39th Legislative Day

April 3, 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 Tim Zikeo of the St. Paul and Immanuel Lutheran Churches in Steeleville. Pastor Zikeo is the guest of Representative Reitz. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Zikeo: "This may be the only opportunity I ever have to address such a prestigious group. I'm glad to be here with you this morning and good morning to you. Let us pray. Our gracious Lord, You have ordained government. You have given us legislative leaders. For the good of Your people, for the good of Your nation, we pray that, as this day of Sessions begins that You would bless those who are here, that You would help them to put aside party bias and whatever other matters may be... may come between them, and grant them the wisdom and the courage to do those things that are right for the good of Your country and for the good of Your people. We pray that You would grant them wisdom, grant them courage, be with them, and bless them throughout this day in all that they do. We pray on Your holy name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative McKeon."
- McKeon et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Julie Curry is excused for part of the day.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

She will be with us later in the afternoon."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative Schmitz and Representative Stephens are excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 112 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Smith. Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 953. Representative Fowler, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3007. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 646, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1004, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1457. Representative Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3364. Representative Curry, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education, to which

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on 2, 2001, reported the same back with the Monday, April following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3521. Representative Burke, Chairperson from Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, 2001, reported the same back with the following 2, recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 172, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 280, and Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3188. Representative Dart, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 524, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 593, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1075, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2531, and Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3024. Representative Collins, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2807 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Brosnahan, Chairperson from the Committee on the Disabled Community, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3216. Representative Bugielski, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3008. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 482. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Tobacco Settlement Proceeds, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1886. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Monday, April 2, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 475 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2098. Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Andrea Moore, did you wish to call House Bill 2054? Mr. Arthur Turner, did you wish to call House Bill 3050? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3050, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3050 is a culmination of three Bills, one that was introduced by Representative Julie Curry and another one introduced by Representative Jerry Mitchell. And basically, it deals with the issue of school funding, in particularly, with those districts that are poverty stricken and those that are in dire needs of funding. You've heard over the last 20 years we've talked

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

about... Well, I should say, over my twenty-year period of being here in Springfield, we've discussed this issue of school funding and to no avail have we come up with a solution that makes any sense. Although this is temporary in nature, the intent here was that if we pulled the Bills that have already passed out of the House, the intent was to send a message to the Senate that we, in this chamber, have taken a bipartisan, as well as an interest that represents the diversity in this state, in terms of small towns and what effect the school funding, at this point, has on those districts in addition to inner-city districts and in what impact it's having now in the suburban area. And so it is our hope that in sending this Bill over to the Senate that they will understand the sincerity in terms of how we want to approach this issue of school funding. And the recommendations that are made in this Bill are thus; one, we want to raise the foundation level from 4425 currently, to 4600; it also lowers the minimum threshold for the poverty grants from 20% to 15%, allowing an additional 120 school districts to apply for supplemental state aid in the form of poverty grants. said, this issue, I'm certain, will be negotiated over in the Senate. But it was our intent here today to send a message to the Senate that this is an issue that reflects the entire state. And we hope that they would take it seriously and that we could do something in terms of increasing the st... formula."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this legislation. This has taken a lot of hard work by a lot of people to put this together. And although we have passed, individually, each of these pieces of legislation,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

I, along with Representative Turner, Representative Curry, Representative Smith, and others, believe that we can send a stronger message to the Senate that we have examined this situation very closely and made some differences. If you listen to the following figures, these are the differences that it will make and all of these are positive figures. In Chicago, \$94 million more money, 30 million for other Cook, four and a half million for DuPage, 16 million for Kane, 14 million for Lake, 7 million... seven and a half million for McHenry, eleven and a half million for Will, and 75 almost 8... \$76 million for downstate schools. We've done this and examined all of the possibilities that we have for school funding. We wanted to be fair to the entire state, and I believe we have. We've done all this and still stayed within the Governor's budget. We will still be able to fully fund the categoricals at the state's obligation. We'll still be able to pay the pensions of our downstate teachers and Chicago, and at the same time have a Bill that distributes equally the amount of money that the Governor says we have in the budget. I think we should all get on board. I think we should send a strong message to the Senate, and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

There have two proponents. The Chair recognizes Mr. Giles.

Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly to the Bill. I simply rise to give the Bill strong support. I believe that the Sponsor of the legislation is on target to continue to send legislation over to the Senate to force them to act. We must continue to push this issue and make sure the schools are funded on a equitable and par basis.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

And I just simply rise to strong support this legislation and urge my colleagues to continue to put measures like this over in the Senate. And hopefully, we will continue to get some action on this legislation. I think the previous speaker, Representative Mitchell, had a similar piece of legislation which raised the foundation level, this one increases it a little bit more. And we want to continue to push this legislation out of the House into the Senate. And hopefully, the Governor will agree and sign some of this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of things I want to clear up, 'cause I don't want anybody to be confused by this Bill. This does bring the foundation level to 4600, exactly like the proposal earlier, does not increase that. The increases are in other areas. Another thing that we stated is it lowers the poverty level to 15%. That's the EFAB recommendation. This Bill leaves it at 20, but changes the amount of money that goes to the various districts. And that's how we got the equity. So, it's a great Bill, but I don't want you to be confused that there are things in here that are not. Those two changes are the ones that you've voted on before. But what we've done was put all the good ideas together in Representative Turner's Bill with his blessing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. 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 110 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Shirley Jones. Is Representative Shirley Jones in the chamber? Do you wish to call House Bill 3148? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3148, a Bill for an Act concerning voter registration. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones."

Jones, S.: "On House Bill 3148, offers an Amendment to address concerns raised by the Cook County Clerk Office and the... it amends the Election Code to provide that the county clerk and board of election commissioner must first update voters' registration information to the State Board of Election within seven days after each registration period is closed. The Bill will be in additional to the requirement that they furnish update voters' registration information to the State Board of Election within ten days after December the 15th and May 15 each year. I ask for your favorable vote."

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

There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Shirley Jones, did you wish to call House Bill 3149? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3149, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones, S.: "On House Bill 3149, amends the Election Code to

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

provide deputy registrars with additional voters registration form, so long as they have no more than 500 unaccounted for in the past year. The Bill also provides that the county clerks must forward completed voters' registration applications to the appropriate county clerk after making a record of it within three business days of accepting it. I ask for your favorable vote."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Is it your intent to hire more people? How many are...

do you think you're talking about and does this apply to
every county in the state?"

Jones, S.: "No, no one really addressed that in the committee.

And it's really not a issue. But I don't think it is to hire more. They just have to provide more forms for the registration."

Parke: "I'm sorry."

Jones, S.: "Can you hear me?"

Parke: "I can't... I didn't hear you. Mr. Speaker, there's a...

Mr. Speaker there's undercurrent that it makes... I can't

understand what the Lady is saying."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, could you please give your attention to Mr. Parke and to Representative Jones."

Parke: "Just to say one more time, is this apply to every county, first of all?"

Jones, S.: "Yes."

Parke: "Second, it says here, 'to provide a deputy registrar with additional voter registration applications.' Does that mean it's the same deputy registrar, or just giving them

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

responsibility?"

Jones, S.: "Each registra... Each deputy registrar can get 500 forms. It's just adding more forms for them to use. For large..."

Parke: "Are we gonna pay this deputy registrar more money since we're asking them to..."

Jones, S.: "No, it's not asking for more money. Sometime you go out and register people and you might register 200 people and 50 more people might want to register. So, they just need more forms to... for them to... Instead of running back and forth picking up forms, it makes it easier for the registrar to have more forms on hand."

Parke: "How many forms do they handle now, Representative?"

Jones, S.: "Two hundred."

Parke: "And so, now we're asking... we're saying that you can handle up to 200, but we can now go up to 5,000?"

Jones, S.: "Five hundred not 5,000."

Parke: "Five hundred. And what problem did you see arise that you want to solve with this?"

Jones, S.: "When you go to large communities, or organizations, or grocery stores, or whatever, and people are coming in and you might get more than 200 people to register, so you need more forms to register."

Parke: "Did... Is there anybody in oppos... showing opposition to this Bill?"

Jones, S.: "No."

Parke: "Can you tell us why Champaign County is opposed to this?"

Jones, S.: "No, we can't tell you why Champaign County was opposed to this."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

of the House. I rise in opposition of the Bill. The 200 figure, which has been codified for some time, has hardly ever been reached. I think any county clerk would tell you that. There is no reason to hand out... The original figure, it's been amended. The original figure was you'd have to give a deputy registrar 5,000 registration forms. I mean, that's just ludicrous. Now, it was amended down to 500, certainly a more manageable number. I think the only place this has ever come up, other than perhaps Chicago, where you have the density of population, and it might make some sense there, it tends to raise its head on college campuses. We charge the county clerk with registration integrity and valid integrity. And the county clerks will tell you that the 200 figure... 200 registration forms that they give out to deputy registrars have seldom, if ever, been reached. They bring back 50, they bring back 100. But if you start handing 'em out in packs of 500, not only are your printing costs going to go up, but it becomes rather difficult for the county clerk to try and keep track of who has how many registration forms, how many were actually handed out, should they extend the deadline by a few hours for the afternoon mail, or should they keep the office open an extra hour, are there in fact, hundreds if not thousands of registration forms out there that the deputy registrars failed to return which then causes problems on Election Day, as we've seen in many precincts throughout the state. You know, there's an old adage if it isn't broken why try to fix it? And the current number of handing a deputy registrar 200 election forms, to my knowledge, no one has come forward and said, this doesn't It inhibits a citizen's right to participate. It's work. just an abomination. I've never heard anybody say that.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

In fact, I've always heard people say that even the 2... the package of 200 that you get are seldom, if ever, used. And many of them come back not used, but unfortunately after the registration process is over. So, to increase that number to 500, I... for the life of me, I don't know what sense that makes. And I stand in opposition of the Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones to close."
- Jones, S.: "Yes, to the Members of the House. You are not required..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones, excuse me. Mr. Righter, are you seeking recognition?"
- Righter: "I am, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a few questions of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Righter. Mr. Righter was seeking recognition and then I thought the light went out. But, Mr. Righter."
- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Jones, what exact problem are you trying to cure now by raising that number by about two and a half times from 200 to 500?"
- Jones, S.: "Okay. Now, if you got a voters' registration drive, some people might have 200 registration cards to pass out, you might have 3 or 400 people that want to register. You are not... I mean, if you want take 100 registration cards and go out and register somebody, you can. If you want to take 200, you can. If you want to take 300, you can, 400 or 500. It's not that you have to take the 500 registration cards."
- Righter: "Okay. Right now, does the deputy registrar and the circuit clerk, they already have the ability under current law to distribute as many forms as necessary, don't they?"

 Jones, S.: "Only 200."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

- Righter: "Okay. So, a single deputy registrar can have no more than 200 forms?"
- Jones, S.: "Right."
- Righter: "Is there anything to prevent a circuit clerk... If you have a group that maybe has more than 200 people that want to be registered, is there anything to bar the circuit clerk from simply sending another deputy registrar to the same group and using that 200?"
- Jones, S.: "No, it's just an inconvenience."
- Righter: "One last question I want to ask, Representative Jones and that is, if a deputy registrar is given 500 forms and they go out and they use 150 or 200 and those... the rest of those forms are not returned, is there any... does anyone have to pay for those? Is there any ramification for that, is there... or is that not an issue at all?"
- Jones, S.: "No. No, they don't have to pay for any volunteers."
- Righter: "Okay. Thank you, Representative Jones. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones to close."
- Jones, S.: "This Bill only serves for the county clerk to give up the 500 voters' registration card if they are requested by the register... registrar. And I ask for your favorable vote. 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? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan, do you wish to vote? Mulligan. Did Representative Mulligan wish to vote? Representative Klingler. Representative Klingler, did Representative Mulligan wish to vote? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 74 'ayes', and 36 'noes'. This Bill,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Boland, did you wish to call House Bill 1982? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1982, a Bill for an Act concerning voters' pamphlets. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1982, which we passed an exact same Bill like this last term, passed out of committee 11 to 0. What it does is it amends the Election Code to provide that the State Board of Elections shall print and distribute a state voters' pamphlet. Additionally, a county may enter into an intergovernmental agreement to jointly produce a voters' pamphlet. The Bill provides for the distribution of voters' pamphlets which include not only candidate portraits and statements, but arguments for and against public questions on the ballot. The Bill also provides for requirements for reviewing and accepting the materials in the pamphlet and the candidates would be required to pay a small fee to be included in the voter pamphlet."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, how will this pamphlet be distributed?"

Boland: "It will be mailed out to all households and it will be... it can be distributed through libraries and probably Secretary of State Offices and places like that. The board would determine those other places."

Black: "And who would write the... who would write verbiage under each candidate? Would the candidate furnish that?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Boland: "The candidate would furnish that. There is limits on how much can be put into the statement and the size of the block for each candidate."

Black: "And this would be for every candidate on the ballot including local candidates or..."

Boland: "No, this would be for president, vice-president, the constitutional officers, U.S. Representatives, U.S. Senators. And then if a county were to enter into an intergovernmental agreement, then they could have their local ones on there."

Black: "Wouldn't this be better left to the local election authorities rather than mandating the state board to collect all of this material, compile it, and then mail it? I mean, cost is not the overriding factor, I'm not suggesting that it is. But, some counties already do this. I know Champaign County puts out a comprehensive voters' guide and I would think that if a county would want to do that, it might be best left up to the local election officials rather than mandate the State Board of Elections to do this. I have a hard time even figuring out with their staff where they would find the time and the expertise to do this in house. I would assume they would contract it. Is that your assumption?"

Boland: "That would be my assumption. They had no objection to it in committee."

Black: "What... Again, what difficulty are we trying to overcome by compiling a voters' guide, at taxpayer expense? Most of the verbiage would be written by the candidate rather than a..."

Boland: "Well, two..."

Black: "...third party, you know, a noninvolved party. I mean, what is that supposed to correct?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Boland: "There's two things that it seeks to do. One is to get greater voter information into the hands of more people and also to get vital information as far as how you become a voter, what you have to do to register, if... you know, how you need to reregister if you move, how you can obtain an absentee ballot which is very valuable. I found this probably to be one of the biggest and most helpful things that voters have talked about. And also, it helps to level the playing field so that someone who may not be an incumbent or someone who may not be the wealthiest candidate has at least one shot at getting his information, some basic information, before the voters."

Black: "What would a candidate have to pay... What would the fee be to offset the production costs and the mailing costs?"

Boland: "The fees don't offset all of it."

Black: "Oh, and I understand that. I'm just..."

Boland: "Right. But the fees are as follows; president and vice-president, \$500; U.S. Senator, Representative, \$500; constitutional officers, \$300."

Black: "So, Legislators... legislative races would not be included, correct?"

Boland: "Right. They would..."

Black: "Because of having to target where those then would be sent."

Boland: "Right. This was... We had those originally last term in the last Bill, but we... I amended that out at the suggestion of Representative Hoeft and Representative Winters who pointed out just as you did, the problem with the various jurisdictions..."

Black: "Right."

Boland: "...overlapping in that."

Black: "And if a candidate chose not to do this, then that's the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

candidate's prerogative, correct?"

Boland: "Very definitely."

Black: "All right. And..."

Boland: "Very definitely."

Black: "I know you and I have run in many elections and there are times that you and I get six questionnaires a day before the election. You know, fill this out, I mean, groups that we've never heard of want a picture, your statements on, you know, whether tennis shoes should be outlawed in school or something. I mean, there's no end to it. I don't see this taking the place of any of those questionnaires, do you?"

Boland: "Probably not. This wouldn't be keyed to those special interests. It would be more general information; what's the person's background, what's their education, what governmental experience, if any, they have, that type of thing."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you very much, Representative."

Boland: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Winters: "I wanted to know, the fiscal impact on my notes is between 4 and 5 million dollars, is that a correct statement?"

Boland: "It could be, yeah. We've got one that says 1.5 million, but it might be as high as that. If... I'm sorry, the later one... the later analysis has 2 to 3 million."

Winters: "Okay. And what do you expect... if we have 3 people running for Governor on each party, any kind of estimate of what we might actually bring in with the 500 and \$300 fees?

Have you looked at how many people filed in past

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

campaigns?"

Boland: "I have not, but we're talking mainly in Illinois as a two party state. And it's very, very difficult for a third party or independent candidates to even get on the ballot. They have very high petition signature requirements. For example, to get on statewide, you must get 25,000 signatures versus a maximum of 10,000 for a major party candidate."

Winters: "In other words, we would not expect to get maybe 10 or \$20,000 at the maximum for the filing..."

Boland: "Probably."

Winters: "...filing fees."

Boland: "Probably right."

Winters: "Any reasoning behind the fact that the major candidates for president, vice-presidents, and governor, I believe, are the \$500 fee, and yet, in our analysis it says that they're going to get the same room, what 59.8 square inches, as the candidates for lower offices, and yet, you've got a lower filing fee. Is there any kind of constitutional challenge to an unequal... an unfair fee structure, when they're both given the same opportunity to spread their message?"

Boland: "No, this is copied after what 12 other states are doing and it has not been constitutionally challenged there."

Winters: "There is, in our analysis again, a fee of a hundred dollars for State Senator or State Representative. Is that still in the Bill?"

Boland: "No, that is not."

Winters: "Okay. Now, there is another interesting Section in here where it says that the printing of names of persons or organizations supporting or opposing either a public question or the statement of a candidate is not allowed.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

However, if you put quotation marks around it, if it's a direct quote, then it is allowed. Could you explain why that provision might be in there?"

Boland: "Yeah, that... the quotation is part of the public record. In other words, if somebody says that, you know, Representative Winters is a wonderful State Representative and that's been out in the press, you know, if the president said that about you or something, that would be allowed in, 'cause that's part of the public domain."

Winters: "Well, if I take an ad in the local weekly paper for \$25 and include in that a quote saying, 'I've been supported by, you know, the Plumbers Union XYZ and the Manufacturers Benevolent Association', would that then qualify as a quote that I could put into my own ad or into my own statement?"

Boland: "Those groups have to approve that, for you to use their name."

Winters: "Okay, but anybody..."

Boland: "Unless in the newspaper on their own, you know, they were to say we endorse, you know, Representative Winters."

Winters: "If they run it in their own in-house newsletter, if they are sending out a statewide thing to their own Members, a quotation from that would qualify to... for me to put it in."

Boland: "Yes."

Winters: "Okay. It seems like we'll be lining up those quotations ahead of time then, as we might do in a campaign. But for an official state document, we're generating the quotations that we want the people in the state to see."

Boland: "Right."

Winters: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boland to close."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Boland: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and for those who asked the very important questions. This is a very important step forward in the whole process of campaign reform and moves us into the forefront of this whole issue along with the other states that have already done this. I ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 67 'ayes', 42 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hamos, did you wish to call House Bill 980? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 980, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance coverage. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 980 simply says that insurance companies that already provide for prescription drugs must also provide for contraception. The goal of this Bill is to prevent unintended pregnancies. And this is a goal that we, as Legislators, share. Currently, 97% of large insurance policies include coverage for prescriptions, but only 33% provide coverage for contraception. should like this Bill? Well, I think that business should like this Bill, because just in the last four months, this is different than the last time we considered this Bill two years ago, in the last four months, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has ruled that it is illegal sex discrimination for a health insurance policy to exclude contraception. And the concern here is, is that this could open the flood of litigation directed against

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

businesses whose policies don't already provide for contraception. We think insurance should like it because for those policies that include maternity coverage, it's certainly cheaper to prevent an unintended pregnancy than to pay the very expensive costs of delivery and in some cases, for complex deliveries. And we certainly think that your constituents should like this Bill because in poll after poll, over 90% of people in Illinois believe that family planning is important. And I do ask you for your favorable support. And I'm available for questions."

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

This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Klingler. Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this measure. I think that everyone of us realizes in our personal lives, the importance of family planning. And we must understand that this availability must be extended to everybody. I think the cost of providing birth control coverage is important and is something that is much cheaper than the cost of difficult pregnancies. I also would like to emphasize for how long Members of both parties have held... talked about the importance of family planning and the government's role. And specifically, I'm referring to former President Dwight Eisenhower and former President Harry Truman. And I'd just like to read a brief, brief paragraph that was issued jointly by Presidents... former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower back in the early 60's. Now, this is President Eisenhower speaking. He said, 'Once as President, I thought and said that birth control was not the business of our Federal Government, the facts changed my mind. Today, with former President Truman, I have come

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

to believe that the population explosion is the world's most critical problem. In some areas, it is smothering economic growth, it can threaten world peace. Millions of parents in our country, hundreds of millions abroad, still denied the clear human right of choosing the number of children they will have. Governments must act private citizens must cooperate urgently through voluntary means to secure this right for all people.' I think that this Bill, which is not tied into any other medicines, but is simply indicating that if a company offers prescription medicine, it cannot discriminate against women and not offer birth control. I really would urge passage of this Bill. I think the time is long overdue. Thank you."

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

There have been two people in support of the Bill. The

Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this legislation. Here we go again, another unfunded mandate on the backs of small businesses in this state. I just don't understand it, one Bill after another Bill after another Bill. When are you guys gonna get tired of driving businesses out of providing health insurance for their employees? If you keep putting all these unfunded mandates on the backs of the business community, they are going to have to make decisions of whether or not to keep the doors open, or to close the doors, or to cut their health care benefits. You know, hear you people stand on the floor and say, time and time again, every year more and more people are going uninsured. Uninsured. You're saying, why is that? Well, the answer is this kind of legislation. You keep funding... passing unfunded mandates onto the small business community. I

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

don't understand it. If you want this kind of care, go to your employee and negotiate with it. That's collective bargaining is all about. If you don't have collective bargaining, you go to the employer and say, this is something that's important to the rank and file of our company. We are asking you to provide this. We think it's important that we'll do this in a lieu of a increase... of a salary increase. Because if this is what they really want, let 'em negotiate with the employer instead of us continuing to go and telling the small business man or woman, you don't have a choice, we know best what's for you, we know what we ought to be doing in this state, that's to pass more unfunded mandates on the backs of small businesses. You all will be guilty of what you're doing to the small business community of this state."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. Two have spoken for the Bill. One has spoken against the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, there are companies that offer coverage that are affiliated with a religious group. And I think we had this discussion a year or two ago about the right of conscience. Will those companies who offer coverage to members of their religious-based faith or religious organizations still be able to write a policy that would say, we just don't cover that, that violates our religious tenant and we can't do that or we just will not do that? Or would this supersede their right of conscience?"

Hamos: "Representative Black, I have in my hand the Health Care

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Right of Conscience Act, which very specifically provides that health care personnel and health care payers, which of course includes insurance companies, are not required to and are not civilly or criminally liable for failure to assist with any health care service that relates to family planning. So, there is no liability as to any of the right... if they choose to exercise their right of conscience."

Black: "I tend to agree with you, but I noticed that the Catholic Conference, for example, opposes the Bill. Is it their interpretation that this Bill will somehow overrule their religious teachings and their basic tenet and that they would have to, then, offer this coverage?"

Hamos: "I have not had a conversation with them, but I can say that for purposes of legislative intent or I think because we understand statutory construction, this is not intended to overrule any other law. And I'm holding in my hand, a law that's very specifically on point. I think the Catholic Conference may have some other issues with family planning."

Black: "Sure, no, I understand that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. Two have spoken in support of the Bill, two have stood in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. I think it's a question of simple fairness, Ladies and Gentlemen. For years, women's groups have been trying to... attempting to gain coverage for contraceptives and insurance programs. And I think nothing in this measure is unconstitutional or goes against any type of persons' ethics. The question of

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

fairness is this, is that if insurance plans can cover Viagra for men that have sexual dysfunctions that may wish to have a child with their spouse because of a sexual dysfunction, and Viagra, as we know, has led to happier lives and happier couples, why not cover women's contraceptives? It's a simple question of fairness. And I ask you to support the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos to close."

Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The only Legislator who spoke in opposition to this actually voted for this Bill two years ago. It was the exact same Bill two years ago, nothing has changed. My... You know, my doctor consultant reminds us that there are other purposes to oral contraception including pain management. And this is a Bill that is reasonable, it's affordable, and is good public policy in that it promotes family planning. And I ask for your support."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 70 'ayes', 36 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. We have with us today St. Augustan School from Belleville, Illinois. And I'd like to have a great General Assembly welcome for them."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Acevedo, did you wish to call House Bill 934? Mr. Clerk, could you read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 934, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Third Reading of this House Bill."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 934 amends the State Finance Act to create the Secretary of State Police Service Fund. provides that the Secretary of State Department of Police may apply for grants and contracts and receive, expend, allocate, and disburse moneys made available by public or private entities, provides that the Secretary of State Department of Police is authorized to perform specified powers and duties related to law enforcement. It also provides that the persons within the Secretary of State Department of Police who exercise these powers conservatives of ... conservators of the peace, provides that the Secretary of Department of Police may charge, collect, and receive fees or moneys equivalent to the cost of providing its personnel, equipment, and services to governmental agencies. And any moneys generated are to be deposited into Secretary of State Police Service Fund to be used for the Secretary of State Department of Police expenses. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair. Is there any discussion on House Bill 934? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you.

Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, what would the Secretary of State's

Police do or what would they use grant money for? I mean,

would they use it to buy patrol cars, or radios, or in-car

computers? I'm just not sure why they want to be on parity

with the State Police, for example."

Acevedo: "It would be used for personnel, equipment, or services

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

for a... to governmental agencies."

Black: "Well, do the... Maybe you can clarify something. The Secretary of State's Police have specific duties with vehicle titles, et cetera. Do they also have full police powers? For example, if they're driving down the road, can they stop a speeder or somebody for failure to use a turn signal or if the primary stop seat belt law passes the Senate, pull somebody over for failure to use their seat belt?"

Acevedo: "Yes, they do..."

Black: "So, they have..."

Acevedo: "Right now, they do have full police powers."

Black: "They have full police powers?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

Black: "What would the basis be for the Secretary of State Police to request a COPS Grant from the Federal Government? Why would they be interested in that grant?"

Acevedo: "Currently, Representative, if for some reason the Secretary of State has certain costs, whether it be squad cars or money allocated for personnel, and it comes out of their budget and they are given a grant from the Federal Government. The money is then turned over back into the General Fund. It is now turned back over to the Secretary of State Police. So, by creating the Secretary of State Service Fund Act, the Secretary of State would be able to receive the funding directly."

Black: "Are you familiar with the Federal COPS Program? Do you know what that stands for?"

Acevedo: "Can you repeat that?"

Black: "The acronym COPS Grant, do you know what that stands for?"

Acevedo: "No, I don't believe so."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Black: "It's Community Oriented Police Services, I think. The people who have raised questions about the Secretary of State's Police applying for, for example, a COPS Grant. A COPS Grant would give a small community a salary to hire a police officer, and then it's a diminishing grant. I think it's three to five years, it gets lower every year, helps small communities put police officers on the street. might be used to buy a squad car, to upgrade a radio system. And some of the local units of governments have expressed concern that if you include the Secretary of State's Police in the ability to go after these grants, there are highly trained people in the Secretary of State's Office who can put together an outstanding grant proposal. And it would be a much larger grant, and then some of the small communities will say, they'll knock us out, we don't have any other resources than to apply for a COPS Grant. The Secretary of State's Police, in their opinion, have other resources at their disposal. So, I think some of the mayors who have contacted me, quite frankly, are afraid of the competition that the Secretary of State's Police could give them on the grant process. What could we say to alleviate their fears and concerns on that?"

Acevedo: "Two points you brought up, are you talking about the CAPS Program or COPS Program?"

Black: "COPS."

Acevedo: "Okay."

Black: "Community Oriented Policing."

Acevedo: "Okay. In the City of Chicago, it's considered a CAPS Program."

Black: "Okay."

Acevedo: "But to answer your question..."

Black: "Well, Chicago's always different."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Acevedo: "Okay. To answer your question, the funding that your talking about is community oriented. Now, this is statewide. So, it wouldn't affect the money that's given out to the community organizations."

Black: "How many sworn officers are there on the Secretary of State's Police? How many sworn officers are there?"

Acevedo: "I would estimate about 130."

Black: "Okay. Would it be the intention of the Secretary of State to be able to apply for grants, to add personnel, apply for a federal grant, say, look, we need 20 more Secretary of State's police officers? We'll get a federal grant and add them to the payroll."

Acevedo: "Representative, basically, this deals with... as far as safety for the policemen, such as body armor, or overtime for the policemen that have to work overtime. Also, in answer to your question from before, when the Secretary of State Police file for a federal grant, they are not competing with other law enforcement agencies within the State of Illinois. They're competing with other states as far as New York, California, other various states."

Black: "Well, and I understand that. But in a local unit of government, when they apply for the grant the council has to approve the grant. And there's always debate because a grant isn't free. I mean, it's just federal money, tax money coming back. What they're... And the fear is always that if you don't look at this very carefully, sure, you can pay for an extra police officer with that COPS Grant for one or two years. Eventually, your local taxpayers have to pick up the cost. My fear is, and I'm not sure I understand where we're headed with this, if the Secretary of State were to get a grant to add 20 officers and the first two years would be our federal tax money paying the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

bulk of those expenses, that's one thing. If in the third and fourth year we have to pick up the cost out of General Revenue Funds, that's another issue. Because see, that decision would not be brought back to the General Assembly."

Acevedo: "Representative, as I stated before, this legislation wouldn't affect as far as hiring additional police officers. This has to do with the reimbursement of where the Secretary of State has to re... have to pay upfront for the cost of certain, like I said, body armors or overtime for personnel. And at that time, they would be reimbursed."

Black: "Is the number of Secretary of State officers fixed in statute or can that number go however high the Secretary of State thinks he could pay for?"

Acevedo: "It can higher or lower."

Black: "All right. So, the number, whatever it is, 120, 130 sworn officers, that isn't capped by statute. In other words, the Secretary of State could add to that total, correct?"

Acevedo: "Yes, he can. Also, I believe, any... if you have additional officers, it would have to be... it has to be approved by the budget."

Black: "Okay. Now, the Secretary of State's Police have full enforcement power over the Vehicle Code. Would it be the intent of the office, if grant money could be available, could they start a drug interdiction unit? Could they start other units that would get into the Criminal Code, and then duplicate what other police agencies are doing in that?"

Acevedo: "I don't think this legislation deals with what you're speaking of, or considers special units within the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

department. And I don't believe that this legislation mentions of any special units that are being formed."

Black: "And I don't disagree with you. But I've been here long enough to know that what we sometimes intend gets expanded under the rule-making process. And I... What I don't want... And I don't think it's necessary. If it is, the Secretary, I'm sure, could convince us. I don't think we need the Secretary of State's Police expanding into drug interdiction, safety education. In other words, we don't need a duplication of effort with very scarce law enforcement resources. And I think you can agree with that."

Acevedo: "And Representative, you're absolutely right. And this legislation never mentions, as far as special units..."

Black: "Okay. Is... I've heard from one county official in the last two weeks that there is some interest by the criminal justice information authority and the State Police to generate a new communications system called IWIN. And it's a wireless system. Now, some rural counties have just spent upwards of a quarter million dollars to get on the radio system. I think it's called the Alert System. Is there anything in this Bill that's aimed at advancing the wireless technology? I believe it's referred to as I-W-I-N."

Acevedo: "Representative, the Secretary of State could be reimbursed for what you're speaking of, but it'd have to be first approved by the General Assembly. Appropriated, I'm sorry."

Black: "Well, now see that's my whole point, right there. I'm not convinced that if the Secretary of State is able to accept grants to do what he or she wants to do with the police force that it would then, in fact, come back to the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

General Assembly. And that's my fear. He or she, the Secretary of State, excellent people know what they're doing can write grants. They expand what they're doing. They could add equipment. They could add, maybe, vehicles. But as you said, maybe radio equipment, maybe wireless technology, personal safety gear. And our federal tax money would pay for it. Now, in three or four years when that grant begins to diminish, then the Secretary of State may come back to the General Assembly and say, this has been a great program but the federal tax dollars no longer will pay for it, so I need to increase my budget by \$2 million to pick up what the federal grants were doing. That's my fear, is that we may be asked to validate what federal tax dollars started and then becomes a cost, a direct cost, to the Illinois General Revenue Fund."

Acevedo: "Representative, I believe before that would happen the funding for... the appropriations for the Secretary of State would have to increase before... up front, before these units can continue on within the process."

Black: "Yeah, and I think that's the key, Representative. And I won't belabor the point. I think that's the key. If we had some oversight or constructive notice on the grants that are being prepared and the uses for which they are prepared, that might be a different issue. I don't know. Many times we let groups get grants and then we have no idea what the grant is for or how many dollars they get and it complicates the appropriation process around here, I can tell you that. But I won't belabor that point. I appreciate your answers to my questions. Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Well, just to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Hoffman: "I would just like to point out that it's mν understanding that all law enforcement, including the State Police, local law enforcement, the chiefs of police, they're all in favor of this legislation. I've not gotten one call from anyone indicating their opposition. simply talking here, about making sure and insuring that the Secretary of State's Police can receive grants, federal grants, can come in order for them to do a good job as law enforcement officials. I would submit to you, although I certainly respect everybody on the other side of the aisle, if a Member of your party was the Secretary of State, you'd be taking a different stance on this Bill. I would just say that follow the rest of the law enforcement's lead and give this measure an 'aye' vote and give the Secretary of State Police the same power that other law enforcement agencies have."

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

Acevedo: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not about competing with other law enforcement agencies within the State of Illinois. This is asking the Federal Government to bring more money back into the State of Illinois for the Secretary of State to continue the job... tremendous job they've been doing, and that is to help being a part of fighting the crime in the State of Illinois. So, remember one thing when you press your buttons, this is about bringing more money... more federal money back into the State of Illinois and competing with other states, not within other law enforcement agencies within the State of Illinois. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Bill 934?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 934, there are 103 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', and 3 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Persico, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Persico: "On a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Persico: "Yes, I'd like every Member of the General Assembly to help me wish my seatmate, Renee Kosel, a happy birthday, her 29th birthday. And there are two cakes down here made by Representative Poe's wife. And we appreciate it. One's a chicken cake and one's a rib cake, I believe."

Speaker Hartke: "Happy birthday, Representative. House Bill 2054, Representative Moore. Out of the record. House Bill 572, Representative Bradley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 572 amends the Illinois Physical Therapy Act. It adds a Section concerning continuing education requirements for the renewal of a license for physical therapists or physical therapy assistants. It provides that the educational requirement shall be established by rule. Open for any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any questions? Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 572?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 572, there are 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3162, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3162, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3162 is the product of negotiations and is now agreed by all parties. This deals with how the state will conduct compliance operations and this would be the alcohol and tobacco compliance. The Bill, as amended now, has removed the objections of the City of Chicago, does not have the preemption problems, and will have the Law Enforcement Training and Standard Board as the lead agency which will develop some basic rules or baseline rules in conjunction with all of the law enforcement agencies, the retail liquor dealers association. And it will just give us a standard of operation statewide that will give us a base. With that, there is no opposition to the Bill. Be happy to answer any questions. And I thank Representative Saviano for conducting the negotiations and achieving agreement from all parties."

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

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

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, there's a Section in the Bill that says a home rule unit may not regulate enforcement actions in a manner inconsistent with this regulation, except for the City of Chicago. Is that a preemption of home rule?"

Mautino: "Yes, there is a preemption of home rule... home rule authority. The City of Chicago currently has their own standards, which are actually much stricter than what is going to be proposed. So, they have their own system, as do the State Police."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. Since there's a preemption..."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes, a preemption of home rule Section in the Bill, does it require Super Majority Vote?"

Speaker Hartke: "We will check on that and get back with you before the vote is taken."

Black: "Thank you. Could I continue asking questions?"

Speaker Hartke: "And you can continue the discussion."

Black: "Representative, I did hear... I think the Amendment has worked out some of the objections. I did hear from, particularly in my area, rural police departments who only have maybe one or two, if they're lucky, three officers. Their initial understanding of this Bill was that if they found somebody to go in, if they wanted to do a sting on a purveyor of alcoholic beverages, that there were strict limitations on the appearance of the young person they were sending in. In other words, they couldn't get him to dress up to where he would look older, you know, maybe scruffier clothes, maybe ask him not to shave Thursday or Friday. In other words, they interpreted that to mean that you'd have to take a clean-cut young man or woman who obviously

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

wouldn't look 21, which then, of course, the sting wouldn't work. Has that language been worked out?"

Mautino: "Actually, there are no standards of structure within the Bill. The groups did agree that this is how they normally operate. They have their standards where you can't use someone who is 19 and looks like he is... looks like me. You know, you can't send in a... And I don't know that they are any that fit that description."

Black: "I'm gonna tell you something. If I owned a store and you came in, I'd card you, you don't look like you're 21.

You'd have to be someone like me."

Mautino: "It's a delight to have you back here. But there are some base standards which the law enforcement are going to agree on. They're actually gonna be the people who will set these standards along with the Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board. That's why the chiefs of police are now in support, as well as the State Police and the Sheriffs' Association, who had the greatest opposition originally."

Black: "All right. So, you have worked out language that I know it concerned them at one time and that was, they were fearful that they would have to run somebody in to do a sting who was, in effect, a choirboy or a choirgirl and the... you know, one look and the owner would say, no, no, where's your ID? So that... You're telling me that language has been worked out?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Black: "That local police authorities are confident that they can still run a sting operation?"

Mautino: "Yes. And it is our goal that they continue to run the compliance operations. The industry itself, wants to make sure that if there's any bad actors that are out there, and

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

there are, that we find them and we do not allow them to continue to operate. We want to just make a fair set of standards apply to cross all and that's why we're gonna work with law enforcement to create them."

Black: "Have you... I'm just curious. And I know this is a double-edged sword, those who sell don't like these, they often think that it's entrapment. In many cases, I would tend to agree. On occasion, it is. Have the retail liquor establishments or the package stores contacted you at any time in this process about perhaps amending it so that they wouldn't feel that, sometimes more so than any other business, that they were encouraged or enticed to break the law and then, of course, pay the price?"

Mautino: "Yes, I've had those conversations with groups that had those concerns."

Black: "And they feel that there are sufficient safeguards in the legislation? You know, we both don't... we both want legitimate business people to be able to operate. Those who would sell to anyone, if they had the price, we would like them to perhaps find another business. So, those people who use common sense, those who make every attempt to comply with the law, this legislation would not be viewed by them as an entrapment or a trick to get them to break the law. Would that be a fair statement?"

Mautino: "Yes, and actually the people in support of these... And

I can just go through the list real quickly for you, of
this Bill, as amended, is the Illinois State Crime
Commission, MADD of Illinois, the Illinois Retail Merchants
Association, the Licensed Beverage Association, the
Restaurant Association, petroleum marketers, tobacco, candy
dealers, associated beer distributors, wine institute,
Miller Brewing Company, Anheuser-Busch, wine and spirits,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

as well as the law enforcement..."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "...agencies who will sit and design these standards."

Black: "Just out of curiosity, why would the petroleum marketers sign in? Is it against the law to sell gasoline to a minor or is it because they represent the convenience stores?"

Mautino: "It could be the convenience stores."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "But I did notice the credit unions liked the Bill, too.

So, you know..."

Black: "Credit unions liked the Bill, too?"

Mautino: "They're not opposed, they're adamantly neutral."

Black: "I can see I go to the wrong credit union, I can tell you that. I appreciate your answering the questions. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black, we have your answer for your inquiry.

Parliamentarian."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, House Bill 3162 does preempt home rule, but it does so in a manner that permits concurrent regulation by units of local government. Therefore, this Bill will require 60 votes for passage."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Righter: "Representative Mautino, I want to ask a couple questions about the specifics that you have in the Bill with regards to directing what this youth, the undercover confidential source, or however you want to term them, certain things that they may or may not do. Now, it's my

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

understanding, in the Bill, that the person that they're... that the Liquor Control Commission may be using may not initiate a conversation with the licensee that they are being sent in to attempt to make a purchase from. If that's the case, how are they going to go in and ask for whatever it is that you're trying to find out whether or not the licensee is selling illegally?"

Mautino: "The Amendment to the... Are you speaking to the direct Bill? The Amendment of the Bill basically sets up that the standards for how these operations... compliance operations or stings will be conducted, is going to be designed by the Law Enforcement Training and Standard Boards and local law enforcement. So, the specific... who initiates a conversation, what the person may or may not wear, what the age of that person who is sent in on the sting operation, are not directed. These will be rules that will be done by JCAR through a process which will include all of the groups that have been at the table."

Righter: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Mautino: "Thank you. I appreciate the questions from Representative Black and other Representatives and would simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3162?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 3162, there are 96 Members voting 'yes', 13 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- hereby declared passed. House Bill 163, Representative Jones. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 163, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Petroleum Education and Marketing Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jones."
- Jones, J.: "Speaker. House Bill 163 extends the existence of the Illinois Petroleum Resource Board until July the 1st of 2008, the scheduled sunset date for the Act. Provides that assessments to the fund, the Illinois Petroleum Resource Board, shall be imposed on persons who own an interest in the gross production of oil and gas in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 163?' All in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 163, there are 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2425, Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2425, a Bill for an Act with regard to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill as amended, and the Amendment was just adopted yesterday, allows the substitute teacher to teach beyond the current 90-day limit provided

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

that after four years such a substitute teacher must hold certification as a regular teacher. As amended, this Bill is supported by the Illinois School Management Alliance, the Large Unit District Association, the State Board of Education, the Illinois Education Association, and the Illinois Federation of Teachers. It is identical to Senate Bill 1293, which passed the Senate by a margin of 56 to 0. I would be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2425? The

 Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Whiteside,

 Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in strong support of this Bill. Representative Cowlishaw and many of us in the House have tried for many years to solve the problem of fewer and fewer substitute teachers in our schools. I think this is a reasonable solution. I think it's one that everybody's worked together on. And I certainly stand in strong support of the Lady's House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Black: "Representative, I wasn't here yesterday. Excuse me, just a clarification. I haven't had time to look at it. Certainly would rise in support of anything that would ease the substitute teacher shortage. Does this Bill apply to those teachers who have retired and would allow them to teach more days than they currently can under the law, or is this just dealing with those who are subbing and not those who have retired from active teaching?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Cowlishaw: "Basically, this Bill is... addresses itself to the categories of certification of these individuals rather than whether or not they are retired from a full-time teaching position. And what it basically does, is that right now the law says that a substitute teacher may not teach any more than 90 days or 450 school hours in any one school district in any one term. This Amendment... This Bill, as amended, provides that substitute teachers may not exceed 120, rather than 90 school days, and 600 rather than 450 hours, in any one school district in any one term."

Black: "Okay fine."

Cowlishaw: "That's all the Bill does."

Black: "Thank you very much. I know that you and I share an interest in education. And the number of unstaffed classrooms in this state, on any given day, is frightening. So, I appreciate what you're trying to do."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, does your Bill, in any way, address a teacher certificate? And, for example, could you have an art teacher in a physics class? And if so, for how long?"

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much for your question. This Bill, in no way, changes any of the present laws, rules, or practices having to do with certification of teachers. Absolutely, all it does is to increase the number of days that one substitute teacher can teach in the same school district, in the same term. That is all it does. It does not even touch any issues having to do with certification."

Davis, M.: "Can that teacher teach in the same classroom for more than 90 days?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Cowlishaw: "Yes, but they have to hold certain types of certificates. Just a minute and I'll tell you what types; early childhood, elementary, high school, or special certification. Such persons who are fully certificated may substitute teach for a period not to exceed 120 school days under the provisions of this law. Previously, it was 90 days."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I do understand what the Representative is attempting to do, and that is allow some remedy for the teacher shortage and the substitute shortage that we, as other states, are suffering in the State of Illinois. And as we pass this legislation, which I'm sure we will, I encourage all of us to consider what kind of options and incentives we must develop in order to encourage people to go into teaching. My concern with any extension of the number of days a substitute can serve in a room has to do with having a teacher who is certified in one area and being in a classroom, say an art teacher in an algebra class for up to 120 days. But since we're trying very hard to make sure our children have before them a classroom teacher who has a degree, and hopefully is certified, and working towards a masters, then I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Cowlishaw: "I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
Bill 2425?' All those in favor will signify by voting
'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Representative Garrett, would you like to

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

vote on this legislation? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2520... or 2425, there are 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cowlishaw on House Bill 58. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 58, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow I'll wait a little later before I get out my lunch that I've brought from home. This Bill creates an income tax deduction the National Guard and Army Reserve individuals who receive pay for their duties while they are serving in those Currently, the income that these people capacities. receive as a direct salary from the Reserves or from the National Guard are exempt from state income taxes. This simply adds to that the additional deduction for any additional compensation they may receive for the period when they are serving. Just for your information, compensation for servicemen while they are prisoners of war or MIA is already deductible. Compensation to National Guardsmen while they are on annual training is already But under current law, compensation paid to deductible. persons in that type of service at times other than national training is not deductible. This is a proposal put forward by the National Guard Association of Illinois in an effort to provide support for young men and young women who have sacrificed part of their lives for their country, through service in the National Guard or the Armed Forces Reserves. I would be glad to answer any question

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

and I would..."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 58?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner, would you like to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 58, there are 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 241, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 241, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. No further Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 241, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk... Would you care to leave this Bill on Second or would you like to hear it on Third now?"

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Flowers: "We can do it now. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 241, a Bill for an Act concerning health services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 241 does three things. It addresses the contraceptive coverage for women. It also provides coverage for the reimbursement of nutritional supplement for people who are suffering from a condition that would prevent he or she from taking sufficient food orally in

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

order to substain (sic-sustain) life. And it talks about the epidural, that women cannot be denied epidural because of their lack of ability to pay. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to House Bill 241."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, is this another unfunded mandate onto the backs of the small business community?"

Flowers: "Well, Representative, it depends on how you look at it."

Parke: "Well..."

Flowers: "Can you imagine..."

Parke: " ... how would I look at it?"

Flowers: " ... I'm gonna answer your question, Sir, because you're talk about unfunded mandates and I'm talkin' about peoples' lives. This Bill merely says that if your doctor says that you need a nutritional supplement in order to live... Now, you talked about the coverage. Okay? The insurance... Their employer has covered them, have insured them. But the insurance company has decided not to pay for the supplement after giving them the operation to save their lives, they're going to deny them the supplement in order to live... in order to... in order to live. And as far as the epidural is concerned..."

Parke: "Representative..."

Flowers: "You know, people die from pain everyday..."

Parke: "Representative..."

Flowers: "And to deny a woman the right to have epidural because of her inability to pay is unconscionable."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Parke: "Representative, do you know of any case, personally, where this kind of nutrigent (sic-nutriment) has been denied?"

Flowers: "Well, I'm glad you asked that question, Representative.

Do I know of anyone personally? No, but the Department of
Insurance, our Department of Insurance, was the one that
brought this to our attention and they know of someone,
personally, and as a result... Would you like for me to
read to you about the gastric feeding tube? Let me just
tell you."

Parke: "No, I just wanted to know..."

Flowers: "There are..."

Parke: " ... if there's actually... I've been told that this is covered..."

Flowers: "Well..."

Parke: " ... and so, I just need in..."

Flowers: "Well, again, the Department of Insurance, our director,

Nat Shapo, brought this to my attention."

Parke: "Okay."

Flowers: "And so, therefore, you understand the reason why this is what you should not consider as another unfunded mandate."

Parke: "Well, of course I can. This is an unfunded mandate. You're telling the providers, the small business people for the most part, 'cause the big businesses will negotiate this with collective bargaining or if they're ERISA covered, they won't be covered by this legislation. So, it falls on the back of small business. You're tellin' 'em that they have to provide birth control pills. Is that right?"

Flowers: "Well, you know, now you're jumpin' around. Yeah, I'm sayin' that, because once again that's a life-threatening

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

situation that's..."

Parke: "What, if they have birth control?"

Flowers: "...only applicable to women and plus it's discrimination and so there's lots of things that birth control pills could do to save a woman's life or either to relieve them of pain. Yes."

Parke: "Birth control saves a woman's life?"

Flowers: "Yes, Sir, because some women... Representative Parke, until at such time that you walk a mile in a woman's shoes, certain women cannot, for medical reasons, should not have children. So therefore, it does save their life. And I just want to say to you, in regards to the gastric feeding tube. Obviously, it is not covered by the Department of Insurance, I mean, by the insurance company because it was suggested at the consumer's division of the Department of Insurance which has had complaints about insurance companies failing to provide coverage for epidurals, as well as prescription nutritional supplements, Sir. This is our Department of Insurance."

Parke: "Well, Representative, what's the position of the Department of Insurance on your Bill, now?"

Flowers: "Pardon me, Sir?"

Parke: "What's the position of the Department of Insurance on your Bill?"

Flowers: "Well, I'm going to... Well, I'm not gonna speak for the Department of Insurance."

Parke: "Wait a minute."

Flowers: "I was elected by the people..."

Parke: "Wait, wait, wait, wait. You brought it up..."

Flowers: " ... and not by..."

Parke: " ... and said that this came from the Department of Insurance."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Flowers: "It did."

Parke: "What is their position on your Bill?"

Flowers: "If someone from the Department of Insurance is here to nod their head 'yea' or 'nay', I will be able to speak for them. But I did..."

Parke: "So, you don't know."

Flowers: "...I did meet with the Department in my office and they are supportive of this part of the legislation."

Parke: "This part, but..."

Flowers: "As far as the..."

Parke: "...on the overall Bill, you don't know what their position is."

Flowers: "I didn't ask them."

Parke: "Representative, the major part of this Bill is that small business has to provide birth control pills for any of their employees. Does this include dependents, also?"

Flowers: "That... You said that was the major part of the Bill."

Parke: "Well, if..."

Flowers: "My whole point..."

Parke: "If the majority of the underlying part of it, the epidural mandate, is very little that insurance companies for the most part cover it, but there is some kind of a small problem than the majority of this Bill is this."

Flowers: "Small problem, tell that to a person, Sir..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke, bring your remarks to a close."

Parke: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Parke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Illinois Life Insurance
Council, Illinois Retail Merchants' Association, Illinois
Manufacturers' Association, Independent Insurance, National
Federation of Independent Business and the HMOs'
Associations all see this as an additional unfunded

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

mandate. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask when the Session's over why don't you make a list of all of these unfunded mandates you voted for and go to some of your small business men and women in your community and ask 'em what they think about this. Then ask 'em, after we've dumped all of this on 'em, why they're dropping their health insurance or if they're not, why are they continuing to do it after we continue to pass one unfunded mandate after another, after another. It's beyond me. I don't understand it."

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

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Johnson: "Representative, you know, I've been reading through your Bill here and you know, you... we just passed a Bill out of here covering contraceptives as an additional mandate, and I basically agree with Representative Parke consistently on the mandates. However, your Bill addresses what I think is a far more important issue here and that is setting up separate standards of care within our hospitals, based on the ability to pay, in terms of obstetrics. Now, I guess my question to you is, if this Bill were to go to the Senate and since there is a free-standing contraceptive Bill over there, would you be amenable in the Senate of removing the contraceptive mandate from your Bill since that's also contained in another one and let them vote on that? Because I think your underlying provisions here really merit support and I think we need to deal with this."

Flowers: "I would be more than happy to do that, Sir. No problems."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Johnson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

O'Brien: "I've listened several times in debates with one of my colleagues speak about mandates with small business owners and I am, in fact, a small business owner and we employ three women, besides myself, three women of child-bearing And I know that I would much rather be faced with age. having to find the cost to cover these medications and an epidural in our insurance plan than cover the cost in our insurance plan of a at-risk pregnancy or the maternity leave that follows then. So, I think that this just makes common sense. There are only seven people employed law firm and four of those people happen to be women and I think at this... really is just a commonsense approach to a problem. When we look for health insurance coverage, we can often obtain it, but with no maternity coverage, no coverage for the types of things that women need. really doesn't do us a lot of good. We spend a lot of money and we aren't providing the service to our employees that we would like to. And so I think that this just really makes a lot of sense. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the people of the State of Illinois, I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 241. Thank you."

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

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Bill 241?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 241, there are 59 Members voting 'yes', 51 Members voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority,..."

Flowers: "Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Flowers: "Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Would you please put this Bill on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor has requested that this Bill be placed on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1004, Representative Flowers. On the Order of Postponed Consideration. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. This Bill's on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1004 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 would merely say that it would be up to each local school to make the rules and regulations in regards to having cell phones in the school. And the other part to the Amendment merely says that when you call a school within the first few prompts you must be able to talk to a human being. That's all the Amendment does. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

1004."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1 to

House Bill 1004? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from

Champaign, Representative Winkel."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Winkel: "Representative, would this Amendment vest the control of the decision making wherein the General Assembly or would that be in the local school districts?"

Flowers: "It would be in the local school districts, Sir."

Winkel: "Okay. So, this would allow the local school districts then to make rules as to who can possess or use cell phones on school property?"

Flowers: "You're correct."

Winkel: "Now, if the local school district wanted to they could regulate the use and possession, or they could choose to ban cell phones, as they saw fit?"

Flowers: "You are correct."

Winkel: "Thank you very much."

Flowers: "Thank you, Sir."

Winkel: "I support your Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, I commend you for the Amendment. I...

Well, let met ask you a question. Does the Amendment
become the Bill?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Now, is there anything... As you and I talked about this the last time, what you had wanted to do was to

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

remove the criminality from someone who brings an electronic device to school. Now in the Amendment, and I like what you have done to the Amendment, but if the local school decides that they will allow this or not allow it, have we still removed the criminal act of the student bringing the instrument to school?"

Flowers: "No, we have not removed that."

Black: "Okay."

Flowers: "But..."

Black: "So... But if the local school board allows it, then I'm going to assume that some zealous prosecutor won't come in and say, 'well, that's fine, that's your policy, but the State Law says you shall not.'"

Flowers: "Well, Representative, you know, I tried to do it that way and for some reason it was rejected because, you know, it appears to me that if we had repealed the law, it was quiet as to what school boards could or could not do."

Black: "Right. Okay."

Flowers: "But for some reason that point did not get across."

Black: "Yeah. Well, I..."

Flowers: "So, the criminal aspect of it is still on the books, but yet we're saying that if the school boards want to do so, they can do so."

Black: "Okay. And I would think that you could work with a Senate Sponsor where you could accomplish both. You could make it a local policy and yet somehow remove the criminality. And I don't think it would be a problem unless you had a very zealous prosecutor who wanted to make a name for himself or herself, that would be my only concern, if we didn't specifically address that."

Flowers: "But also, Representative, on line 13 it says, 'and may by rule provide for the imposition of appropriate

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

discipline upon any pupil who violates such a..."

Black: "And I don't have any problem with that, but I... my only concern is we may not be wiping out the state statute, so we may find... a school may find itself in conflict when they may think that, hey, this is now our decision and they're okay with that, and then somebody comes in and says, well, you may be okay with that, but the State Law says they shall not have this on their... on school property."

Flowers: "Representative, it says, on line 9, it also says 'that a school board may prohibit or regulate the use..."

Black: "Okay."

Flowers: "...or possession of any cell phones.'"

Black: "All right. Does the staff think that we have addressed the underlying State Law prohibiting the equipment on school property?"

Flowers: "We had previously, according to staff, is that in the original Bill we outlawed it totally..."

Black: "Right."

Flowers: "...and completely. Now, we're saying that a school board 'may prohibit'."

Black: "Okay. So, they won't..."

Flowers: "So there lies the difference."

Black: "In your opinion and it's your intent that they not be in conflict with state statute."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Black: "And this should take care of that."

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Black: "I commend you for your work on it. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you, Sir."

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

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

 Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Flowers, my analysis of this says that your final Amendment states that if you call a student's school, you must have the option of speaking to a human being. Is that correct?"
- Flowers: "That's correct."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. In other words, they can't put you in that loop that keeps zeroing around and around and around to the point that you never get to talk to someone that's not automated."
- Flowers: "Beginning in 2003, Sir, we will be talking to live people at the schools."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. I only have one question. Your Bill limits this only to the public schools. Could you have not put all elementary and secondary schools on your Bill? Because I know of several private schools that we have the same problem."
- Flowers: "You know, Representative Mitchell, I would have been more than happy to do that, but I was dealing with the public schools right now and I didn't think that we could regulate all private schools because there's home schooling and you know, so I didn't want to go reaching that far. If I could just deal with the school my daughter goes to and a few other public schools, I..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, could you add the one my daughter goes to, right now, because it's..."
- Flowers: "Well, can we talk? After you vote for this Bill, Sir.

 Thank you."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just address the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I believe that in this age of information and in this age of technology most and many parents are working, some are gone to work by the time their children are home from school or gone to cheerleading practice. It is extremely, in my opinion, significantly important that the school set the policy, but a parent be allowed to provide his or her child with a telephone. I had a nurse to call me to say that she went to work from 4 to 11 leaving home at 3. daughter went directly to cheerleading practice and then some other class upon leaving school. She wanted the opportunity to call her daughter and make sure she had arrived safely at the second location. It is important provide our children with this safe, safe we technology and leaving it up to the schools what their policy will be. I think it's a very, very wise piece of legislation and as we move into the new millennium we cannot pretend that technology does not exist. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion on the Amendment? Mr.

Turner, do you stand in opposition to this Amendment?"

Turner, J.: "I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask a question."

Speaker Hartke: "Proceed."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I'm concerned about the portion of the Amendment that has a mandate on local school districts and I'm curious as to why you're putting that mandate into the statute."

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- Flowers: "What portion are you referring to, Sir? Representative Turner."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Turner. Would you clarify your question."
- Turner, J.: "But she hasn't responded to my question, yet, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "She wants a clarification of your question."
- Turner, J.: "Oh, she asked for a clarification? Well, the Amendment says that the school 'must' provide for the caller to speak to a live person rather than to hear options, as I read the language. And I'm curious as to why we have the 'must' mandate provision in the proposed Amendment."
- Flowers: "Representative Turner, would you please finish reading that sentence and it says, 'among the first set of menu choices', they must provide a human being, 'among the first set of menu choices'. Because if there is a problem in the school, Representative, and if you had a child in the system, I think you would want to talk to someone to know, is it true that the school building is on fire or is it true that there is... the meeting has been canceled tonight or something to that effect."
- Turner, J.: "Okay. Just wanted to make clear, then. You do
 intend that language to be mandatory as of July 1, 2003?
 No question about that, that is your intent with the Bill,
 as amended."
- Flowers: "According to the Amendment, if they use an automated telephone answering equipment system, yes, it shall take effect July 1 of 2003."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1004?' All those in

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

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 Rossi: "Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "No further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2563, Representative Bassi. Suzie Bassi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2563, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal justice information. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. I bring before you House Bill 2563 which amends the Criminal Justice Information Act and changes the membership of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority from 18 members to 20 members by adding to it the state appellate defender on the premise that this will provide better representation for the defense, perspective on criminal justice issues, and then an additional member of the general public, so as to retain the ratio of public members to private members. There is no known opposition. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2563? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2563?' All in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2563, there are 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Bill 1889, Representative Miller. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1889, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance coverage. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Bill 1889 amends the Illinois Insurance Code to provide coverage for medical services ancillary to dental services for the disabled and children under seven. Under this legislation, persons eligible would include those with severe dental conditions who, in the opinion of the dentist, cannot be successfully treated by the use of conventional management procedures. This Bill, in no way, would require payment under medical insurance for dental services. An example of this would be the same day hospitalization or the anesthesia used for sedation. Anesthesia is needed to treat the patient yet is denied because it is ancillary to the dental services. This is unfair and, in my opinion, discriminates against this group of patients. The 90th General Assembly passed legislation that is similar to this Bill. And I would ask for a favorable vote, so that now the issue can be finally resolved with the needy population."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, you're a dentist, right?"

Miller: "Correct."

Parke: "Okay. And you believe that we should mandate to the hospitals that they should provide... I'm not sure I understand."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Miller: "Okay."

Parke: "I'm lookin' this over and it doesn't make sense. Is it to tell people who have disabilities that they have to be covered?"

Miller: "No. First off, yes, I'm a dentist, but I do not treat any patients and I want that to be on the record, in the hospital. So this Bill does not affect me nor my practice."

Parke: "Okay."

Miller: "What this Bill does is, for instance, if there's a child who's two years old who has nursing bottle caries, severe decay due to the parent just giving 'em sweets or whatever. It's very difficult to manage that child in a normal practice setting. Some dentists are able to do it, okay. Some are not. And so with that patient, if the patient was in my practice, I would normally refer to the specialist. Even still, with the pediatric dentist they may be able to treat that patient, they may not. If it is better to treat that child in the hospital, then usually that child is put to sleep under it. Just because the child is put to sleep, what this Bill is saying is that those services, the anesthesia that may be required, should be covered similar to any other thing, it's just the fact that it's dental services that are being provided. This Bill does not say that the insurance should... that dental services should be covered by the insurance company. It's just simply saying... the anesthesia that should be covered."

Parke: "Are these requests being denied by the hospitals?"

Miller: "Yes."

Parke: "Have you talked about... have you talked to the hospital society, hospital association about your legislation?"

Miller: "I've not talked to the hospital association about this."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Parke: "You have not?"

Miller: "I have not. It's not a question of whether... it's not a question of ... they will provide the anesthesia for you. It's requiring the insurance company to cover that as a benefit for those particular patients, for that small group of that population."

Parke: "So, you're mandating that the hospitals pay it and hospitals have to pass it on to either the private pay health insurance carriers or they have to eat it."

Miller: "I'm asking for... Excuse me, Representative Parke. I'm asking for the insurance coverage for those services ancillary to the dental services. It's really... I'm not asking the hospitals to do anything. For instance, if your child, you know, was in the hospital for this, for a gallstone, the insurance company would cover... you know, or tonsils removed, they would cover the tonsils being removed, okay, the anesthesia so on, so forth. And all we're asking is for the insurance company to cover the anesthesia just be... if the child is being treated for dental services, but not the dental services to be covered."

Parke: "Well, the hospital has to bring a dentist in, I presume,

I mean, a medical doctor probably couldn't do this work,
right?"

Miller: "There are many specialists who have hospital privileges, many pediatric dentists who are affiliated with hospitals for cases like this. There are many dentists who may treat a disabled, a physical or mental disabled in a hospital setting. Many general dentists will not do that unless they've had speciality training in this area."

Parke: "Well, then who pays for it now? Who pays for what you want to solve now? Who pays it?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Miller: "Then you would eat the cost on that. The patient... the parent would or the... would eat the cost for their child."

Parke: "So, the patient. The costs are borne by the parent."

Miller: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear your question, Sir."

Parke: "I said, the costs are borne by the parent."

Miller: "Yeah. Whoever would pay for noncovered services, which in the case of a child, would be..."

Parke: "Okay. If there in... Would this be covered under emergency room for the most part?"

Miller: "It could be. For instance, same-day hospitalization.

So, if a child was hit with a baseball bat and fractured...

well, that may be under medical, fractured not only their tooth, but an orbit or the maxilla then it may need to be put under for that emergency repair. An oral surgeon would be able to treat it then it could... that emergency room service would be considered under this."

Parke: "Why is the statewide school management alliance opposed to this?"

Miller: "That's a good... I do not know."

Parke: "And you haven't... I mean, I'm just sort of surprised that you'd put a Bill that affects hospitals and you wouldn't talk to them about this."

Miller: "Well, I don't think it affects..."

Parke: "I guess, I'm..."

Miller: "Once again, I don't think it affects hospitals because hospitals provide anesthesia and these kind of services already. What it's just simply stating is that if a child under seven has severe decay and, in the opinion of the dentist, needs to be treated in a hospital setting, the insurance company will cover the services ancillary to the dental procedures. So, once again, I get back to the anesthesia or if it was an emergency room, it's not saying

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

that. I'm sure the hospital would be happy to provide the services, it's just unfortunately they deny treatment. And I use the example of a tonsil, tonsillectomy, they may cover that, the insurance company may cover the anesthesia for that, but will not cover for dental because it's related to dentistry."

Parke: "Oh. All right. And this only applies to disabled people?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke, bring your remarks to a close."

Parke: "I just asked, does this only apply to disabled people?"

Miller: "And children under seven."

Parke: "Disabled children under seven?"

Miller: "No disabled, meaning somebody who's an adult who's autistic who would be hard to communicate and had severe dental or mental handicap and also children under seven.

In addition, the hospital association has not come to me with any opposition of this Bill."

Parke: "Thank you."

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

Klingler: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. For a number of years I've talked with dentists in my community who have large practices that have a large percentage of disabled people and also and children. And they mention when it comes to very difficult oral surgery and very difficult extractions, that a child or a disabled person or person with a mental disability, is simply too frightened to simply do this procedure in the office chair. What they need is some kind of mild anesthesia to get them through this, but properly supervised in the hospital setting. Other procedures that are just as invasive but nondental, the ancillary benefit

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

of the anesthesia is covered and I think that because it is oral... Simply because it's oral surgery is not a reason to disallow this coverage, especially in cases of the disabled, mentally ill persons, and children. And I would urge support for this important legislation."

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

Osmond: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Osmond: "All right. Representative Miller, why are you including children under seven? Is the part of the language for this?"

Miller: "If I heard the question completely, you asked me how... why am I including children under seven?"

Osmond: "Correct."

Miller: "Well, a lot of times it's hard to treat those who are...

a lot of times children don't like to go to the dentist and so... and sometimes the... once again, the general dentist, if a child has severe and that's what it says in here, 'severe dental decay' and that is not able to be treated usually by a general dentist or the specialist cannot treat them with typical behavioral management procedures and in that case, they would be referred to a hospital setting."

Osmond: "Could... You said that the language contains the word 'severe' dental treatment. I don't see that in mine.

Maybe you could help me out with that. It just says, 'in conjunction with dental services'."

Miller: "I'm sorry, Representative. Yeah, I stand corrected. It would include an opinion of the dentist... who cannot be treated success... can be successfully treated by the use of conventional management procedures."

Osmond: "So, it's up to the dentist to decide whether or not in

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

the event of a child, whether or not he feels or she feels that they could treat the child or instead, they would refer them to a hospital then to... for what other procedures would you expect just for... You can administer anesthetics now in the dental office, can't you?"

Miller: "Well, local anesthesia most dentists do administer, but this is not considered... this is medical services ancillary to it. So, once again, I get back to the putting children to sleep and those kind of things if the child is not gonna sit still through the procedure or it's just gonna be a traumatic emotionally to the child and a lot of times the specialist will feel that it's a better setting in a hospital setting, particularly if the child is very young, as I said earlier, two years old."

Osmond: "Are you using a medically necessary standard to do this or is it just because the child doesn't like going to a dentist. It seems to me as though we're gonna incur an awful lot more expense for this if we're just transferring people over to hospitals all the time just because, in the opinion of the dentist or mom or dad, that the child under seven doesn't want to go sit in the dentist's chair."

Miller: "Well, I think most health care providers would rather not treat the child in the hospital and would rather not have the child put to sleep. In fact, most children can be treated by conventional management procedure. There are many that are... that I use, there are many that other dentists use, but we're talking about once again when we're not able to communicate with the child. The child could have, you know, just have problems with sitting still in a dental chair and so, we're talking about a select population and also in addition to that, the parent may feel because the child is crying or make cause emotional or

- 39th Legislative Day

 April 3, 2001

 psychological trauma that a hospital setting may be better."
- Osmond: "Who makes the determination that a child should go under anesthetic treatment? Would that be the dentist or..."
- Miller: "Yeah. In the opinion of the dentist, it would be treated, but ultimately it'd be the parents' consent."
- Osmond: "Is there any..."
- Miller: "Absolutely."
- Osmond: "... physician approval? Any other physician or that...

 and excuse me, are dentists, I mean, do you have the
 ability to do that, now? I mean, I'm not..."
- Miller: "Yeah, we... If I was a specialist, I would be able to have the authority to say, yes, this child... it would be better if we put this child under, but ultimately, it's the perennial (sic-parental) consent of the... perennial (sic-parental)."
- Osmond: "How do you expect this to relate to an overall cost increase?"
- Miller: "You know, I think, once again, I mean, you know, I would love for it... the insurance companies would have just covered it, you know. But unfortunately we're talkin' or fortunately we're talkin' about a developing (sic-developmentally) disabled and we're also talkin' about children under seven who, once again, most children can be treated within the specialist dental practice. So, you know, I couldn't give you a number, but I would say, you know, I wouldn't say that it would be that much."
- Osmond: "Many times in the health insurance policies there's provisions for medically necessary treatment. It's your experience that in all the lists of people that you've mentioned here that cases could not be made without this law? That an autistic or severely disabled person, it

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

wouldn't be medically necessary to do that now?"

Miller: "Well, as a health... as a dentist, I would agree with that state..."

Speaker Hartke: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Osmond: "My only comments on it is that I think that broadening from seven-year-old for any reason is not suitable. There doesn't seem to be a medically necessary reason to do it. I think that... I know that doctor... Well, Representative Miller mentioned something earlier about emergency room treatment as far as an accident goes, most of that's covered now under major medical policies. If you're in a car accident and you have damage to your face, that's gonna be covered under medical coverage. If you're hit in the head with a bat, that's already gonna be covered under your major medical and I really don't see that we've demonstrated a need for this legislation at this point. And I would ask the Body to vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "Go ahead."

Poe: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like for you to look up in the balcony over here and welcome a class from my district, the Rochester Elementary School. So, let's give 'em a big welcome to Spring..."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there further discussion? Mr. Miller to close."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and House Members. I'd like to just quickly address that medical necessary point that Representative Osmond... that the Representative brought up. If insurance companies covered services, ancillary

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

services, related to dental services, then this... there would be no need for this, but unfortunately they do not. Just because certain things are labeled as a dental or relationship to the teeth, then they do not cover certain things and those do include anesthesia and treatment in a hospital setting. And so, I would ask the Members of the House here for a favorable vote on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1889?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1889, there are 100 Members voting 'yes', 10 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1905, Representative Wojcik. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1905 amends the Public Community College Act to provide that the amount of the required bond for the treasurer of the community college district is 25% of the amount of all of the bonds, notes, mortgages, monies and other assets for which the treasurer has custody. This House Bill makes the community college treasurer's bond identical to the K-12 school district's treasurer's bond. This Bill does not affect the city colleges of Chicago. And Representative Wirsing is my cosponsor and I believe, he can explain further."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just... I'd be willing to answer any questions, if there are some."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1905?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House pass House Bill 1905?' All those in favor

signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The

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

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

record. On House Bill 1905, there are 110 Members voting

'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

hereby declared passed. House Bill 2054, Representative

Moore. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2054, a Bill for an Act concerning an advisory referendum on a tax increase to fund land preservation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moore."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of t.he House. House Bill 2054 is an initiative brought forward by the Illinois Association of Park Districts supported by many of the other organizations that support initiatives like this around the state; the Illinois Nature Conservancy, the Open Lands Project, and many, many others. So many times we have legislation that does a small this does a very large thing in that it asks the voters of the entire state if they would be willing to support the sales tax increase for land preservation. It is... In our state, there are many different issues, of course. In the northern part of the state, it is urban sprawl that is something that is a problem. Also, in the area of Springfield, also in the area of Peoria, the land

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

consumption continues to increase. In the downstate areas, the preservation of open space and rural recreational opportunities such as hunting and fishing and camping is also critical to maintaining the state's rural and agricultural areas and also providing some economic development. I would be happy to an... There are no known opponents to this Bill. I would be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, is this a front-door referendum?"

Moore: "This is a front-door referendum and it's advisory in nature."

Parke: "And who will use this and how?"

Moore: "The referendum?"

Parke: "Yes, Ma'am. Let's say it gets 51% of the people of Illinois supporting it. What do you do... Where do you go from there?"

Moore: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you. Could you repeat the question? I couldn't hear you."

Parke: "If you get 51% of the people of Illinois vote for this referendum, what do you with it? Where do you go with this?"

Moore: "It is an advisory referendum to the Illinois General Assembly and then at that point in time we will... it is hoped that we will put together an initiative that will provide a program somewhat similar to the Open Lands Trust legislation which was, I think, unanimously passed by this Body. It will not be exactly the same because that was a bond program. This one, I'm hoping, will have a little

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

more flexibility and of course, it would have some additional money. We would have to look at trying to implement a sales ta... an increase in the sales tax."

Parke: "What happens if you get 49%?"

Moore: "Well, then I would say the referendum fails."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

Moore: "This is an advisory referendum."

Parke: "Thank you."

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

Moore: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good initiative. It's one that we should be doing more often, asking the citizens what they think of and what their opinion is. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2054?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2054, there are 82 Members voting 'yes', 30 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 776, Representative Cross. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 776, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a fairly simple Bill and all it does is amends the Illinois Horse Racing Act we adopted back in 1975. I know all of you are aware that the Thoroughbred Breeder's Program Task Force was to have a

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

report back to this General Assembly by March 1st with recommendations that they were, I guess, we legislated some time ago we asked them to come back. They have not completed their task force report. This Bill simply allows or gives them time until May 1st to get those recommendations to the General Assembly. I'm not aware of any opposition. All the horses (sic-horse owners) in the State of Illinois are for this. And I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 776?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 776, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2298, Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2298 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. House Bill 760, Representative Leitch. What is the status of that Bill?'
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 760 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.

 House Bill 1954. What's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1954 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. House Bill 914.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 914 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.

 House Bill 1722. The status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1722 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second... Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. Third Reading on the Calendar appears House Bill 3392, Representative Daniels. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3392, a Bill for an Act in relation to developmental disabilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3392 is a recommendation of the Illinois Council on Developmental Disabilities and an initiative of our developmental disabilities legislative package. It creates a workforce task force to address high rates of unemployment amongst persons with disabilities and it creates a longitudinal study on the outcomes of secondary education programs for students with disabilities. The task force will consist of 16 members both of the House and Senate, as well as representatives from various agencies, advocacy groups, and the business community. The goal of this study is to identify gaps in services that may exist for these students transitioning out of their secondary

- 39th Legislative Day

 education, in addition to identifying strategies to narrow

 any gaps in services that may exist. I ask for your

 favorable support."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 3392?

 Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3392?' All those in favor

 will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The

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

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

 wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 3392,

 there are 111 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no',

 and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a

 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.

 Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2139?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2139 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the order... for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 2438."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2438 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 1081, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1956, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2276, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3193."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3329, on Second Reading, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3329, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3364, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Franks in the chamber? Take that Bill out of the record temporarily. House Bill 524, Representative Franks. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 524 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 524, Amendment #2 is a result of negotiations and ongoing negotiations. The Amendment was drafted by the Farm Bureau in conjunction with the Democratic House and Democratic-Republican staff along with the Senate Agricultural staff and it pertains to the Producer Protection Act. This is how we're going to be dealing with contracts in agriculture and it simply asks that they be readable. The Amendment itself takes out a provision for super priority liens and a hundred thousand dollar contract threshold from the original Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Turner on the Amendment. He declines to voice his opinion. Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- to House Bill 524?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3098, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3098 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2531, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2531, a Bill for an Act creating the Short-term Loan Act. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Dart, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Dart on the Amendment."
- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was a product of suggestions from the committee. Removes the interest rate cap and deals with issues dealing with the investigative powers of the department. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Steve Davis."
- Davis, S.: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. On House Bill 3392, my switch has malfunctioned. I would like the record to reflect that I should be recorded as 'yes'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will reflect your wishes. Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... You know, Mr. Speaker, I...

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

It's gettin' a little crowded... noisy in here today and I think this Bill may be one we have some concerns about... I don't know if concerns, but we have some questions if we could maybe make sure that..."

Speaker Hartke: "We're discussing the Amendment."

Cross: "Well, I... he explained the Amendment. I, frankly, couldn't hear a thing he said, so if maybe..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Dart, would you reiterate."

Cross: "... Tom, could you explain it again?"

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Dart: "The Amendment is the product of the committee's suggestion dealing with the powers of the Department of Financial Institution. They felt they were too broad. This narrowed the scope of it. It also removed what was the sticking point for numerous people was that there was an interest rate cap on the Bill and that removed that from the Bill, as well. It also removed the provision about the prohibition of payday loan stores around schools."

Cross: "So, and..."

Dart: "Basically, scales the Bill back, Tom."

Cross: "Tom, I under... I'm looking, at least at our file, that IRMA, the Illinois League of Financial Institutions, Small Loan Association, Consumer Lending, some other groups or those groups were opposed to the original Bill."

Dart: "IRMA came up to me during the committee and they told me they're now neutral on the Bill, because of the changes that they had been concerned about. Some of the other people you're referencing are the very people we're trying to regulate. So I can't see any scenario where they're going to, all of a sudden, decide this is a good idea."

Cross: "Does Amendment #1 become the Bill?"

Dart: "No. Amendment #1, basically, scales the Bill back is what

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

it does. It keeps it in place and removes, basically, the three primary things I just talked to you about, are the primary things that it removes."

Cross: "All right. Well, maybe we can look it over and spend a little more time... Are there any other Amendments you have?"

Dart: "No. That's the only one right now. There's another one that I've been talking with some folks about, but we haven't come to an agreement on it yet."

Cross: "All right. Where's the Department of Financial Institutions on this Bill or do they have a position?"

Dart: "This is very similar to the rules that they're pushing in JCAR or had pushed in JCAR, so I don't... not exactly sure of their position, but this is very, very close to theirs. So, I would imagine that this would be something that they'd be in favor of, though they've being taking somewhat of a hands-off policy on a lot of this, right now."

Cross: "One of the notes I see in there, is there a Section in your Amendment that deals with civil actions under your Act along with..."

Dart: "Yeah..."

Cross: " ... punitive damages, Tom?"

Dart: "Yeah. What it does is it provide... it removes penalties. You have to look at it in context of the whole Bill though, Tom, for it to make sense. And what it does is it removed portions that allowed for criminal sanctions; instead allowed the Department to impose some degree of civil sanctions. So, as I say, it's more of a retrenchment than moving forward."

Cross: "All right. And you mentioned something about schools, a minute ago."

Dart: "Yeah. Tom, what had happened was in the original Bill

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

we'd put a prohibition on the payday loan stores and title loan stores being around the areas of schools and universities. Practically speaking, Tom, when it came down to it, when you looked at what that would do, in certain areas like the City of Chicago, it would literally abolish them because they couldn't fit within that radius. And as I told people from the very beginning, the thought here was to regulate, not abolish, and we're working towards that."

Cross: "So, with your Amendment, what happens to those or do you even have any language now that deals with the issue of payday loans near or around schools or universities?"

Dart: "They can... There's no prohibition anymore."

Cross: "All right. None whatsoever."

Dart: "Under the Bill there was a prohibition saying you couldn't be within, I think, it was a mile of schools. That Section is just pulled out altogether, so that they would be able to locate in the areas they choose."

Cross: "All right. Thanks a lot."

Dart: "Sure, Tom."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, the deletion of the interest cap... I know I'd had some calls from credit unions, labor organizations, who have an affinity... Credit card, for example, who are very concerned about that. We've fought that battle here years ago. And you've eliminated the cap on interest rates, correct?"

Dart: "You're correct."

Black: "All right."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Dart: "It seemed to have been the stumbling point for numerous people, Bill. And I really didn't want that to be the focus of it."

Black: "Yeah. No, I understand. And I won't even go down the road about credit card interest, that's for another day. The argument, Representative, can be used and I know in my hometown we didn't have any of these, they popped up six or seven years ago, generally the sign of a community in transition or a weak economy or what have you, not that I'm denigrating my hometown. But I've had people call me and I'm not sure I understand their concerns. But what they tell me and you tell me how you would respond. They said, look, if I could get credit from a bank, from a finance company, from a savings and loan, that's where I'd go. I'm not after 5 or not after a home mortgage. thousand. I need a couple of hundred bucks to tide me over, keep the bill collectors off my back. I go, I'm What's the problem, Representative? And I... I'm happy. not sure they would... they understand when I say I'm trying to protect you from yourself."

Dart: "Yeah. And see, and that's a very good point because the reality of it is, is that, true, and I've worked on this for now about three years and we had some task forces. We met in Champaign, and down in East St. Louis. And so, we tried to get a cross section of everybody to hear just what you're talking about and when we talked to them, what came about, which was news to me, was that the banks actively did not want these people. So, I didn't know that at first. We found that out. And so, I went about trying to put this together in such a way where if people truly mean what they say, which around here sometimes you're led to wonder, if they mean what they say, then they should be

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

able to operate fine under this Bill because this isn't abolishing it, it isn't running out of business. But the one part... the problem that was from one end of the state to the other was is that the way these places are operating, once you get in, you can't get out. And so the major thing that we were trying to do was to break that cycle, saying, listen if you have your car break down and you're in the middle of a pay period, you need the \$200, allow you go do it, and buyer beware. If they're gonna charge you a million dollars interest, but you want to pay that, that's your choice. We're not gonna tell ya you can't do that. What we are gonna say though, is that after three or four of these loans, and we cap it, I think, after two you have to have a cooling-off period, then we would stop in... we'd step in and say, listen, enough's enough because you're no longer doing what you said you we're gonna do which is take care of this small little need you had. Now, you're using this as a form of financing which, as I said, the problem gets to be is these folks... and this is what they were saying, they get in and they can't get out, because they do these things called these rollovers where we were finding the average person was having, I think it was, 16 loans a year. And we were attempting to try to make it so that it was just what it said it was, was that short-term need, they can do it, charge whatever they want and they can do that, but just not this go on so the people, frankly, are going into bankruptcy."

Black: "Is there anything in the... I don't see anything in the

Amendment that specifically addresses the car title loan.

Is that covered in the Bill?"

Dart: "That's in the original Bill."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Black: "All right. And well... You've answered the question about the interest rate and that, I guess, will have to wait for another day. But it's your intent that if a person wants to do this and feels that this is the lender of only... or last resort and that's what they want to do, other than give them constructive notice, if that's what they want to do, that's what they're gonna do. Right? I mean..."

Dart: "Yeah. And that was at the heart of it, Representative, is that we are not gonna be paternalistic and say, listen, we're gonna tell you how to do it. The other side of this issue would like to say this is what we're attempting to do. We're telling the people how to run their lives. they've said flat out, all the time, these are short-term loans for little needs. And I said, well, fine. let's live by that and say, we're only gonna do it so these people can only extend it a short period of time. After they cool off, if they want to do it again a month later, go ahead, they can start the cycle again, but that wasn't what was happening and that's where the other side has been so horribly deceptive. And whenever I asked them for the information and all the rest of the stuff, they never came up with it. And this was sort of allowing it to go on, but to have some very broad lines. They would say, once again, it's squeezing 'em so they can't operate. Ι would challenge them to show me how."

Black: "All right. One of the major complaints I've had with people who do this is that they go in to make a partial payment, they say, well, I thought I could pay this off out of my next check, but I can't. But I'd like to pay \$50 on the hundred. And if what people are telling me is true, they were all, oh, don't worry about it; oh, that's okay,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

you come back next week. Well, then the hundred, instead of being a hundred and twenty-five, was a hundred and fifty and would shortly be a hundred and seventy-five. And they started to just simply, as you say, they never could give, you know, they were paying back 300 and they borrowed a hundred."

Dart: "And Representative, you just hit the nail on the head and that's the major thrust of what I'm trying to do with that, is so that folks are very aware of what's going on and that they can spend down the principal part of this so that they can start getting at that. And as I say, I really think we've been reasonable with this. It's gone through a lot of different versions and I'm sure I'm gonna hear a lot more about this and it's probably not completely done, but it's close."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Dart: "Sure. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion. Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2531?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3364, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3364, a Bill for an Act concerning the corporate accountability for tax expenditures. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Franks, has been approved for consideration."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Amendments 2 and 3 change the Bill. And this is a Bill... The Amendments were agreed on by DCCA, they were actually drafted by DCCA. I've talked to the Illinois Manufacturing Association who indicates that they are neutral as well as the Illinois Municipal League."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Franks, keep your remarks to Amendment #2, please."

Franks: "It's Amendment 2, okay. Just Amendment 2. This was the... There are neutral on this. What this would do was create the State Economic Assistance Accountability Act and provides for DCCA to have written incentive agreements with companies that do business with the state and get tax breaks and incentives. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross on Floor Amendment #2."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "Representative, does the... does #2 become the Bill?"

Franks: "Yes, it does."

Cross: "All right. If I'm not mistaken, there were numerous opponents when the underlying Bill was filed. Are those...

Are you aware of that opposition whether it's still there?"

Franks: "It's my understanding that now Department of Revenue and DCCA are both neutral. When I spoke with the Illinois Manufacturers' Association yesterday, they indicated they'd be neutral on it as well as the Illinois Municipal League."

Cross: "All right."

Franks: "I'm still waiting to hear back from Motorola. I have a call into them and I've faxed them the Amendment."

Cross: "All right. If I remember, at least when this Bill was

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- initially filed, Representative, there was from reading in some newspaper accounts this concept would require the recipient of the DCCA help or DCCA funds to return that money that they borrowed to DCCA. Is that the concept of your Amendment or Bill?"
- Franks: "Well, it's one of the issues in there. What we're saying, is all the incentive agreements have to be written, and part of it would be that if they didn't live up to the agreement to get the incentives, that they'd have to pay back a portion of the incentives."
- Cross: "Who's gonna make the determination as to whether or not they lived up to the agreement?"
- Franks: "The directive, DCCA, can elect to waive enforcement of the incentive agreements. It's up to DCCA."
- Cross: "How... the agreement or the expectation of the company whether it's Motorola or whomever, are the terms of the agreement subjective that they need to live up to or objective?"
- Franks: "They are objective. But there is a subjective requirement, I guess, or a subjective component, in that if DCCA can give a waiver, if it believes it will promote the viability of the project or will contribute to the retention of jobs in Illinois associated with the project. Even though there are concrete objective terms, there's still a subjective component to it."
- Cross: "All right. Now, does this Bill deal with just outright grants to particular employers or does it, in addition, apply to assistance such as tax credits and tax exemptions?"
- Franks: "I believe it deals with the capital investment goals. I believe it's the grants."
- Cross: "All right. So, it absolutely..."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

- Franks: "I'm sorry. There's also some state tax exemptions under the High Impact Business designation and that's part of it as well, Representative. I apologize."
- Cross: "Okay. Would those tax exemptions would there be... I assume there'd be a way to calculate those in the event that DCCA felt like they were not living up to expectations and they would then go after that money as well?"
- Franks: "Yes. We're giving DCCA the flexibility to deal with this and to put forward the rules and regulations."
- Cross: "Does this Bill apply at all to the issue or this

 Amendment apply at all to whether or not a local

 municipality or a county provides grant money and/or tax

 incentives or tax credits like DCCA?"
- Franks: "No, Representative. It's just for the state."
- Cross: "Is there a mechanism in which... Is there an ability for a county or local municipality to do what we're doing?"
- Franks: "Not that I'm aware of."
- Cross: "Is there any reason why we would not want to give the same type of protection to a local municipality or a county board that provides economic assistance just like the state?"
- Franks: "Well, I wanted to start with the state and we'll see how it goes. We can do that Bill next year."
- Cross: "All right. Does the... In the event of Motorola, were there any local incentives or was it all state?"
- Franks: "There was some local incentives, and curiously, they didn't take advantage of the biggest one they could have and that was the property tax and they didn't take it."
- Cross: "Okay. What's the difference with your Amendment #2 and the original Bill?"
- Franks: "Well, I shelled the original Bill which was Amendment #1. The original Bill had a lot of individual components

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

based on the payback provisions and we thought it would be better suited to have DCCA have more control since they're the ones providing most of the grants and working with the tax incentives."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? On this Amendment, we have four people seeking recognition. Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, staff indicates that there is a third

Amendment filed to this Bill. Is it your intent to call

Amendment #3?"

Franks: "Yes."

Black: "Okay."

Franks: "Yes, Mr. Black."

Black: "Okay. And that's not germane to the question. I just wanted to know if there were other Amendments. I apologize for not speaking directly to Amendment #2. I think, Representative Cross had you answer the questions that I was concerned about and that is, if a local unit of government, under a Tax Increment Financing district or even an enterprise zone, wants to abate taxes or buy land for a prospective developer for an economic development issue, that's not covered under this Amendment, correct?"

Franks: "Correct."

Black: "All right. There are also times... Things have changed dramatically in the last 20 years. Communities will actively bid now for a prison. Twenty-five years ago that was unheard of, and some communities will, in fact, by some internal method buy the land and donate the land to the Department of Corrections, i.e., the State of Illinois, to help their chances in attracting a prison. That's not

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

covered under this."

Franks: "No, it isn't, Representative."

Black: "All right. So, you're only talking about specific programs that are administered by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs?"

Franks: "They're state based."

Black: "Okay. Now, there is a program, and forgive me, I can't think of the name and I think one of the more popular programs that the Department does. It's a constant struggle today in a changing economy to keep your workforce trained on new equipment, new technology. And it seems like we never appropriate enough money for that job training funds to... where you can give a grant to a company to do training on new equipment or new technology to help them remain productive, so hopefully, the plant will continue to operate. Would this Amendment impact those kinds of funds that DCCA would give to an existing plant to upgrade the skills of its workforce?"

Franks: "I believe it would, depending on under what grant program that they're receiving funds for."

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

Franks: "I believe it would..."

Black: "Okay."

Franks: "...depending on what grant program they're receiving funds for."

Black: "That would be a concern only in that, I think, that is different than bricks and mortar, land, or whatever. I don't know how we could quantify... You know, if a company asked for and received a quarter million dollars to train their employees on a new piece of equipment that the company purchased in anticipation of trying to stay competitive, eight or nine months later they find, well,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

not only did the new equipment not keep us competitive and even though our employees did a great job on learning to use it and they were, in fact, productive, the business climate is so... so different than when I was a young lad, that the company just says, well, we can't compete. That's, you know, that's the end of it. Would they then be required to pay back that kind of human capital?"

Franks: "You make a very good point, Representative, and we've made it flexible enough where DCCA will look at each individual case on an individual case basis. There's not gonna be the bright lines."

Black: "So, each will then... would be judged on an honest effort by the company because there are some who do use training money..."

Franks: "Sure."

Black: "...certainly to their advantage and to their employees advantage, but competitive pressures are such today that what looked very promising a year ago, just may not work, i.e., Montgomery Ward. I mean, things have changed so dramatically. When I pick up the paper and see that an Illinois company is laying off 25,000 workers, I mean, that's just... it's hard for me to absorb and it's not uncommon today."

Franks: "Right."

Black: "So, you're giving me reasonable assurance that the Amendment would give DCCA the flexibility to say, this was a good faith effort. It was not through mismanagement. It was not through falsification of records. They really did try to enter this crazy marketplace and after their best effort simply couldn't compete and had no choice to pull the plug. So, while they may go after some bricks and mortar money, they do have the flexibility to say, well, in

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

our opinion 60% of the funds we advanced you were used productively and the market forces just didn't work out. So, we're not gonna come after you on that."

Franks: "Correct."

Black: "All right. 'Cause I think if we didn't have that flexibility, it could be a real chilling effect on somebody trying to stay competitive in a market. And I appreciate your answers. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

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

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I'd just like to rise in support of Floor the House. Amendment #2, particularly on the last point that Mr. Franks made with Mr. Black, and that being that the Department has the flexibility to under... to enforce some reciprocity in the financial relationship between the state and... and employers and prospective employers. I think it is possible to quantify... to quantify the expectation that DCCA can have from an employer who seeks to obtain and use job training funds. If anything, this adds an additional measure of accountability to how those job training funds are being spent, because under the current circumstances, there's tremendous discretion in how those job training funds are being disbursed and it's often hard to measure as to whether or not the job training funds are being spent, are actually being spent in the best way possible and whether or not they're actually making a difference in creating jobs or whether those jobs would be created and those workers would be trained if in fact, they didn't receive those moneys. I think that this is a... the refined version of this Amendment and of this Bill, of the

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

underlying Bill, is something that's commendable and that it is something that provides business with a firmer understanding up front of the relationship that they have. It's something that's productive. It's something that's positive. I don't see it as a deterrent at all, and I rise in support of it. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3364?' 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: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Franks has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Amendment #3 is a technical addition given to us by DCCA and I'd be glad to answer any questions to this."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "Representative, maybe you've covered this earlier. It's gotten so noisy in this chamber, it's hard to hear anything. But my question is... deals with the issue of the written agreements... and specifically, who would have access to these written agreements?"

Speaker Hartke: "Franks."

Franks: "DCCA would certainly have access to it. And the written agreements are going to be incentive agreements, and they're gonna have certain things listed in them. If you'd like me to go through a thumbnail..."

Cross: "I know what's in them. My question is, who has access to them? And I guess the concern I have Representative, and I... it has nothing to do with the merits of your Bill, but

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

I guess it does have something to do with the merit of your Bill, or merits of your Bill. Should we not exempt... my fear is that this written agreement would be subject to the Freedom of Information Act and a competitor or another state, through some mechanism, were to get access to these written agreements. My question is, or suggestion perhaps, is should we not thinking about exempting these written agreements from the Freedom of Information Act? Because I don't know that we want other states to have access to these written agreements, because then we're gonna be playing poker with other states. And I don't know that we want to get into that business."

- Franks: "I believe right now the state is already giving incentives, and I believe... and we're not doing anything differently than what the current law already is, if those are discoverable under a FOIA request, they would be so here."
- Cross: "But now you have outright written agreements, that I think people are gonna have access to. I don't know that they were all types..."
- Franks: "Well, right now the state has some written agreements as well, when they're giving incentives."
- Cross: "Well, why wouldn't we want to exempt that information from other states, for instance?"
- Franks: "Well, I think it's a question of sunshine, and letting people know where their tax dollars are going."
- Cross: "It's not a matter of... it's a matter of... it's an issue of the State of Indiana or the State of Missouri or the State of Iowa or the State of Wisconsin or the State of Kentucky saying, wow, let's get access to the State of Illinois' Incentive Agreement to Motorola and maybe we can up it a little better and give'em a different incentive.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

And then it forces us, it forces us to spend perhaps more taxpayer money. I'm not talking about sunshine. We're all for favorable, you know, sunshine and open government, but why should we put ourselves at a disadvantage with competing states, is my only point, Representative."

- Franks: "I don't think we would be. Because right now, if they..."
- Cross: "Well, they're having access to this information."
- Franks: "Well, they'd have the access either way. If for instance, a company wanted to play one state against the other, which they do every day, that's how they do it. They say, this is what Illinois is gonna give me, what can you do for me Indiana?"
- Cross: "Well, we could talk about it perhaps more on Third Reading. I just... I think there's a way to improve this Bill and I'm sorry you're not... you don't have an interest in that, but I appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3364?' 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. A fiscal note and a state mandates note have been requested on the Bill as amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading pending the issuing of the notes. Representative Crotty, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

- Crotty: "I would ask that the colleagues on the House Floor help
 me in welcoming the 8th grade class from St. Christopher's
 School in Midlothian. They're sitted (sic-seated) right up
 here."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the Illinois General Assembly. House Bill 1081, Representative Slone. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1081, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Slone, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Slone, on Amendment #5."
- Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #5 is an Amendment requested by the... I believe the Cook County Fire... the Cook County Forest Preserve District and also, I think the DuPage County Forest Preserve District and it would insure that the Bill only apply in situations where there is unreasonable fire risk and I would request your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #5?

 Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is

 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill

 1081?' 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 3193, Representative Biggins. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3193, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Biggins, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Biggins. Mr. Biggins on Floor

Amendment #1. Out of the record. House Bill 1956,

Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1956, a Bill for an Act concerning the payment of local government fees. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Moffitt, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is language that was at the request of the Committee to take care of a couple of clarifications. One, that if a county treasurer is to accept credit cards, they would have to put it out for bid, as far as the processing of those credit cards. And secondly, they have to inform the person paying with the credit card what the fees will be. So this is just additional clarification, makes the Bill better. It's a request of the County Treasurers' Association. We passed very similar language last year and these two additions make it even better from the standpoint of the consumer. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #1? Seeing no one is seeking recognition. The question is, 'Shall the House pass Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1956?' All 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 3008, Representative Lyons. Joe Lyons. Is he in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3008, a Bill for an Act concerning credit unions. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Joseph Lyons, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Joe Lyons on Amendment #2."

- Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Speaker. Excuse me for being out of place. Amendment #2 basically, is language that we agreed upon when we passed the Bill out of... out of committee. The Illinois Bankers Association has concerns with part of the Sections there that we... we worked... went back to the table, put this back together and now the IBA has no opposition to the Bill. So, I look for favorable..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

 Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill

 3008?' 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 1886, Representative Hamos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1886, a Bill for... a Bill for an Act to create the Kids Share Endowment Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor

Amendment #3 incorporates several suggestions that were

made in the Committee the first time we presented. And

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

that's what this Amendment does. First of all, it delays the effective date of the whole program to begin next year. It sets aside \$50 million of your... of tobacco settlement funds, then for six years to create a Kids Share Endowment. And it adds four Legislators to the Kids Share Endowment Authority and it also adds the Attorney General to the Endowment Authority and that's all that this Amendment does. And I look forward to discussing the full Bill on Third Reading. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #3?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill

1886?' 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 3007, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3007, a Bill for an Act concerning townships. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3007, becomes the Bill. What it does, is takes the language for demolition from, I believe, House Bill 26 and also expands it, working in conjunction with the county on building code maintenance. And I would ask for your approval on Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3007."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3007?' 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: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 2098, Representative Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2098, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Myers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is an agreed language from the Illinois Sheriffs' Association and the Illinois State Police. This is an Amendment that will add an additional surcharge onto a fine for seatbelt violation. That additional surcharge will go to fund programs, such as Operation Cool, which are programs designed to encourage seatbelt usage among high school students."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

2098?' All 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 3188. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3188, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee.

Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hassert, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hassert."

- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 allows the Village of Bolingbrook quick-take powers for 24 months to retain 200 and some odd jobs with a GM plant distribution center. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

 Seeing that no body is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3188?' All 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: "Let that Bill on the Second Reading. House Bill 3521. Mr. Madigan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3521, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Speaker Madigan."

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this

 Amendment would add \$500 million to the state debt program

 for the purpose of enhancing the school construction

 program. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

 Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

 3521?' All 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. Notes have been requested

- 39th Legislative Day

 April 3, 2001

 on the Bill as Amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "That Bill will remain on Second, pending the issuing of the notes. House Bill 646, Representative Lindner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 646, a Bill for an Act with regard to schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Lindner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner on Amendment #4."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was Amendment #5 that went before committee. Yes, and I wanted to withdraw Amendment #4."
- Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Speaker Madigan. Representative Lindner will present the Amendment."
- Madigan: "This Amendment was drafted in conjunction with Representative Lindner. My elements of the Amendment concerns bullying in schools, but I would defer to Representative Lindner to explain the Amendment."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Amendment #5 is Speaker Madigan's Amendment, and adds to House Bill 646. It was discussed throughly in committee and it adds the language, the bullying language, to that Bill. And Amendment #5 does become the Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Representative, just curious in looking at Amendment #5, and I understand the concept of this and I... I'm sure it's very good. I'm not sure... do you have a definition of

- 39th Legislative Day

 what 'bullying' is?"

 April 3, 2001
- Lindner: "No, that is left, that is left up to the local school boards."
- Cross: "So, the local school board in conjunction with their parent-teacher advisory committee will define at that point what... what a bully is or what bullying is?"
- Lindner: "That's correct. It will be in their policy on school safety and there already is in the Code, the parent advisory initiative in the Code, and this just adds an Amendment to that. On school violence and... and just the word 'bullying' was added by Speaker Madigan."
- Cross: "It's just... and I think I know where you're both heading with this. It seems like it might be hard to come up with a legal definition or a statutory definition of what 'bullying' is. And I just, I'm... asked..."
- Lindner: "That's why we didn't do it. We didn't do it on purpose, because we feel that should be left up to the local school boards who might have a different ideas about that in different areas of the state."
- Cross: "All right, Representative. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 646?' All 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 172, Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Capparelli, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Capparelli on Amendment #1.

Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would remove everything from the Bill and replace it with a... an increase in the number of members on the gaming board, from five to seven, and that's what it does."

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

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

Brunsvold: "Yes."

Black: "Which one? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Black: "Am I addressing Representative Brunsvold or Dean Capparelli?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brunsvold, apparently is presenting the Amendment."

Black: "And an outstanding choice, I might add. Representative,

I only have one question."

Brunsvold: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Why?"

Brunsvold: "Well, way back when we first..."

Black: "Way, way back?"

Brunsvold: "Way back when we first..."

Black: "Way back."

Brunsvold: "...developed a five member board in the original Bill, when Senator Jacobs and a number of us sat and talked about the board numbers, we didn't want... we didn't want a lot... you know, the boards can become unwieldy, so you don't want a lot of members. You don't want like 21 members. So you try to get a workable number, I think.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

And five members, three would be a quorum, two members could not speak together without breaking the Open Meetings Act, according to my sources. There was some problem, I think, developed with that. So I think, two more members, seven would be a little, would be a lot better as far as communication between the board members are concerned."

Black: "Okay, I, I won't go into some of the underlying questions because that's embodied in the Bill, but at some point I'd like to review term expiration..."

Brunsvold: "Okay."

Black: "...So that we have an idea of actually how many replacement members we could ultimately be talking about."

Brunsvold: "Okay."

Black: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 172?' 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: "Let that Bill remain on Second Reading. House Bill 30... 593, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 593, 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 Hartke: "Representative Lang, on Amendment #1."

Lang: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was a technical Amendment that would have been requested by the committee, and it came right out of committee easily

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

yesterday, with no debate."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

Representative Black on Amendment #1."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, how many Amendments is this for you?"

Lang: "I'm not sure how many Amendments. Thank goodness there's no Amendment limit here, Mr. Black."

Black: "Are you sure?"

Lang: "Well, not that I've been told. We'd better get this one done in a hurry before there's a new ruling."

Black: "All right. I just... was just checking. It seems like you've had a rather large number of Amendments."

Lang: "Well, I've been busy, Sir."

Black: "Yes, you have been. I'll give you credit for that, and more power to you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 593?' All 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 3216, Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lang."

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

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

The federal courts have... the United States Supreme Court has ordered states in a case called Olmstead, to take people out of institutions and other restrictive places where possible, for people who are mentally ill, people who have developmental disabilities, and others and put them in less restrictive settings. Last year this House addressed this issue briefly in a Resolution that required the Department of Human Services to have a detailed plan to respond to the Olmstead Decision in place by the first week of January of this year. After compiling a laundry list of proposals by advocates to deal with this problem, the Department simply categorized all of these without rendering any opinion, and even yet today, in April the year 2001, the Department of Human Services has no plan on the table to implement Olmstead. Floor Amendment #1, will begin to do that. I do want to say out in front, to the Body, that this is not an Amendment that I expect to go to the Governor's desk as is, but is a work in progress. I would expect continued discussions in the Senate, but if fail to act, our ability to deal with Olmstead may be gone for this year. The Supreme Court ordered that states deal with this issue long before this. And if we fail to send a Bill to the Senate, and this is a Bill that has some substance to it, but still needs some changes. If we fail send something over and keep this issue alive, we will have lost our opportunity to first comply with the court order of the United States Supreme Court, but more important, lose our opportunity to provide appropriate care to those with MI and DD and others. And so, I would strongly urge your support of this Amendment, so we can move this Bill to the Senate."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor... on Floor

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Amendment #1? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3216?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those 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 482, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 482, a Bill for an Act concerning the local regulation of firearms. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table that Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Table Amendment #2. Withdraw Amendment #2.

Bost, would you like that Bill to remain on Second Reading?"

Bost: "Yeah, let's keep the Bill on Second."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, let that Bill on Second Reading.

Ryder, are you ready on House Bill 2276? Mr. Clerk, read

the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2276, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tom Ryder, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask... make an inquiry of the Clerk, as to the status of Floor Amendment #1?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk. Floor Amendment #1 on House Bill 2276."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2276, remains in the House Rules Committee."

Ryder: "Thank you. With the indulgence of the Chair, we wish to proceed with Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #2."

Ryder: "This Amendment has met the technical review necessary.

It also puts language on the Bill that meets with the approval of, I believe it's the Illinois Trial Lawyers

Association and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill

2276?' All 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 1075, Representative Ryder. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1075, a Bill for an Act concerning electronic commerce. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tom Ryder, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The committee yesterday approved this Amendment for consideration. The underlying Bill deals with electronic signature. The contents of this language have been proposed by the Attorney General's Office and related folks which provide some of the consumer protection necessary for this kind of process. The underlying Bill was brought on behalf of the National Conference on Uniform State Laws.

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #2? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1075?' All 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. Mr. Moffitt, did we do your Bill 1956? Mr. Moffitt, did we move your Bill 1956 already? I believe we did. Correct? Okay. Mr. Biggins, are you ready on House Bill 3193? Out of the record. Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 953, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 953, a Bill for an Act concerning seeds.

Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Smith, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an attempt to address some of the concerns that have been raised in the agriculture community by the GMO issue. This would simply allow those discussions to continue, this is not the end product. All we're attempting to do with this Amendment is to add the inclusion of a toll-free number in the labeling that is required on all seed corn bags. I know of no opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Logan,
Mr. Turner."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Turner: "Representative, I couldn't hear a word you said, could
 you repeat that, please?"

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Smith: "Yes, I said it's a good Amendment."

Turner: "Yeah, well, I think you said a little bit more than that. What does your Amendment do, Representative?"

Smith: "All this Amendment does is add the requirement that there be a toll-free number on the labeling of all seed corn bags."

Turner: "Yeah, so... so every bag of seed corn, if your Bill, as amended, passes, will have a 800 number on it?"

Smith: "That is correct. As I stated though, this is... just to allow this Bill to continue through the process. There are discussions going on with all the various groups in the agriculture community."

Turner: "Well, have there been accidents when... out in the farm or something, that has occurred when someone's filling their planter up or something? Why do, why do we need a 800 number on a bag of seed corn?"

Smith: "I think the idea is, and this is a initiative on behalf of the Corn Growers Association. I believe this is intended to maybe answer some of the questions that producers might have in regards to the GMO issue."

Turner: "What if the local seed dealer doesn't have a toll-free number? They have to establish one?"

Smith: "Yes, that's required that it would be on the label, showing corn growers..."

Turner: "So if the local seed dealer in my district does not have currently an 800 number, that dealer will now have to get one and post it on the... on each bag of seed corn, correct?"

Smith: "I ... believe it's the dealer. It would be the company,

Representative."

Turner: "Not the dealer, just the company?"

Smith: "That's right."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Turner: "All right, so they won't be calling the dealer up.

They'll be calling the company, if there is such a call made."

Smith: "That's right."

Turner: "Do you know if the seed corn companies, then, have a position on the Bill?"

Smith: "I've not heard from them Representative Turner, but as I said, you know, discussions are ongoing on this issue and this is just a small attempt at this point."

Turner: "Well, this is, really then just a shell Bill?"

Smith: "Well, this is not exactly a shell Bill. If nothing else happens, at least we will provide a toll-free number for producers."

Turner: "Could we call it a half a shell Bill then?"

Smith: "You might call it that, yes."

Turner: "A half shell Bill. All right, thank you Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Lawfer, do you stand in opposition to the Amendment?"

Lawfer: "No."

Speaker Hartke: "He stands in support. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 953?' All 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 1457, Representative Hoeft. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act relating to education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoeft, has been approved for consideration."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoeft, on Amendment #1."

- Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 sets up a testing committee for the state assessment, the ISAC, and the Prairie State Exam. And sets up certain conditions with which they will report back to the state in 15 months. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1457?' 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 2807, Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2807, a Bill for an Act in relation to courts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Capparelli, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 allows for the advancement of funds from the General Revenue Fund to pay lapsed appropriation claims issued by the Court of Claims arising out of special funds."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

 2807?' 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 3525, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3525, a Bill for an Act in relation to housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Schoenberg, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill... Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3525 allows the department... the Illinois Housing Development Authority to develop and implement a program for teachers who are to be first-time home buyers as an incentive program to give them discounted mortgages. There's certain criteria that these teachers applying for the mortgage have to meet. Primarily, that they have to be employed by a district that is underserved or experiencing a teacher shortage, as determined by the State Board of Education and that they make a commitment to teach in that school district for an extended period of time. This Amendment becomes the Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

3525?' 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 20... 280,

Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 280, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

39th Legislative Day April 3, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 280 would provide that tax-exempt, religious-based entities would, if a change would occur in their tax-exempt status, that they would be required to report that change to the local tax authority. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black, on the Amendment."

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The computer says Committee Amendment #1, but that's Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #1."

Black: "Okay, Representative, just one question. This is a very good Bill. I've heard from many people in my district and I've shared this with you. Are the Amendments weakening the Bill that you started out with?"

Burke: "No, Representative. You might be thinking about another Amendment that we tabled..."

Black: "Okay."

Burke: "...that we withdrew, previously. That was quite controversial in local county government and that is not the case with Amendment #2."

Black: "Okay, well, I..."

Burke: "This indeed, was my original understanding of what the Amendment that was recommended would be."

Black: "Okay, because I... for a Bill sponsored by a Chicago
Legislator, and I don't mean that in a derogatory sense,
whatsoever, I don't think I've ever gotten as much mail.
I've heard from both of my supervisors of assessments, a
great many people who are impacted by this Bill,
particularly in the religious community, praising you for

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

bringing this. My only reaction is a little bit of envy, that I didn't think of it. But I think it's a... just an excellent Bill. And I would resist any attempt to water down what you started out with, because I think that it makes eminent good sense. And I think that you have broad base, if not statewide support for the Bill. And I commend you for doing that, and I hope I'm a cosponsor somewhere on the Bill."

Burke: "You are defiantly on this, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion on the Amendment? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 280?' 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 3193, Representative Biggins. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3193, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Biggins, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 makes a small technical change in the language."

Speaker Hartke: "Biggins, are you finished explaining the Amendment?"

Biggins: "Going a little... going a little slow, even though it's a small Amendment, it's got some big words. It just makes a couple technical changes, including ability to have

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

access pursuant to a public easement on parts of the land, gaining the tax benefit."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Moore."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Moore: "Representative, is this the Amendment that... that addresses some of the concerns that were highlighted by the Lake County Assessor and some of the larger corporations in Lake County that have provided open space surrounding their corporate campuses?"

Biggins: "Yes, it is."

Moore: "And so, this Bill is now agreed to by all those parties?"

Biggins: "No, I've not heard from all of them about this. But this was in response to their initial concern."

Moore: "Is this the Amendment that Abbott brought forth?"

Biggins: "I believe Abbott's... the origin of the Amendment, but I'm not 100% positive."

Moore: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3193?' All 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 3363, Representative Curry. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3363, the Bill's read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

- 39th Legislative Day
- April 3, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3353, Representative Howard, Constance Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3353, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2432, Representative Kenner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act in relation to housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3073, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3073, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We need to table Floor

 Amendment #1 and I would like to move to adopt Floor

 Amendment #2, if that would be possible."
- Speaker Hartke: "Heard the Gentleman's Motion to Table Amendment #1. 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... Amendment, the Amendment is tabled. Amendment..."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative... Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is what we

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

thought we had adopted the other day and the explanation that I gave the other day, the changes, that is what this Bill does. We did vote on this. But the way it was explained, it just wasn't the exact language that we needed. And then Floor Amendment #2 does do what was explained the other day."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman, are you confused?"

Hoffman: "Dazed and confused. I just, I just want to... first of all, was Amendment #1 adopted and then tabled? Is that what we did?"

Speaker Hartke: "It was adopted and then his Motion was to table.

The Motion carried to table. And Amendment #1 was tabled.

And now he has presented Amendment #2, which you're ready to discuss."

Hoffman: "Which restricts the ban on home rule truck regulations as to size, weight, and load limitations. Is that correct?"

Bost: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion?"

Hoffman: "I'm unconfused now."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3073?' 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 131, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 131, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1

- 39th Legislative Day

 April 3, 2001

 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3525, Mr. Schoenberg.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 20... 3525. Supplemental

 Calendar, 3525. Out of the record. House Bill 2548,

 Representative McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2548, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Clean Indoor Air Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 242, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 242, a Bill for an Act regarding education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3024, Representative Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3024, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Daniels, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Meyer, representing the Amendment for Representative Daniels. Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 has been heard in committee and was voted out of committee with no dissenting votes. It deals with the disclosure on banking benefits in the surrounding area where a prison would be built or where an airport would be built. And I would ask that this Amendment be adopted."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3024?' 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. A fiscal note has been requested on the Bill as amended by Amendment #2, and the note has not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading, pending the presentation of the notes. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Fiscal note request has been withdrawn."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 231, Representative O'Connor. Mr. Clerk. Mr. O'Connor in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 231, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 1457, Representative Hoeft. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. House Bill 644, Representative Morrow. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 644, a Bill for an Act in relation to apprentice programs. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 1921, Representative Myers, Rich Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of

- 39th Legislative Day

 April 3, 2001

 House Bill 902?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 902 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Return that Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. Jones, what is your pleasure on House Bill 902?"
- Jones, J.: "Table Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman's Motion is to table Amendment #2.

 You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those is favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 has been tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Leave that Bill remaining on Second for purpose of Amendment. What is the status of House Bill 280?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 280 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Return that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 927, Representative Winkel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 927, a Bill for an Act in relation to ground water. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 238... House Bill 2382, Mr. (sic-Ms.) Soto, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, read the the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2382, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill... House Bill 2235,

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

Representative Kenner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2235, a Bill for an Act concerning state employees. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Kenner."

Kenner: "Shh, shh. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm finding... looking for my glasses here... over 40. House Bill authorizes the heads of certain departments to issue shields or other distinctive identification to employees not exercising the powers of peace officer, if the shield or identification is needed by the employee to carry out his or her duties. This legislation corrects a problem created by Public Act 91-0883 passed during the 91st The designated authorities which would affected, would be the Director of Agriculture, Director of Natural Resources, Secretary of Human Services, State Fire Marshall, Board of Trustees, Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of State. This Bill passed out of committee unanimously and there are no opponents to the legislation. I would ask for a 'yes' vote, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2235? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you very much. I rise in support of this Bill.

This issue may seem like a very minor issue to many of you, but as the person who represents the State Capitol area, I can tell you, it's a very big concern when, for example, the Secretary of State's security officials were... their, their badges, their stars and their star shields were taken away from them. They felt that they had worn these for many years. They weren't trying to, you know, impersonate a state police or another kind of uniformed officer, but that this was part of their... their badge and they... they

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

were very very upset when this was taken away and I'm very glad that Representative Kenner has a Bill to help correct this problem. Because I can tell you every day as I'm walking around the Capitol, I have them saying, 'are we gonna get our stars back?' And it's something that very important, I think, for the moral and for recognizing... making them distinctive, that they are there for security purposes and I... I would hope the people would support this."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussions? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Kenner asks for the approval of House Bill 2235. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2235, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 27 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 2564. Representative Miller. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2564, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Today

I present House Bill 2564. This Bill expands the motor

vehicle review board's mediation form to include other

protests, which already exist under the Franchise Act.

Currently, these complaints include relocation, new point

and cancellation of termination disputes by license...

license franchise among others. House Bill 2564 will

expand the board's ability to include complaints regarding

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

improper allocation of vehicles, arranging two-tier pricing among dealers, forcing dealers to accept vehicles they didn't order, to name a few. There's no known opposition to this bipartisan Bill. I ask Members for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2564?

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House adopt... shall the House pass House Bill

2564?' All those in favor signify by saying... voting

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

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

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill

2564, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no',

and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For

what reason does Mr. Cross seek recognition?"

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you'll recall, over the last couple of days, we've had some dialog over the issue of Agreed Bill List and five Bills, six Bills, et cetera. You are deliberating, given careful deliberation in a deliberate manner, if I'm not mistaken. And I just wondered, do you think we have an answer, expect an answer by Saturday?"

Speaker Hartke: "Probably Saturday, yes."

Cross: "Now, in all honesty and being very serious here, do you think that we can expect an answer by tomorrow morning as to the is... idea of a new Agreed Bill List or the ability to expand this limit of five to six?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross, have you passed five Bills yet?"

Cross: "I'm... well, it's funny you ask, I'm at four. Someone, I
don't know what you'd call it, something called a brick on
my fifth Bill and I'm hopeful and excited with the idea

39th Legislative Day

- April 3, 2001
- that you might actually lift that brick before Friday."
- Speaker Hartke: "Well, when you get to your five Bill limit, then, then we'll..."
- Cross: "Maybe, you can help me. See the guy next to you, to your left? Ask him to take the brick off and I'll run it right now."
- Speaker Hartke: "He feels weak today. House Bill 236, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 236, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 521, Representative May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning health coverage under state employee programs. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Committee schedule distribution.

Mr. Clerk, would you like to read the Committee schedule."

- Clerk Rossi: "Committee schedule, for Committees meeting this afternoon, is being distributed. The following Committees will meet immediately after Session. The Cities & Villages Committee in Room 115. The Registration & Regulation Committee in Room D-1. The Transportation & Motor Vehicles
 - Committee in Room 114. The following Committees will meet 30 minutes after Session: The Commerce & Business Development Committee in Room 114. The Health Care Availability Committee in Room 115. The Human Services
 - Committee in Room D-1 and the Insurance Committee in Room
- 122-B.
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair would like to remind Members that

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

there are numerous Senate Bills on the Calendar and until they pick up Sponsors, they cannot be assigned to Committees. Representative Lang now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 11:00 a.m., on Wednesday, April 4th, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. 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: "This Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 290, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning Selective Service registration. Senate Bill 376, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Senate Bill 493, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to cloning. Senate Bill 530, offered by Representative Rich Myers, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone systems. Senate Bill 534, offered Representative bу Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning hearing instruments. Senate Bill 610, offered by Representative Steve Davis, for an Act concerning matters relating to the Senate Bill 615, Secretary of State. offered Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning family Senate Bill 624, offered by Representative Lang, a law. Bill for an Act concerning long term care facility residents. Senate Bill 686, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 824, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois Coordinate System. Senate Bill 827, offered by Representative Rutherford, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Senate Bill 830, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act

39th Legislative Day

April 3, 2001

concerning State Police. Senate Bill 912, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act with regard to education. Senate Bill 984, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act regarding taxation. Senate Bill 1048, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act in Senate Bill 1080, offered by relation to estates. Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 1104, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning banking. Senate Bill 1234, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Senate Bill 1486, offered Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act regarding appropriations. Senate Bill 113, offered by Representative Moore, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Senate Bill 170, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act in relation to schools. Senate Bill offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning unemployment insurance. Senate Bill 326, offered Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Senate Bill 405, offered by Representative Hartke, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Senate Bill 464, offered by Representative O'Brien, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 698, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Introduction and First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will now stand adjourned.