permit? So there are 60 equal partners in the corporation."

Lawfer: "I think that there would still only be 15 issued to that."

Hartke: "Yes, but which of the 15 of the 60 owners would be allowed to get the permit?"

Lawfer: "Well, I..."

Hartke: "First come, first served?"

Lawfer: "Well, we're not changing that, so I don't know. I assume it'd be the first 15, so... But that's, you know, been current law. We're not changing..."

Hartke: "Would the president of the corporation get it first and then the secretary and then the recording treasurer and you know, down the pecking order?"

Lawfer: "If they wanted to be hunters, that probably would be the way it is."

Hartke: "You don't address that in this legislation?"

Lawfer: "No. All we do is make members of an LLC on the same basis as stockholders of a corporation."

Hartke: "Okay. I don't disagree with the legislation. I... How many extra permits will this put into the system every year?"

Lawfer: "Probably not a lot. If I remember, there was, you know,

- 30th Legislative Day

 several hundred thousand permits issued. I believe, DNR

 testified that there were probably 6 or 7 hundred landowner

 permits issued to corporation or corporation shareholders."
- Hartke: "So, that will allow those owners or people who have their farms in partnerships or in incorporated to apply for a landowner's permit the same as individual landowners. Is that correct?"
- Lawfer: "I believe that partnerships and so on, were already covered on this. This only adds LLC, limited liability corporations and..."
- Hartke: "All right. Thank you very much. Not a bad piece."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

 Representative Franks, do you rise in opposition?"
- Franks: "I want to ask a question of the Sponsor, if I may, if he'll yield."
- Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."
- Franks: "Representative Lawfer, I understand what you're trying to do here. I've got some constituents who have asked me about this very issue. But what I see your Bill lacks and I didn't know if anybody had talked to you about, what happens if they are a beneficial owner of a land trust? Presently, they cannot get those permits. Has anyone talked to you about that issue?"
- Lawfer: "As far as land trusts, no, Representative, nobody has, no."
- Franks: "Because I think those people should be able to get the licenses, as well. Would you be willing to move this to Second so we can amend this Bill to include those people?"
- Lawfer: "My constituent, of course, is a member of an LLC in JoDaviess County and he's asked that we move this forward in this regard. So, I would like to move this Bill forward in that regard. If you would like to enter a Bill that

- 30th Legislative Day

 March 21, 2001

 would address the trusts then I'll be glad to help you on
 that."
- Franks: "Representative, I'm not trying to stop it. I know we have two and a half weeks. I'd just like to make it a better Bill, so it'd be more encompassing to all those people that are left out, because we're gonna have to do more legislation then. If that's not something that you want to do, I'll talk to a Senate Sponsor. Have you chosen a Senate Sponsor?"
- Lawfer: "No, I haven't, but I think that Senator Sieben, who represents my area, will probably be picking this up. But I guess I don't understand where a land trust would fit in this."
- Franks: "Well, the Act, as I read it, has to do with getting permits for hunting, correct? And you're allowing people who are owner... or beneficial owners of the land through an LLC to be able to hunt, correct?"
- Lawfer: "Well, if they were a member of a trust and owned farmland, I think they would be eligible already."
- Franks: "They're not. Right now, if you're a benefic... if you're a beneficiary of the land trust, you can't get... you are not able to get those permits to hunt. The only reason I know this because I have a constituent in Richmond, a Mr. May, who's talked to me about this very issue. And this is the first I learned of your Bill."
- Lawfer: "Okay. I was not familiar with your issue there,

 Representative."
- Franks: "Would you be willing to work with me with the Senate Sponsor to put a friendly Amendment on this Bill to include beneficiaries of land trusts?"
- Lawfer: "I will not make a commitment in that regards right now because... but on the other hand, a lot of this definition

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

then, who a stockholder, who a member was, required considerable time from DNR to work up very, very specific aspects of here, so that this was closely controlled because there was some opposition to expanding this to a lot of people. This does not, in that regard. I'm not sure what your efforts in regards to a trust would open up."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. question, there 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For the Ladies here today, Representative Wojcik has found some money in the ladies' restroom. So if you have lost some and would like to come and talk to her about that. Seriously, if you've lost some money in the ladies room, Representative Wojcik has found Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 889. Representative McAuliffe."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 889, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 889 provides that no action would be brought against a professional land surveyor to recover damages under specified circumstances more than four years after the person claiming damages actually knows or should have known of the conduct giving rise to the action. It also provides that no such action may be brought if ten

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

years have elapsed from the time of the conduct giving rise to this action. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill that we've negotiated over the last two years between the land surveyors and Illinois trial lawyers. It puts land surveyors in this state on the same par as civil engineers, architects, under liability questions and statute of limitations. It's an Agreed Bill and I would ask for your favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1929 for Representative Mulligan."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1929, a Bill for an Act in relation to child care. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1929 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. In the provisions concerning child care coverage from the Department of Public Aid, it provides that the threshold for a family's eligibility for assistance shall be at least 55% of the then current state median income for similar families."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion?"

Mulligan: "Well, let me fin..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me. Go ahead, Representative."

Mulligan: "Okay. In 1999 Representative Doug Scott carried House

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Bill 1718 which would have updated the state median income to current figures. At that time, the cost estimate to catch up with the lost time was about \$14 million. Bill did not pass. Today the estimate cost to catch up and determine eligibility based on the current state median is approximately 29 to \$31 million. Remember that this is four years worth of expenses. Each year fail to do this the cost grows. The Illinois Department of the Human Services can update income eligibility administratively and does not need legislation to do so. Thus far, they have been unwilling to do so based on cost. The reality, again, is that the longer they wait the more expensive it becomes. Families regularly call and ask what they can do to continue their eligibility with the program. The only solution is to turn down raises and promotions in order to continue their eligibility with the program. most people the slight hourly raise will not make up for their added child care costs. A woman who makes \$9.37 an hour is at the income limit to remain eligible for subsidized child care. What happens is she cannot even accept a 1% increase and what happens is over the long haul instead of helping them they get further and further So if you have a child that you start out turning behind. down raises that's a year old and you wait 'til they're in school, when they're in school and you don't have to pay for subsidized day care, that's the time the family can once again become solvent. If she turns down raises for four years, she's then further behind, because in order to maintain her child care, which would be much more than her raise if she loses the subsidy, she keeps turning down a raise or she moves back home. Therefore, her regular income at the end of that time is behind not only by what

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

it cost of her child care, but behind for the raises that she turned down for probably the past four years in order to maintain the subsidy. This is something that the state must do. We cannot let it go. Each year that we let it go... I mean, how would you like to base what you're doing with your salary on a 1997 income? I think this is a very important Bill. We've let this go for a while. I think it's important that we support this and that we get this Bill out of the House so that we can at least negotiate how we can continue to work on this until we currently arrive at using a current state median income in order for the people that need it to have subsidized child care. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

Does anyone stand in opposition? Representative Lyons, no.

Representative McCarthy, do you stand in opposition?

Representative McCarthy. This is on Short Debate. Do you stand in opposition? Recognize Representative McCarthy, please."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Do you just have a question?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Sponsor will yield."

McCarthy: "Representative, the... our analysis speaks about the fact that the current law or the Department rule is that they're trying to do this for people up to 50% of the income level, but it doesn't give us any numbers as how successful they are at that. Do you know what their current allotment in the budget allows them to do now?"

Mulligan: "What they're currently doing is the current budget allotment is based on the 1997 state median income. And then they did in 1998 they took the state median income 50%

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

with a 10% disregard. What the proposal in this Bill would do would be move it to a current state median income and do it at 55% which would be less than what it would be if we did it at 50% with a 10% disregard. That is probably in the budget for right now, although we got an increase in federal money of \$39.5 million which the Department said they would add originally on top of the budget, instead they replaced it with GRF. So, I mean, there's some controversy over doing this. And when Representative Scott carried the Bill, it was only 14 million in '99, now it's up to 27... 31. So, I mean, if we keep on letting it go, we're never gonna get caught up. So at some point, I think, we need to start moving it, at least incrementally, 'til at some date certain we have it at the current state median income and that it automatically stays with each year's state median income."

McCarthy: "Okay and the other question is, are there current medians set for different size families? It's not just one median is it?"

Mulligan: "Yes. There's different sizes. It goes from...

depending on how many there are per family. There's two,

family of three, family of four, family of five..."

McCarthy: "Okay. Could you tell me, just for my information, is the family of four, is that separated to like a parent with three dependents as opposed to maybe two parents and two dependents or is it just a family of four?"

Mulligan: "It doesn't matter. It could be a family of four, so if..."

McCarthy: "So, it's the same income for or..."

Mulligan: "Yeah."

McCarthy: " ... the same median income thing is set?"

Mulligan: "Right."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

McCarthy: "And do you... Finally, do you know what percent of the people we're being able to address today with the 50%?"

Mulligan: "I'm sorry, say again?"

McCarthy: "Right now it says we're supposed to be doing this up to people 50% of that medium (sic-median) income? Do you know how much of that target audience we're hitting today with the current budget?"

Mulligan: "I can't hear you. I can't understand what you're saying."

McCarthy: "There's so much noise in here I have a hard time hearing myself, so... Right now, we have a target of 50% of the family median income, correct?"

Mulligan: "It's..."

McCarthy: "Do you know if we're meeting that need today?"

Mulligan: "It's 50% of the state median income plus a 10% disregard, which is confusing to figure out. So, those people that are targeted are served and it would be like what I explained. A family of four could make up, with the adjustment, could make \$25,975 in order to be eligible. If they make over 25,975, they would become ineligible. It's not even expanding it on a sliding scale, which a lot of people would accept. They just lose it at that point if they go over it. So then they may be paying a hundred and thirty four dollars a month for child care and it'll go up to \$540, so a small raise certainly does not cover that and it's a disincentive for people to do that."

McCarthy: "I thank you for your answers and I thank you for your patience in trying to hear the questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Does anyone speak in opposition? There being no one is opposition, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2247. Representative McAuliffe."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2247, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire inspectors. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2247 amends the Peace Officer Fire Investigation Act. Provides that a badge, different from a badge issued to peace officers may be authorized by the office of the State Fire Marshall for the use of fire prevention inspectors employed by that office. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2378 for Representative Biggins."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again. House Bill 2378 helps the Cook County assessor assume the same opportunities and administrative abilities as other assessors in the major Cook... Chicagoland area. It is... provides that in Cook County,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

in this case, the assessor needs to increase an assessment in a particular class of property in any township or assessment district notice may be given by publication instead of by direct mail. Now, this does not mean that in any general reassessment triennial the assessor will still be required to mail notices to each individual taxpayer as under the current law. But this Bill does permit him to, by publication, list those changes in a newspaper in the local community advising of any changes in assessment. This currently is the practice in the collar counties and has resulted in savings of several hundred thousand dollars in mailing fees and there has been no particular..."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion?"

Biggins: "... from the assess..."

Speaker Hannig: "There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, would you like to call House Bill 2294? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2294, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is House Bill 2294. It amends the Criminal Code of 1961. It provides that a person commits the offense of aggravated assault when he or she, while in a motor vehicle upon a public highway, knowingly displays a firearm to a person in another motor vehicle. This was brought to us by the State's Attorney of

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

DuPage County in order to fight the road rage in Illinois today. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2412."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2412, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winkel."

- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2412 amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. This Bill would authorize the sale and delivery of beer in Memorial Stadium on the campus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign during games in which the Chicago Bears are playing there during the renovation of Soldier Field. Also, there's an Amendment to the Bill. So, this is House Bill 2412 as amended and it would authorize the sale of alcohol at the Forest Preserve District in Cook County. I'd be glad to take any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 2412. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question... Excuse me, Representative Mulligan. The Lady does not wish to answer... ask any questions. So, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last call. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 3

- 30th Legislative Day

 March 21, 2001

 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a

 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

 Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 909?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 909 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1000?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1000 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2564?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2564 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 2221?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2221 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 2046?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2046 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 2315?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2315 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 of House Bill 1769?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1769 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. And what is the status, Mr. Clerk, of House Bill 3262?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3262 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. And Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 661?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 661 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 241?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 241 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 3078?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3078 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 1898? 1848."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1848 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. If anyone has a Bill that's on Third Reading that needs to be amended and they wish to return it to Second Reading at this time, they need to come

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- to the podium and give us a list. Representative Mitchell, for..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I did go to the front and ask that House Bill 2221 be put..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, we returned that."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, if you have a Bill that needs to be returned, come to the podium and give us your list and we'll work with you on that. Mr. Clerk, do you have any Committee Reports?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 21, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Amendment #2 to House Bill 23, Amendment #2 to House Bill 279, Amendment #2 to House Bill 629, Amendment #4 to House Bill 646, Amendment #2 to House Bill 1920, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2556, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3128, and Amendment #1 to House Bill 3284."
- Speaker Hannig: "For those Bills that the Rules Committee have sent Amendments directly to the floor, we're going to go through that list at this time for your consideration, so House Bill 23. Representative Feigenholtz. Is the Lady in the chamber? The Lady's not in the chamber. House Bill 279, Representative Burke. The Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Fowler on House Bill 629. The Amendment's on the floor, Representative. Do you wish to call the Bill? Okay. Representative Feigenholtz has returned. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 23."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 23, a Bill for an Act concerning children's health care. Second Reading of this House Bill.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is really more of a technical Amendment. This is language the Department of Public Aid worked on with the advocates of this legislation, so that it was consistent with the KidCare language and it allowed other items in the Bill to be promulgated by Department rule."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She will yield."

Parke: "Representative, did you say this is in a working on... with the Department of Public Aid?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Parke: "Have they removed their objection to this Bill now that this Amendment is on?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Parke, this Bill is subject to appropriation. I think that philosophically the Department doesn't have any opposition to the Bill. It really becomes a budget issue, but they wanted to make sure that the language in the Bill was consistent with what we already have in KidCare language and also wanted to leave a few items to administrative rule. But philosophically they're not opposed to this Bill. It just becomes a budget issue and we'd like to move this to the Senate to see how we can negotiate this very important measure into the budget."

Parke: "And this Amendment is just a technical for the most part?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Parke: "Okay, thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lou Jones on House Bill 1920. Is the Lady prepared? Out of the record. Representative Osmond on House Bill 2556. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2556, a Bill for an Act concerning insurers. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Osmond, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a technical change to the Bill. It simply exempts corporations who are listed on the New York Stock Exchange from complying with the language in the Bill in that by virtue of being on Stock Exchange they're already in compliance with regards to directorships. This is at the suggestion of the Department of Insurance and it's one of their initiatives."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Boland, are you prepared on House Bill 3284? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3284, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

 Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

 Representative Boland, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Boland."
- Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a technical one, doesn't make any substantive change. Simply makes the language of the interlock condition in the bond Section the same as it is in the supervision Section."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1776?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1776 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order... I'm sorry, did you say Second Reading? Okay. Then it shall remain on Second Reading. And what is the status of House Bill 152?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 152 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Would you return that to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. And Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 276?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 276 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Going to the Order of House Bills-Second Reading and we're gonna try to find those Bills that don't have requests for fiscal notes and other things that would hold them up, in any case, and see if

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- there's a need by the Sponsor to move them to Third. So, we'll start right on the front end on House Bill 5 for Representative Daniels. Can anyone gives us an indication whether we should move forward on that? Out of the record. Okay. Representative Jones has returned and we're going to go back to that Order of Business for a second. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1920."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act regarding education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Connie Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Howard on the Amendment #1."
- Howard: "Yes. I would like to have that Amendment tabled."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. That Amendment is withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lou Jones, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jones."
- Jones, L.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I mean, Mr. Speaker.

 Amendment 2 simply deletes 'private' for private schools and it also states that it's subject to specific appropriations because there is no appropriations right now attached to the Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed. A fiscal note has been requested on the Bill as amended and has not been filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Jones, you'll have to file

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

a fiscal note to move the Bill to Third. So, the Bill remains on the Order of Second Reading. Returning to the Calendar, House Bill 26. Representative Black, would you like to move that Bill? House Bill 26, on the Order of Second. Short Debate. Would you like to move that? Representative Black, wou..."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. I thought that
Bill was shelled in committee. I think the Bill's a shell
Bill. Not at my request, but it was my understanding that
it got out of committee after it was shelled."

Speaker Hannig: "So, would you like to move it from Second to

Third, is the question at this time? Or do you want to...

Do you wish it to remain on Second for an Amendment?"

Black: "No, let's just pass it."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Black: "On a voice vote if we could. All those in favor 'aye'; opposed. 'Ayes' have it. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 26?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 26, a Bill for an Act to amend the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act of 1993. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Black, you also have House Bill 144 on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Turner on House Bill 151. Out of the record. Representative Schoenberg on House Bill 131. Would you like to read the Bill, Representative? Move it from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Jones on House Bill 163. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Okay. Would you like to move the Bill from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 163, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Petroleum Education and Marketing Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Black, you have House Bill 166. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on House Bill 176. Representative Hoffman, I'm sorry I didn't see it. Did you want to move it? No. Out of the record. Representative Lang on House Bill 84. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 84, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 simply deletes one Section of this Bill that is superfluous and was unnecessary. And I would ask for your adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative O'Connor on House Bill 225. Out of the record. Representative Righter on 230, House Bill 230. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 230, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative O'Connor on House Bill 231. Out of the record. Representative Flowers on House Bill 236. Out of the record. 242, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. 264, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. Representative Tom Ryder on House Bill Could someone give us a indication on House Bill 375 for Representative Tom Ryder. Out of the record. 389, Representative Johnson. Out of the record. Representative Howard on House Bill 300. Would you like to move that? Out of the record. How about Representative Johnson, we had... okay. Representative Fritchey on House Bill 397. Would you like to move that to Third? Out of House Bill 446, Representative Wirsing. record. Representative Wirsing, 446. Would you like to move it to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 446, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Feigenholtz. Could you take it out of the record, perhaps, until Representative Feigenholtz comes on the floor? Okay. Out of the record. We'll try to get back to it. House Bill Representative Leitch. The Gentleman wish to move that Okay. Out of the record. Representative Scott on House Bill 505. Out of the record. Representative Dart on 506. Out of the record. Representative Turner on 512. Representative Turner. Out of the record. Representative on House Bill 521. Okay. Out of the record. May Representative Mautino on House Bill 524. Out of the Representative Righter on House Bill 544. record. out of the record. Representative Mitchell, Bill Mitchell

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

on House Bill 546. Representative Mitchell, would you like to move the Bill? Representative Bill Mitchell. Representative Bill Mitchell, would you like to move this to Third? Out of the record. Representative Franks on House Bill 570. Would you like to move the Bill? Out of the record. Representative Currie, Barbara Currie. Out of the record. Representative O'Connor on House Bill 579. Out of the record. And 580? Okay, out of the record. Representative Lang on 582. Out of the record. 591, Representative. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 591, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #1 was prepared in agreement with the committee and the bankers and lawyers regarding their responsibilities for reporting elder abuse. This is an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "The same explanation."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. How about Representative Lang on 593? Would you like to move that? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, has the Amendment on 593 come out of committee?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, are there any... Amendments..."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been referred to committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, the Bill's still in committee... or the Amendment. So, out of the record. 596. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 596, a Bill for an Act in relation to elderly persons and persons with disabilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is an Agreed

 Amendment that I don't believe there was any opposition in

 committee. And I would ask your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Lang: "Same explanation, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Being none, all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Same explanation."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Dart on House Bill 599. Out of the record. Representative Slone on 614. Representative Slone, would you like us to move 614? 604. Out of the record. House Bill 618, sorry, 604. Representative Jones, John Jones. Representative Jones, John Jones. The Gentleman's in the back in discussion with Harold Murphy. And we'll take it out of the record. Representative Fowler on House Bill 629. Would you like to move that? Out of the record. Representative Coulson on Representative Coulson. Out of the record. Representative O'Brien on 633. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Morrow. Out of the record. Representative Lindner. Representative Lindner on House Bill 646. you like to call the...? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Durkin on House Bill 671. Representative Durkin. Out of the record. Representative Osmond on House Bill 711. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Schoenberg on 732. Would you like that to move? Out of the record. 742, Representative Mautino. Representative Leitch on 760. Out of the record. The Gentleman wish to move that? Out of the record. Representative Howard on House Bill 762. Representative Connie Howard. Out of the record. Representative Black. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, Representative Black."

Black: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

Black: "Actually, it's a point of personal privilege."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Black: "Yes. You know, one of the great things about working here is working with staff on both sides of the aisle. They're very good people, they work very long hours, often for far too little pay. But I just want you to welcome with me and wish a happy birthday to a young man on our side of the aisle, Frank Aloysius J. Straus, who turns... I think he turned 23 today. Happy birthday, Frank."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, shall we call the Bill?

House Bill 770. Move it from Sec..."

Black: "What Bill is that?"

Speaker Hannig: " ... from Second to Third. And..."

Black: "I think Mr. Uhe and I need to talk to about that before we call that Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Cross on House Bill 776. Representative Cross. Out of the record. Representative Joseph Lyons on 778. Out of the record. Representative Scully. Representative Scully. Representative Scully on House Bill Do you want us to move that from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Mautino on House Bill Representative Mautino. Frank Mautino on House Bill 800. Would you like us to move that Bill? Out of the Representative Mathias on House Bill 904. Out of record. the record. Representative Hamos on 911. Out of the Excuse me, 906, Representative Mathias. Out of the record. Representative Doug Scott on House Bill 913. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 913, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Moore on House Bill 915. Out of the record. Representative Pankau on House Bill 921. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 921, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Pankau, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Pankau."
- Pankau: "Mr. Speaker, a question first. Has the tabling Motion that I filed yesterday on Committee Amendment 1 been approved by the Rules Committee?"
- Speaker Hannig: "I'm told by the parliamentarian that the

 Amendment was not tabled or the Motion to Table did not

 come out of the Rules Committee and we can't do it on the

 floor without that."
- Pankau: "Take it out of the record, please."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record. Representative Durkin on House Bill 922. Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 922, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Winkel on House Bill 927. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on 929. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 929, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Hoffman on 945.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 945, a Bill for an Act in relation to labor. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Hoffman on 975. Out of the record. Representative Osterman on 982. Out of the record. Representative Poe on House Bill 1008. Representative Raymond Poe. Out of the record. Representative Scott on 1014. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. On 1115, Mr. Scott. Out of the record. 1116, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, 1016."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1016, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Granberg, do you wish to move House Bill 16? Okay. Out of the record.

 House Bill 1039, Representative Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1039, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brunsvold, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you. Committee recommended that we remove the language for this Bill out of the Human Rights Act and put

30th Legislative Day

- March 21, 2001
- it in another Section of the statutes and that's what we did. So, this Amendment simply reflects the committee's request to put the language regarding the motorcyclists in a different Section. So, I would move for the adoption."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

 And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Brunsvold on House Bill 1040. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1040, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Brunsvold, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you. There was an error. There was an extra zero on 500,000 and it simply removes that extra zero."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley on House Bill 1041. Okay. Representative Miller on House Bill 1050. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Lindner on House Bill 1070. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1070, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. House Bill 1075 for Representative Ryder. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Slone on House Bill 1083. Yeah, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1093, a Bill for an Act making appropriations."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, 1083, 1083."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1083, a Bill for an Act concerning groundwater. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor.

 House Bill 1099, Representative Monique Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 1689, Representative Jay Hoffman. Out of the record. Representative Osterman on House Bill 1691.

 Out of the record. Representative McCarthy on House Bill 1704. Out of the record. Representative Scott on 1706.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1706, a Bill for an Act in relation to older persons and persons with disabilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Novak, for what reason do you rise?"
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Novak: "I'd like to welcome Roger Frasier to Illinois General

 Assembly. Roger Frasier, welcome to the Illinois General

 Assembly. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jay Hoffman on House Bill 1713.

 Jay Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Amendments on that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1713, a Bill for an Act to push-polling.

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Yes. Floor Amendment #1 addresses issues that were raised in the committee by some of the Members of the committee. All it does is it indicates that the individual or the worker who may be making the push-polling calls is not the person that would be liable under this Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none. All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mitchell, Bill Mitchell on 1732. Out of the record. Representative Rutherford on House Bill 1776. Representative Rutherford. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Scott on House Bill 1779. Out of the record. Representative Boland on 1784. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Reitz on 1786. Out of the record. Representative Scott on 1790. Representative McCarthy on 1805. record. 1805, Representative McCarthy. Out of the Representative Kurtz on House Bill 1808. Would you like us to move that from Second to Third? Okay. Out of the How about 1810? Wanna move that? You wanna move record. that from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, are the Amendments

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

on the floor?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1810, a Bill for an Act concerning public funds. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kurtz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kurtz, would you like to explain

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kurtz, would you like to explain the Amendment?"

Kurtz: "I'm sorry. There was a misunderstanding. I will be
 offering the Amendment to you tomorrow on that, so I wasn't
 gonna talk about it."

Speaker Hannig: "Do you wish to..."

Kurtz: "I would..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, so you wish for us to take it out of the record at this time?"

Kurtz: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Kurtz: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Hannig: "Out of the record. House Bill 1815,
Representative Saviano. Representative O'Brien.
Representative O'Brien on House Bill 1819. Out of the
record. Representative Cross. 1820, Representative Cross.
Would you want us to read the Bill? Yes. Recognize
Representative Cross, please."

Cross: "Well, I do have a question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

Cross: "I have a Bill on Second Reading I'd like to move to Third. House Bill 256. Could we do that? For some reason it's been sittin' there and I don't have any Amendments. I'd like to move it."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "I don't know..."

Cross: "You don't have a little note on there or anything do ya?"

Speaker Hannig: "I might... I can't find it on this list here,

Representative."

Cross: "Is there... But it's on the Calendar. You mean, is there a special list other than the Calendar?"

Speaker Hannig: "I'm just workin' on a list that I have from the parliamentarian, that I have here."

Cross: "Do I... I have a feeling... Should I presume or assume we're not gonna see that list? So, can you move that Bill for me?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, perhaps you need to speak with the parliamentarian..."

Cross: "All right. Thanks."

Speaker Hannig: " ... on how this works, okay? Representative
Hassert on House Bill 1825. Out of the record.
Representative Durkin on 1843. Out of the record.
Representative Durkin on 1867. Out. Representative
McGuire on House Bill 1869. Do you want to move that from
Second to Third, Representative? Yeah, would you recognize
Representative McGuire, please."

McGuire: "Yes, I'd like to hold that for an Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record. Representative Lyons,
Joe Lyons. Would you like to move 1919? Out of the
record. Representative Collins. Representative Collins on
House Bill 1935. Do you want to move that from Second to
Third? Out of the record. Representative Moffitt on House
Bill 1956. Out of the record. Representative Giles.
Excuse me, Representative Scott on 1967. Out of the
record. Representative Giles on 1969. Out of the record.
Representative Curry on 2016. Out of the record.
Representative Younge on 2052. Out of the record.

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 Winkel, 2056. Representative House Bill 2056, Representative Winkel. Out of the record. Representative Daniels on 2064. 2064. Out of the record. Representative 2098. Myers on House Bill Out of the record. Representative Moffitt on 2145. Representative Moffitt, Out of the record. Representative Ryan on 2148. Out of the record. Representative Brunsvold on 2192. wanna... Shall we move that, Representative Brunsvold? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2192, a Bill for an Act in relation to workplace injuries and diseases. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Wirsing on House Bill 2208. Out of the record. Representative Garrett on 2215. Out of the record. Representative Leitch on 2219.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2219, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Turner on 2222.

 Representative Turner. 2222, Representative Turner. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2026."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act concerning adoption. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Johnson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "Yes. Floor Amendment #2 really just cleans up the Bill in terms of some questions that were raised during

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 committee meeting. And I don't believe that there's any opposition to this. And would ask that Floor Amendment #2 be adopted."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Schmitz on 2224.

 Out of the record. Steve Davis, 2227. Out of the record.

 Representative Johnson on 2228. Representative Johnson,

 2228. Out of the record. Representative Franks on 2236.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2236, a Bill for an Act concerning discount prescription drugs for senior citizens. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 were lost in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Oh, excuse me, Representative Cross. For what reason do you rise?"
- Cross: "I'm curious about the status of House Bill 2236, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is, or not my understanding, we have four Floor Amendments that Representative Coulson has filed and I'm just puzzled why you're moving it on to Third Reading without addressing those four Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Clerk had indicated that none of those Amendments had been approved for consideration by the Rules Committee. You're saying that it's your understanding that they're on the floor?"
- Cross: "Well, I don't know that they've... if... They should be.

 And I don't know why they haven't been considered and I would ask that you hold this Bill on Second Reading 'til

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

we, at least, get some indication from the Rules Committee whether or not you're gonna even consider these Bills. I would, at least, think they would give us the courtesy of hearing Representative Coulsons's four Amendments, at least, in the Rules Committee. You can... If you want to vote 'em down and not support 'em, that's fine, but at least give us the courtesy of havin' a vote on those four Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Franks indicates he'd be happy to move the Bill back to Second at this time, pending some action by the Rules Committee."

Cross: "So, you're gonna put it back and leave it at Second."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, we're..."

Cross: "That'd be fine, if that's what you intend to do."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks. We'll let Representative Franks speak. I thought he was trying to give me a signal. Representative Franks is recognized."

Franks: "We'll move it back for one day."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks said he'll move it back for... at this time..."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: " ... but he will... you know, he doesn't want to hold it there forever. If it's called tomorrow, he'll move it to Third or at some other time, Representative Cross."

Cross: "Well, can we get some indication from the Chair if...

gonna have some consideration of these four Amendments in
Rules?"

Speaker Hannig: "Well, Representative, you need to speak to, probably to your Representatives on the Rules Committee and they can make..."

Cross: "Well, I have a feeling I know where our Members of the Rules Committee will be... how they'll be voting. So, I

- 30th Legislative Day

 just wanna... I'm asking for some assurance that they'll be considered in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, I'm sure that if someone makes a Motion in the Rules Committee, that there'll be a Roll Call vote on it."
- Cross: "Okay. So, you are moving it back to Second at this time?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes."
- Cross: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading. So, Mr. Clerk, hold House Bill 2236 on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Feigenholtz on 2246.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2246, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. 2248, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2248, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Wirsing, what was the number of your Bill, where she had an Amendment? Do you want to do that? No, okay. Representative Reitz on 2259. Do you wish to move that? Out of the record. Representative Coulson on 2271. Out of the record. Representative Moore on 2278. Out of the record. Representative Yarbrough on 2280. Out of the record.
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair. House Bill 2284, Representative Jones, Shirley Jones. Out of the record. Representative, 2288. Representative Mulligan.

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

 Rosemary Mulligan. 2288. Out of the record.

 Representative Coulson with 2290. Out of the record.

 House Bill 2293, Representative Hultgren. Out of the record. 2296, Representative Johnson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2296, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2298, Representative Lyons, Eileen Lyons. Out of the record. House Bill 2303, Representative Burke. Danny Burke, 2303. Mr. Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 2358, Representative Winters. 2358, Representative Winters. Out of the record. House Bill 2361, Representative Franks. 2361. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2361, a Bill for an Act in relation to toll highways. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2374, Representative Jones, Shirley Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 2387, Representative Curry, Julie Curry. Out of the record. House Bill 2390, Representative May. Karen May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2390, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative May, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative May on Floor Amendment #1. Would you explain your Amendment."
- May: "Mr. Speaker. The Amendment #1 is just to add the words 'or

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the United States'."

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

Cross: "Representative, is this your first Amendment?"

May: "Yes."

Cross: "Are you prepared to explain it?"

May: "It's just adding the words to clarify at that stage or any state, having to do with federal military bases."

Cross: "Did this go through committee?"

May: "Yes."

Cross: "What was the vote... Did the Amendment go through committee?"

May: "No."

Cross: "Do you know why?"

May: "Why?"

Cross: "Is that... Do you think that's fair? It's your first Amendment."

May: "What? It was a technical Amendment that's why. It's very, very, very simple. I think, just four words, 'or the United States'."

Cross: "All right, Representative. Thanks."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2390?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2400, Representative Winters. Out of the record. House Bill 2419, Representative Osmond. Out of the record. House Bill 2425, Representative Cowlishaw. 2425. Out of the record.

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

 House Bill 2426, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. House Bill 2427, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2427, a Bill for an Act in relation to stalking. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2437, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2437, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2440, Representative O'Connor. Representative O'Connor. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2440, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. 2464, Representative O'Connor. Representative O'Connor. 2464. Out of the record. Bill 2467, Representative Kosel. Representative Kosel. Out of the record. House Bill 2470, Representative Franks. Representative Franks. Out of the record. House Bill 2472, Representative Myers, Rich Myers. 2472, Rich Myers. Out of the record. House Bill 2473, Representative Berns. Out of the record. House Bill 2477, Representative O'Connor. Representative... Out of the record. House Bill Coulson. Representative Beth Coulson. Representative Coulson. Out of the record. House Bill 2493, Representative Turner. Art Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 2518, Representative Younge. Out of

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

the record. 2519, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 2527, Representative Novak. Out of the House Bill 2555, Representative Osmond. Out of record. the record. House Bill 2563, Representative Cross. Out of the record. House Bill 2993, Representative Parke. 2993. Out of the record. House Bill 3011, Representative Representative Delgado. Out of the record. House Bill 3007, Representative Saviano. Out of the House Bill 3029, Representative Schoenberg. record. Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. House Bill 3032, Representative Mendoza. Out of the record. House Bill 3048, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. House Bill 3050, Representative Turner. Art Turner. Out of the record. House Bill 3052, Representative Flowers. Out of the record. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke, seek recognition?"

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. In this point of information, is there a way that the Chair might ask Members if they have a matter that they'd like called, rather than your... using up your wonderful voice this evening?"

Speaker Hartke: "No. House Bill 3059, Representative Jones. Lou Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 3060, Representative Representative May. Out of the record. House Bill 3065, Representative Crotty. Out of the record. House 3070, Mr. Fritchey. John Fritchey. Out of the record. House Bill 3072, Representative Osterman. Out of House Bill 3075, Representative Turner. the record. Turner. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Scott. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3076, a Bill for an Act in regard to juries. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3087, Representative Meyer. Jim Meyer. 3087. Out of the record. House Bill 3089, Representative Schmitz. Out of the record. House Bill 3090, Representative Winkel. Out of the record. House Bill 3091, Representative Daniels. Bost. Representative Daniels. 3091. Out of the record. House Bill 3092, Daniels. Out of the record. House Bill 3097, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. House Bill 3119, Representative Tenhouse. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3119, a Bill for an Act concerning fiscal notes. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3123, Representative Mitchell. Bill Mitchell. Out of the record. House Bill 3137, Representative McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3137, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to move that... or leave that on Second for Amendment, if I could. I've got an Amendment and I believe the Amendment's been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3148, Representative Jones. Shirley Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 3150, Representative Hannig. Out of the record. House Bill 3154, Representative Cross. 3154. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3154, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

filed."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3155, Representative Cross. Out of the record. House Bill 3157, Representative Collins. Representative Collins. Out of the record. House Bill 3162, Representative Saviano. Skip Saviano. Out of the record. House Bill 3179, Representative Tenhouse. Would you like to handle that Bill for Representative Stephens? 3179. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3179, a Bill for an Act concerning consumer fraud. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3193, Representative Coulson. Beth Coulson. Out of the record. For what reason... Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Yes, inquiry of the chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

- Black: "With leave of the Body, could Representative Tenhouse just call his Bill that was just moved to Third? You can do that under the rules with leave of the Body. He hasn't gotten to move a Bill in two or three days and he'd like to go do that. Would you like to do that? I'm sorry, he's not prepared."
- Speaker Hartke: "Okay. House Bill 3194, Representative Coulson.

 Out of the record. House Bill 3199, Representative May.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3199, a Bill for an Act concerning pharmaceuticals. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3203, Representative

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Sommer. Representative Sommer. Out of the record. House Bill 3210, Representative Tenhouse. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3210, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tenhouse, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Tenhouse, on Floor Amendment #2."

Tenhouse: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In committee there was some issues raised in relation to the width. And this simply addresses that in terms of this Amendment. We'll have an opportunity to discuss it on Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? The

Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Black. Do you stand in opposition to this

Amendment?"

Black: "I'm not sure, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Hartke: "He'll yield for a question."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion?"

Black: "No further questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3210?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3211, Representative Bost. Michael Bost. Out of the record. House Bill 3212,

- 30th Legislative Day

 Representative Scott. Out of the record. House Bill 3216,
 Representative Lang. 3216. Out of the record. House Bill
 3231, Representative Meyer. Out of the record. House Bill
 3237, Representative Black. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3237, a Bill for an Act in relation to agriculture. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3241, Representative Ryan. 3241. Out of the record. House Bill 3246, Representative Black. Would you like to handle that for Representative Stephens? Representative Black, would you like to handle House Bill 3246 for Represent... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3246, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3266, Representative Miller. Dr. Miller. Out of the record. House Bill 3267, Representative Miller. Out of the record. House Bill 3283, Representative Reitz. Clerk, read... No, out of the House Bill 3284, Representative Boland. Clerk, record. read the Bill. It's on Third Reading, already. House Bill 3320, Representative Poe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. House Bill 3321, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. House Bill 3324, Representative Hultgren. Out of the record. House Bill 3341, Representative Osmond. Harry Osmond. excuse me. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Hamos. Out of the record. House Bill 3359, Representative Scott. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3359, a Bill for an Act concerning

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 counties. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3363, Representative Curry. Julie Curry. Out of the record. House Bill 3364, Representative Franks. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Delgado. 3382. Out of the record. House Bill 3392, Representative Daniels. record. House Bill 3533, Representative Dart. Out of record. House Bill 3535, Representative Dart. Out of the record. House Bill 3538, Representative Kurtz. Out of the record. House Bill 3540, Representative Bellock. Out of the record. House Bill 3577, Representative McCarthy. of the record. House Bill 3578, Representative Cross for Representative Daniels. Out of the record. 3579, Representative Cross for Daniels. Out of the record. 3581. 3582. 3583. Out of the record. What is the status of House Bill 2046? 2046."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2046 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Okay. Leave that Bill on Second Reading for the purposes of Amendments. On the Order of House Resolutions there appears House Resolution 55. Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 55 changes the date that a report is due by the Board of Higher Education.

 The Community College Board and the State Board of Education changes the date to the 31st of March. I move do adopt."
- Speaker Hartke: "Heard the Lady's... discussion. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Okay, we'll get back to you."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Resolution 55?

 Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 55?' All those in
 favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the
 opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the
 Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes the Lady from
 Cook, Representative Davis, for an announcement."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to announce a special guest with us today, Mr. Jerry Williams, who is the grandson of Harold Murphy, the pensions chairperson. And if anybody's interested, come and see his A paper entitled Crucial Life Experiences. Would you welcome Mr. Williams, please? Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the Illinois General Assembly, Mr. Williams. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2437?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2437 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. On the Order of House Joint Resolution 9 appears House Resolution... Joint Resolution 9. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "One second, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hartke: "Take that out of the record, temporarily. What is the status of House Bill 3400?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3400, a Bill for an Act concerning liability for the provision of health care. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Hoffman, are you ready? Mr. Clerk, House Joint Resolution #9. Mr. Hoffman."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Hoffman: "Yes, House Joint Resolution #9 is an initiative of the United Transportation Union. And all House Joint Resolution #9 does is it encourages the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives to pass the Bill, as currently before the United States Congress, called the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act. As you know, the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act of 2000 was approved in a bipartisan effort. And we are asking that the... and 19 of the 20 Illinois Members of the United States House of Representatives passed it. And we are asking that the Senate do the same."

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

Parke: "I understand that you want them to do it, but what does it do?"

Hoffman: "The legislation would provide benefit improvements for surviving spouses of rail workers who currently suffer deep cuts in income when the rail retiree dies, and would also provide tax relief to freight railroads, Amtrak, and commuter lines. The Bill is now before the 107th Congress and railroad management, labor, and retiree organizations have agreed to support the legislation."

Parke: "So, it's... You don't know of any opposition to this?"

Hoffman: "No."

Parke: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution #9?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House Joint Resolution 9 is adopted. Clerk, what is the status of

- 30th Legislative Day March 21, 2001 House Bill 276?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 276 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading. How about House Bill 2026?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2026 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, for committee announcements."
- Bolin: "Attention Members, the following committees will Clerk meet tomorrow morning. At 8:00, the Appropriations-Higher Education Committee will meet in Room 118 and the Appropriations-Public Safety Committee will meet in Room at 8:30 a.m., the Agriculture Committee will meet in Room 122-B, the Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will meet in Room C-1 Stratton, the Conservation & Land Use Committee will meet in Room 115, and the Property Tax Reform Committee will meet in Room D-1 Stratton; at 9:00, the Environment & Energy Committee will meet in Room C-1 Stratton, the Human Services Committee will meet in Room 122-B, the Personnel & Pensions Committee will meet in Room 115; at 9:30, the Registration & Regulation Committee will meet in Room C-1 Stratton, the Revenue Committee will meet in Room 115, and the Urban Revitalization Committee will meet in Room 122-B."
- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentleman, the Speaker would like to make an announcement. We've had some very good cooperation today. We have passed 51 Bills over to the Senate. Recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

Black: "I'm just thrilled that we've been able to cooperate and pass 51 Bills. Could you give me some indication of how many of those might actually get out of the Senate Rules Committee?"

Speaker Hartke: "I'm sorry, I would have to..."

Black: "Would you take that under advisement?"

Speaker Hartke: "I'll take it under advisement..."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "...and check with the President of the Senate."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Any Member who would like to move a Bill tomorrow, please see your respective staffs if you'd like to call that Bill on Third. Tomorrow. The Chair recognizes the Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What time does

Appropriations-Higher Education meet, again?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Younge: "We would prefer 9:00 a.m."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 20... Never mind. Mr. Franks, there's a note request been made on 2470. We cannot move that Bill. Representative Younge."

Younge: "The House Higher Education Appropriation Committee will meet at 9:00 in 118."

Speaker Hartke: "Any other announcements? Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, until the hour of 10:00 a.m. March 22nd. 10:00 a.m. 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 Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 134, offered
by Representative Garrett and House Joint Resolution #18,

30th Legislative Day

March 21, 2001

offered by Representative Younge are assigned to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 129, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act in relation to nursing. Senate Bill 487, offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Senate Bill 761, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 838, offered by Representative Klingler, a Bill for an Act in relation to child care. Senate Bill 840, offered by Representative Klingler, A Bill for an Act concerning minors. Senate Bill 842, offered by Representative Wirsing, a Bill for an Act concerning children and family services. Senate Bill 849, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act concerning the Comprehensive Insurance Plan. Senate Bill 869, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. Senate Bill 874, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act concerning hunting. Senate Bill 1097, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Senate Bill 1113, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act in relation to county law enforcement employees. Introduction and First Reading of these Senate Bills. House Perfunctory Session now stands adjourned."