40th Legislative Day

April 4, 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 Jeff Anselmi of the Auburn Christian Church in Auburn. Pastor Anselmi is the guest of Representative Klingler. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Anselmi: "God, we pause before You at this time to ask Your blessing upon this House. Lord, help them, everyone here to realize the great task that they have at hand. Help them to realize the stewardship You've given them. Lord, I ask that You bless them in the work that they do and watch over them. Lord, I thank You for men and women such as these who give up many things to serve this nation and I ask that You be with them today. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Klingler."
- Klingler 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 not a single House Democrat is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Representative Schmitz and Representative Stephens are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Forby. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 116 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Saviano,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Chairperson from the Committee on Registration Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 859, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 893, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1825. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1926. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Commerce & Business Development, which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 827. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Human Feigenholtz, Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be Floor Amendment adopted' #2 to House Bill 632. Representative Mautino, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, April 3, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2419. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 55, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Senate Bill 164, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 208, offered by Representative taxation.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 358, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning the Quad Cities Regional Economic Development Authority. Senate Bill 449, offered by Representative Scully, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 496, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 497, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 508, offered bv Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 538, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 573, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 633, Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Senate Bill 638, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 713, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Senate Bill 817, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Senate Bill 826, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act in relation to Senate Bill 834, offered by Representative vehicles. Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning State funds. Senate Bill 845, offered by Representative O'Connor, a Bill for an Act concerning technology. Senate Bill 856, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Senate Bill 860, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning the Illinois Emergency Management Agency. Senate Bill 887, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning title insurance. Senate Bill 940, offered by Representative

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 965, offered by Representative Forby, a Bill for an Act concerning wages. Senate Bill 1035, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Senate Bill 1039, offered by Representative Garrett, a Bill for an Act concerning the State Comptroller. Senate Bill 1126, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1174, offered by Representative Tenhouse, a Bill for an Act concerning government employee benefits. Senate Bill 1289, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency services. Senate Bill 1348, offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act in relation to State finance. Introduction and First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3621, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning State holidays. First Reading of this House Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Howard, would you like to call House Bill 3353? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3353, a Bill for an Act concerning technology. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask your consideration, my colleagues, for House Bill 3353. This Bill requires the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs subject to appropriation in each of these Sections to... excuse me... to make computer... Community Technology Network Grants for the purpose of providing business planning tools, sustainability planning assistance, and outcome tracking tools for community technology centers and initiatives. It also requires that the Department make Community Computer Recycling Grants for the planning, establishment,

#### 40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

administration, and expansion of community computer recycling and other programs. As well it requires the Department to appropriate, establish, and support a statewide community computer recycling network. And lastly, requires that the Illinois Century Network, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, establish a Community-higher Education Extension Consortium. I ask for your consideration and I'm prepared to answer your questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Righter."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Righter: "Representative Howard, Amendment 1 became the Bill. Is that correct?"

Howard: "I'm sorry. I didn't understand your question."

Righter: "Floor Amendment 1 became the Bill. Is that correct?"

Howard: "That's correct."

Righter: "And what changes did Floor Amendment 1 make to the underlying Bill, Representative Howard?"

Howard: "Actually, it became the Bill because the Bill was a shell Bill."

Righter: "All right. Would... This Bill is subject to appropriation. Is that correct?"

Howard: "That's correct."

Righter: "Now, according to the language of the Bill the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is to... subject to appropriation, administer a special program of Community Technology Network Grants in coordination with the Community Technology Center Grant Program. Is that something that's already existing?"

Howard: "That's correct. That was established last year in the Eliminate the Digital Divide Act."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Righter: "Okay. Now, who exactly will the grants be going...
  assuming that there's appropriation for this, who exactly
  would be receiving the grants? Would it be educational
  institutions or individual businesses or can you help me
  with that?"
- Howard: "Actually, we're talking about community-based organizations sometimes in cooperation with educational institutions across this state who will apply for grants through DCCA. They will receive the grants in order to set up these technology centers, so that persons who are not connected with an official academic establishment or entity would be able to have access to computer technology."
- Righter: "Do you envision what kind of criteria might be set forth in the application process to decide who might be receiving grants and who won't?"
- Howard: "The criteria basically is those organizations within sections of our state where the young people are qualified for low to moderate... well, they're low to moderate income and qualify for the free or low-cost lunch programs."
- Righter: "So, it's fair to say then, Representative, what you're attempting to do then is try to inject some more of the technology that we're all seeing around us into some areas where young people might not have the opportunity to take advantage of that?"
- Howard: "That is exactly fair to say."
- Righter: "Representative, do you have a projected cost to this program?"
- Howard: "Well, yes, the entire program will be about \$11.5 million."
- Righter: "Is there an appropriation Bill somewhere in this chamber or over in the Senate or are you intending to file a trailer Bill that will get an appropriation for that

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amount or some amount for the program?"

Howard: "I am in the process of trying to identify sources of funding."

Righter: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. Thank you,

Mr. Speaker."

Howard: "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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wirsing."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Wirsing: "Yes. I'd like to have the Members of the chamber here give a warm welcome to my Youth Advisory Committee that is here from the 70th District and they're up here back in the gallery, so let's all welcome 'em."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winkel, do you wish to call House Bill 927?

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 927, a Bill for an Act in relation to ground water. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winkel."

Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 927 amends the Department of Natural Resources Act. It would authorize DNR to conduct a study, it's an aquifer study, to develop an understanding of the geology of aquifers and it's scientifically based research that goes to the quantity of the water that's in our state's aquifers that becomes more

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

and more important each year as we tap more and more into the water supply. So this authorizes that study to be done by DNR and I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Hoffman: "Representative, what's the cost of this?"

Winkel: "The early estimates have been that it depends whether we go... embark upon a pilot study or not or a couple pilot studies, but it could be anywhere from 500,000 a year to as high as \$2 million a year. So it is dependent upon that appropriation."

Hoffman: "And whose initiative is this?"

Winkel: "This was an initiative of... suggested by the Illinois section of the American Waterworks Association."

Hoffman: "And has the Governor budgeted for this in his budget?"

Winkel: "It... There's not funding identified in this budget that

I'm aware of. We're still negotiating that, of course."

Hoffman: "Okay. It's my understanding you are receiving some federal dollars and this would be... this would insure that the federal dollars continue to be accessed. Is that right?"

Winkel: "Well, certainly it's related to the efforts by the scientific surveys and others to access federal funding as a part of a aquifer or ground water study. That's correct."

Hoffman: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Murphy. Mr. Harold Murphy, House Bill 2099. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2099, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I bring House Bill 2990 (sic-2099) pension aid, Chicago Pension Bill that we worked on for some time. It passed out of Pension Laws Commission and also the House Pension Committee. We have the Mayor of the City of Chicago on board and Vallas and... and the Chicago Teachers Union. So, everybody's on board with this pension Bill. We have some CTA action in it, too. So, we would ask... urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoeft."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Hoeft: "Actually, this is more informational. This is again one of those problems that we have in this legislative Body voting on pension systems that we do not control, they are the responsibility of the city system. The only problem is that we're lookin' at extending privileges to the Chicago teachers that the downstate teachers do not have. And eventually, this is gonna be brought back and we're gonna have to face the TRS teachers and it's gonna be difficult to say the teachers of Chicago have this privilege, we do not. The important thing is that the Chicago teachers pension system is funded over a 100%. It's in real sound

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

fiscal condition, where the TRS system is not. But no state funds are involved in this. It is approved by virtually everyone. The only problem is that they are giving the CTU pensioners things that we do not have with the TRS system. I intend to vote 'yes'. But it is a problematic vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Representative, let me... I said teachers,... it's the union, but it's the regular employees. It has nothing to do with CTU. On 2099, it has more of the CTA, the CTA is in there, also."

Hoeft: "Excuse me. I'm talking on the wrong Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoeft. 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 97 'ayes', 19 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sommer, did you wish to call House Bill 1978? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1978, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sommer."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1978 amends the Illinois Horseracing Act. Basically, what this does is raises the age at which a person may wager to 21. That is the only provision. Have spoken with horserace interests, they are neutral on the Bill and have expressed no objection to the Bill. I move for its passage and will be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative May. Representative May, did you wish to call House Bill 521? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning health coverage under state employee programs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and distinguished Ladies and "Yes. Gentlemen of the House. 520 (sic-521) amends the State Employees Group Health Insurance Act and in a sentence, it creates a buying pool for health insurance within Central Management Services, CMS, to provide coverage for employees of small businesses. There is a demonstrated need to do something about business insurance... about health insurance in this state, 1.8 million or one in seven citizens of our state are uninsured and more than half of them work full-time, so these are not just part-time And what I find troubling is that Illinois has employees. the second-fastest growing uninsured rate in the United States. This is my creative solution to use CMS because CMS has the insurance... has the experience to deal with large pools. DCCA estimates there could be 600,000 small businesses in the state that could qualify and the Illinois pools in CMS now have 410 people enrolled. And they estimate there could be an additional 280,000 that could be

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

covered by this plan. This Bill sets up a new pool in CMS with the help of a third-party administrator. It's important to note that we've designed this Bill so there are no tax dollars to subsidize this. CMS will factor in all the administrative costs in the first year and then the plan must make it on its own. And there is no bleed from other plans. Amendment #1 simply clarifies that it creates a new pool rather than blending in with the other three pools. And Amendment #2 makes an effective date of January 1, 2003 at the request of CMS to do the actuarial tables and to look at it and set it up and market it. We will work with the insurance industry to create an advisory board under Rules administratively and try to find a way to have the agents help market it. I will be happy to answer any questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Osmond."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Thank you. Representative May, you said that this doesn't involve any state money at all?"

May: "It will not cost the taxpayers money, yes."

Osmond: "How will... Will CMS be reimbursed for doing all of their work on this?"

May: "CMS has estimated that it would cost 600,000 and the General Assembly would need to appropriate this for the first year, but it would be repaid, would be sort of a loan."

Osmond: "So, how would we get that 600,000 back?"

May: "It would, as I said, it would need to be appropriated for the first year, but then it would be repaid."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Osmond: "That sounds to me as though it's gonna cost us some money. How... Where am I missin'?"

May: "The premiums would cover the cost."

Osmond: "One of the... You've made reference to a number of groups that are covered now under CMS plans. What type of groups are in there now?"

May: "The... Well, you and I are in it under the state employees and there is a Municipal Employees Fund which is probably most similar to what this would do, and then there are retired judges and retired teachers, but those are much smaller groups."

Osmond: "I think, actually, you and I are not in the same plan that the local officials are in."

May: "That's correct."

Osmond: "Okay."

May: "You're absolutely right."

Osmond: "Well..."

May: "I'm sorry if I said..."

Osmond: "Maybe you could explain the difference between what's... what we're in and what the local governments are in, just for the Body would get that understanding that we're not in the same pools."

May: "I did... I don't believe I said that. I said that we are in the state employees pool and there is a separate municipal employees pool and that is elected, much as the same as the pool that 521 would create. It would be elected, people would buy in. It would be one more choice for those who can't find an adequate product on the market."

Osmond: "When CMS does the rate structure for the local government pool, what type of risks are in that?"

May: "Each municipality has its own pool."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Osmond: "Are they pretty similar in nature?"

May: "You know, I don't know that I could really tell what the demographics would be. CMS has said that they would use the municipal employees pool as an example and their vast actuarial experience to set the premium the first year, but after that they would use the actual experience of the participants to judge what the premium changes would be in subsequent years, so that it would not be funded by the taxpayers of the State of Illinois."

Osmond: "Is it your opinion that that vast experience in underwriting and experience that they have insuring the local governments is gonna be any indication at all of what the rates ought to be for a very mixed group that you're proposing of all... How many businesses did you say would be eligible for this?"

May: "They've estimated could be up to 600,000 businesses that would be eligible and they're estimating 280,000 might participate."

Osmond: "Maybe you could describe what the mixture of all those businesses are and then help me understand how CMS's experience in promulgating rates for like businesses in the small groups like the townships and local governments has any application at all when you're gonna do a ratemaking between a restaurant and a body shop and a law office and bookstores. I don't see at all how CMS is gonna be able to use any experience they've had in ratemaking for the local governments to be able to come up with any kind of an adequate rate at all for a group that is gonna be so different than what you have. Help me out on that."

May: "Well, I don't know that it would be that different because... Well, there is diversity within municipal employees also, as far as health. I don't know that it

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

matters what their profession is. I think it matters more that it is a cross section of several hundred thousand people, of healthy people, and people who are not so healthy."

Osmond: "All right. Well, there may be a similarity of conditions in health, but are... have you asked the insurance industry, who's been promulgating rates for these type of things, whether or not occupation matters at all in ratemaking? Have you asked CMS whether or not occupations has anything to do with ratemaking?"

May: "You know, I would have to say that CMS is neutral on this. They have studied it and they are willing to take on this if we so deem to give them this function. And I am sure that they would reach out... If they don't have the actuarial information they need, that they would reach out to the industry. I've also talked to the Department of Insurance, also and I'm sure that they would work together with the Department of Insurance. The Department of Insurance does have a lot of information and they're also a state agency that would work with them."

Osmond: "How are they going to... In the 600,000 that CMS, that we have to appropriate, what will that money be used for?"

May: "To set up the plan and you know, it would..."

Osmond: "Who's... Where's the money gonna come from to pay claims until you have adequate premiums that have been generated?

Where's that money gonna come from?"

May: "The premiums do begin in the... when... Well, I don't know.

Maybe you have a special arrangement, but when I sign up
for insurance, I'm not covered until I submit my premium."

Osmond: "No, but you..."

May: "So, they would have that base of premiums."

Osmond: "No, that's correct, but when you pay your premium to an

#### 40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

insurance company, they already have a base of premium. They already have reserves set up. They're already capitalized and they have money already there so that the day after you're approved and you would start incurring claims, there's money already set aside for that. And that's why I'm wondering where the money will be in this plan for when those businesses sign up and I'm sure that they will, where will the money come to pay the claims immediately?"

- May: "This is a self-funded plan and it is up to CMS to gather in the appropriate number of premiums and to set up adequate reserves to cover the costs."
- Osmond: "Now, when... Now, let's go... Just for a second again on this thing, 'cause maybe I'm not makin' myself clear. If you're gonna set up rates and you're gonna set up reserves, that's so that you can accumulate money over time so that there's gonna be extra money in there to pay for claims. That's my understanding of what ratemaking is and what reserves are, but what I'm asking is, where will the money come initially, when these plans are in force, who's gonna pay those claims until adequate reserves are set up?"
- May: "I've already said the premiums are payable before the plan begins and it is up to CMS to set up reserves and to gather in the premiums."
- Osmond: "Representative, what's gonna happen if the rates that

  CMS comes up with are not adequate to pay claims after the

  first year?"
- May: "It will be blended in and if this plan does not self-sustain, then it would cease."
- Osmond: "Is that similar to what your understanding is now of the local health plans that CMS is administering?"
- May: "That is how they were set up in the beginning, I am told,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

but I don't know if that's the case right now."

Osmond: "It's my understanding that under the local government health plan it is self-insured and if their rates are not adequate, they pass those rate changes back on to the group that would be... follows. In other words, if the losses exceed the premiums, they're gonna be assessed and they're gonna have to pony up more money."

"I thought I made it clear that, indeed, CMS would fold that May: back in to the next year's premiums. But there is, I believe, it's a year lag time from using the experience from the previous year as far as setting up increases. You know, Representative Osmond, I really appreciate all of your knowledge of the insurance industry, but I just need to take a moment to say that as a small business owner who was trying to do the right thing to provide health insurance for my employees, because if I have a full-time employee, our system just requires that I provide it. it seemed like every year, although I had a very good agent, every year there were increases and plans were changing and there just wasn't a real good choice of product out there. In fact, the Department of Insurance has... I asked them to check this out and there are 20 companies in the last few years that have gotten out of the small business market."

Osmond: "And did they tell you why they got out?"

May: "I didn't ask that. I just asked for it, because what I hear, you know, from constituents in my own experience is that, indeed, that there are fewer companies offering it. And indeed, even when I did talk to people in the insurance industry, also, they do acknowledge that premiums are being... I mean yes, commissions are being cut on very small groups and I think that this is..."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Osmond: "All right. Well, I will definitely agree with you on that point."

May: "So..."

Osmond: "Much too low, as a matter of fact."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osmond."

Osmond: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Could you bring your remarks to a close."

Osmond: "Yes. One other question, will this plan have any rating bands included in it for premiums?"

May: "No, I haven't included the rating bands, although as you may well be aware, I did hold it on Second until I could ascertain that a state mandates were being met and all state mandates except TMJ are included in what is the CMS insurance product. And I did not, you know, choose to include rating bands because I felt that they were designed for small groups to even out, you know, the experience over several years and I believed that we would have a large enough pool, which is the beauty of this, there would be a large enough pool that it wouldn't be as necessary."

Osmond: "I think that will create a very... I think that that same argument could be made and why we made that argument unsuccessfully that the rating bands won't work and that's one of the reasons why a lot of these companies are dropping out. I would just like to speak to the Bill in summation. I think that the Sponsor's intention to try to somehow make health care affordable is a noble goal. The fact that the other companies that are in the market now have dropped out is because they're not making any money. The fact that this plan will not, in my opinion, stop rate increases, in fact, the CMS plan for local governments have experienced large rate increases as well over the last few years. And you can check with your township officials who

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

are on this plan. I do not believe that just making it bigger will stop the premium increases. We're gonna continue to have premium increases as long as we have medical inflation. We're gonna have continued premium increases as long as medical technology is advancing to offer new programs and as long as we take more... take care of more of the people that need that service, premium increases are going to come. We will fight premium increases through bigger deductibles, better health care, better prevention. But I don't believe this is gonna be the answer. Thank you."

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

One person has spoken in support of the Bill; one person has stood in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield just for an inquiry? It's my understanding or at least our file indicates that there... you did adopt an Amendment to the Bill. Is that correct? Two Amendments?"

May: "Yes, that's correct."

Hoffman: "And they've been adopted and there's no further

Amendments needed. Is that correct?"

May: "No, that's correct."

Hoffman: "Let me just real quickly to what the prior speaker talked about. I believe and we've stood and we've listened to people on the other side of the aisle talk about helping or hurting small businesses. Time after time we've heard how anything that we do on this side of the aisle is going to hurt small businesses and people continually got up and said well, the chamber's against it, the IMA's against it, the Illinois Retail Merchants are against it, NFIB is against it. Well, in this Bill it's just the opposite. We're saying small businesses, we're going to make it more

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

affordable for you by allowing you to pool your resources with other resources to allow for smaller premiums for health insurance. It's that easy. And I don't see how we could be against this Bill. As a matter of fact, we're happy to stand with the IMA, the Illinois Retail Merchants, the NFIB, the Illinois State Medical Society, the IHHA, all in support of this Bill to allow small businesses to be able to afford the everyday cost of insurance. I applaud the Sponsor of this Bill and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

  Two people have spoken in support of the Bill; one person has stood in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Righter."
- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. Will the... I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Righter: "Representative May, I want to go back to the question that Representative Osmond asked you about whether or not the rating band that we passed here in the General Assembly two years ago is going to apply to this legislation and you said it would not?"
- May: "Okay. Yes. The Department of Insurance has said that it does not apply. What specifically did you question?"
- Righter: "Well, the question I guess I have is why do you not have it in your legislation that it should apply?"
- May: "That the rating bands are creating a leveling effect for small pools. This would be a very large pool and I didn't think it was necessary and the Department of Insurance seemed to concur."
- Righter: "Okay. Representative May, have you looked and seen whether or not there are any like plans in other states in the country like this?"
- May: "We believe this is a creative, new concept."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Righter: "So, is it fair to say that you haven't looked or you haven't found any that do anything like this?"

May: "True. Yes."

Righter: "In this chamber in the last two or three weeks, we've seen a flurry of mandates placed on insurance companies that they have to cover this and they have to cover that.

Are the mandates that we've passed out of here, if they've become law and applied to the private insurance providers, are they gonna apply to this also?"

May: "Well, just because they've passed the House doesn't mean that they would pass the Senate, but I think the underlying question if they pass both Houses, would need to be looked at to see if they would be included. All I can really do is state right now that there are 17 state mandates and they are included. Those include alcoholism, breast implant removal, cancer clinical trials, cancer off-label drugs, colorectal cancer screening and I know that was one that we talked about again this year, but it is already there; diabetes self-management, mammography screening, mental illness, organ transplants, pap tests and prostate specific antigen testing, postmastectomy care, postpartum care, pregnancy and well-child care."

Righter: "Okay. You're reading from a list there. Is that a list of coverages that are in your Bill?"

May: "They're current law and they are in all of the insurance plans administered by CMS."

Righter: "Okay. What I'm asking you is, as new mandates are passed and come into law, will those automatically be mandates placed on this program, also?"

May: "I believe that would have to depend on the overall State

Employee Insurance Act, whether we include that. This Bill

does not address that per se."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Righter: "Okay. Now, the concern I've got now, Representative May, with that is that with the State Government or the insurance plans that you have, those government are covering government employees are not... they are not generally out there in the marketplace for the private insurance companies to compete for, but now what your does is it draws potential insureds out of that private marketplace pool and puts them into a plan that's administered by CMS. As the law stands now, all those private plans are on a level playing field because they're But if more mandates are all subject to the mandates. passed and your plan goes into law, then there won't be a level playing field anymore because the plan that's being administered by CMS is gonna have private people or private employees in it and they don't have to cover those mandated coverages like everyone else does."

May: "But CMS has done an excellent job in the past of complying with state mandates and I have no reason to believe that they wouldn't, you know, include the new mandates if, indeed, any of them that we're talking about do get out of both Houses."

Righter: "Well, that's fine, Representative May, but I think that
we can all come back to at least an incident... instance or
two where we've seen a state agency do something that
didn't make much sense to us, made us scratch our head a
little bit. And the question I've got is that, are you
concerned about making sure that this plan plays on the
same field as the private insurance plans do?"

May: "Yes. Yes, I am. Of course, I'm concerned. But my overall concern is that the private marketplace has not been able to come up with a plan and hasn't been able to meet these needs. When one in seven in the state is uninsured and

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

they are full-time employees, most of them are full-time employees or at lease half of them are full-time employees, I believe that we do... we have a problem. We have, in fact, maybe it's more than a problem; I think this is a crisis. That's why I have elected to do this. It's something that I heard, not only do I have experience on, but I hear on the street all the time. And I..."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative May, let me interrupt to advise Mr. Righter that you have 17... 16 seconds left in your allotted time. Did you have a final question, Mr. Righter?"
- Righter: "I do, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Representative May, as

  I understand the legislation, when it was originally
  introduced if it had become law in that form that if there
  was a short... Mr. Speaker, if I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Turn on Mr. Righter."

- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there was a shortfall in the fund, that in order to cover that shortfall in the rates, the premiums may have to be raised. But you've amended the Bill so that if there is a shortfall in the fund, that the General Assembly, the State of Illinois will be responsible to subsidize that. Is that not correct?"
- May: "No, no, no. That is not correct. No, no. The Amendments merely spoke to creating a new pool instead of putting it in one of the existing pools and the date of enactment. There was no Amendment to that effect."
- Righter: "What if there is a shortfall? Who... Are they gonna have to raise premiums or do they come back here and get the money?"

May: "The rates will go up. The rates will go up."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Righter. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. Two people have spoken for the Bill; two people have spoken in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Representative May..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May."

May: "Yes."

Franks: "I wanted to ask you a question. Is anyone forcing the small employers or the self-employed and their dependents to join this plan?"

May: "No, this is... it's absolutely optional that they can choose to do this."

Franks: "Do you have an idea of how many individuals will be joining or how many small businesses?"

May: "Is the question, how many..."

Franks: "Businesses or individuals who will be joining."

May: "Yes, 280,000 is the estimate come up with by CMS. DCCA estimates there could be 600,000 businesses that would be eligible."

Franks: "For this. Okay. Basically, what you're trying to do, it appears to me, is create a buying group for insurance.

Would that be an easy way to describe it?"

May: "That's absolutely correct. It is create a buying pool to have economies of scale. And what I think it will do will also give a better product for the same price. You know, that there are a lot of factors at work in the marketplace, but I think that it will create a better product. We have a very good insurance product in CMS."

Franks: "This is very similar, in theory, to a Bill that Representative Bost passed, isn't it? Where he was trying to get small, I believe, school districts to be able to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

purchase insurance through the state, as well."

May: "Great minds think alike."

Franks: "I agree. And this is very similar to the plan that many of us have sponsored for our prescription drug plan as well to be able to buy in bulk."

May: "That's true. There is an economy of scale that we're trying to capitalize on."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. I stand in strong support of this Bill because I believe this Bill helps end discrimination based on market vulnerability, based on who people work for. I believe that we should treat our small businesses and their employees just as well as we treat government employees and this is one way to end that discrimination. Those people are out, the hard-working business people in the State of Illinois, everyday taking risks and they should be... We should help protect them as much as possible. This is an excellent Bill, Representative. And I would encourage everyone to vote for it."

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

Three people have spoken in support of the Bill; two people have stood in response. There will be one more person in response. Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, it's been insinuated that somehow we're trying to politicize this issue, more people on my side of the aisle want to politicize it. Let's just bury that baloney right now. I'm not the least bit..."

May: "Oh, I don't insinuate that at all."

Black: "I'm not the least bit interested in politicizing it..."

May: "Okay."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: " ... but I would like some answers."

May: "Sure."

Black: "All right. Committee Amendment #1. Committee Amendment #1, all of the new people that would sign up, you put in a separate pool. You don't go to existing pool and broaden the pool, you're putting everybody in the first year in their own separate insurance pool, correct?"

May: "Yes."

Black: "Ah hah. So, those people have no reserve for claims, right?"

May: "C..."

Black: "There's no reserve for claims in that pool."

May: "CM... When the premiums come in, the... you know, it's up to CMS to administer it, to set up adequate reserves. You know, they will have the early premiums..."

Black: "Well, how in the world can you set up adequate reserves on a first-year plan unless you are appropriating nonpremium dollars to set up the reserve?"

May: "We are not appropriating nonpremium dollars..."

Black: "All right. Then how... how..."

May: " ... to set up the reserve."

Black: "If you're not appropriating money, how do you set up adequate reserves on a first-year plan where the premiums aren't coming in?"

May: "Representative Black, it's just my understanding that this has been done for the municipal pool when it was set up and..."

Black: "Oh, it's been done..."

May: " ... the same thing."

Black: "It's been done for many pools. The IMA had a very similar plan. Are you aware of what happened to their plan?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

May: "Not specifically."

Black: "It collapsed. Let me tell you why, Representative. Speaker, to the Bill. This doesn't have anything to do with politics. It doesn't have anything to do with who supports it and who doesn't support it. As someone who has had more than their share of health claims, I have a little bit of personal understanding about this. If you create a new pool of people and there are not adequate reserves, at the end of the year I will guarantee you that that new pool will have a premium increase. That is a given, because the new pool... Had you put everybody in the same pool and spread the risk, the premium increase would have been mitigated. But you have all of these people in their own separate pool. So, at the end of the first year you're going to have losses. The only way to cover your losses is to raise premiums. Now, this has been done by other groups throughout the state and the same thing has happened. At the end of the first year, many of the people who have had no claims will say, why I'm not gonna pay higher premiums. I didn't have open heart surgery. I didn't develop... didn't have a kidney transplant. Why do you raise my premiums? Because those in the new pool, the loss ratio was a little higher than we expect, so we have to raise everybody's premium in the new pool to cover the losses. those who are healthy will say, I'm not gonna participate in this. You raise my premiums, I'm outta I'll go find somebody else to cover me. second year, now, you'll have fewer members in the pool and guess what, they are not the healthy members, they're the ones who are using a great deal of coverage. I'm not denying that they need the coverage. I'm not denying that your plan has some merit. But I've watched many of these

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

work over the years. Had you included everybody in the pool, you would have spread the risk, and to my way of thinking, that would have been a better plan, but I understand a group came to you and said, hey, we don't want those people in our pool because it may raise our premiums 2 or \$3 a month. So, you put all of 'em in a separate pool and that's where the plan begins to collapse of weight. Because these people are not part of the large pool over which you can spread the risk, they're gathered in their own separate pool, at the end of a year premiums will go up, the healthy people will leave, those behind will have more claims. The end of the second year premiums will go up, those who didn't use a lot of will say, uh uh, I'm outta here. At the third year, you're left, unfortunately, with people who will have a good... not good, that's a poor choice of words. Unfortunately, they will have a need for more and more medical procedures and the costs of the plan will go up and the premiums will then go up. I wish you'd left it the way you started out, so you could have spread the risk over the biggest possible pool. The only reason I don't support the Bill, it has nothing to do with politics... This is a good business vote. Every business group in the world is for think it's somewhat contradiction of terms is that many of those businesses have tried this very thing and it didn't work and they abandoned the plan. So, I can't vote for it. I would have been more than happy to vote for it had you put everybody in the pool and spread the risk. Committee Amendment doesn't do that and in fact, treats the new enrollees completely and totally different than those that are treated under the plan that already exists. wish you hadn't amended it. I'm sure your Bill's gonna

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

pass, but believe me, I've been there, I know what I'm talkin' about. I can tell ya, by not including them and not spreading the risk, you've doomed this to the ever increasing problem of higher premiums to cover the cost. I wish you the best and I'm sure the Bill's gonna pass, but not with my vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May to close."

"Yes. I appreciate all of the comments and suggestions that May: just have been made. And I would like to say, Representative Black, that this does create a larger universe than has been created before. There are 43 Sponsors on the Bill and I apologize to anyone that I didn't personally get to ask to be a cosponsor. need in our state for quality health insurance coverage at affordable cost and quality is the key word here. my new and creative approach to meet that need. Business groups support this concept; they are listed. It is the IMA, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, NFIB, the Illinois State Medical Society, IHHA, the Illinois Wood Producers Association, Citizen Action of Illinois, Illinois Forestry Development Council and there's a reason they do, because it would help the working people. I appreciate your thoughtful and open-minded consideration of filling a And as more and more entrepreneurs and small businesses become... it becomes needed as they become part of our state's economic fabric. And I would appreciate your 'aye' vote. 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 96 'ayes', 20 'noes'. This

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Mr. John Jones seek recognition?"

Jones, J.: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Jones, J.: "Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today, right up behind me, we have 30 members from the Wabash Community College Student Senate with us and their sponsors. I'd like for everybody to give 'em a warm welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford, House Bill 2233. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2233, a Bill for an Act in relation to public records. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank you very much. As we recall, perhaps, about a year, year and a half, two years ago there was a study done in regards to the access to information through the freedom of information through units of government throughout the state. And there was a... found to be actually a rather high percentage of inconsistency in implementing that process and part of it was due to truly innocence and lack of information by the units of government. General Jim Ryan had been very aggressive and supportive in trying to put together Amendments to the Freedom of Information Act and through his efforts and working with Representative Barbara Flynn Currie and myself bringing to you today House Bill 2233. It would establish the Public Records Access Counsel within the office of the Attorney General and be able to provide opinions from citizen groups, the news media, when they may have questions in regards to the freedom of information. As

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

well, it also provides for a local unit of government that may have a question as to whether they should adhere to a request for freedom of information to provide an opinion from the Attorney General with that regard as well. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. 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 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'd also like to take the opportunity to introduce the Attorney General, Jim Ryan, who has joined us today as one of the best lobbyists I could have on a piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Recognizes Mr. Dart."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Dart: "I would like to introduce to the Body the new Mayor of the City of Rockford, Representative Doug Scott."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy. Kevin McCarthy, rise, Sir. House Bill 3140. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 3140."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3140, a Bill for an Act in relation to home equity programs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3140 amends the Home Equity Assurance Act. This is a program that is set up in the City of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Chicago and these programs are set up voluntarily by referendum. This Amendment to the Act allows a section of a program, a territory inside a program if it wants to join an already existing program, it can do so by having 10% of the people sign a petition asking for this change and also, it then goes to referendum by the voters. The territories that are included in these Home Equity Assurance Act programs, it's a voluntary program so homeowners while the referendum assigns the tax for the program in order to take part in the program you have to join it of your own freewill. Some of the homes in the areas do, some do not. But this basically amends it so that one program can join another program... a part of one program can join another There's only three existing programs at this time. One's called Northwest, one is called Southwest and the other's the Ashburn program. They're all located in the City of Chicago. I ask for your favorable vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? ... shall take the record. On this question, there are are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. O'Connor, did you wish to call House Bill 231? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 231, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- O'Connor: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House

  Bill 231 would establish an Illinois pilot program and

  policy to prosecute and incarcerate individuals for certain

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

types of gun violations under the federal system as opposed to the state system. The program is based on an extremely successful Project Exile Program in Richmond, Virginia. The Richmond program has three components. The first was heavier gun violation penalties. Under certain federal gun crimes there are heavier penalties and therefore, the possibility of prosecution has been demonstrated to show a stronger deterrent effect. Second, the program provides for incarceration outside of the home state, that in addition, has demonstrated a substantial deterrent effect. And finally, Project Exile has a substantial education and community outreach component. The federal ATF has initiated a similar program in Illinois under name of Project Surefire. It is our intention that Project be coordinated with Project Surefire as ATF specific implements it here. It has the following progra... components: first, the establishment of the pilot program, secondly, the establishment of a Project Exile fund from which federal funds will be administered, and third, it requires a report to the Illinois General Assembly on or before March 1, 2003. I know of no opposition to this legislation. The existing program in Illinois, Project Surefire, has similar components and we'd like to see these two administered together. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dart."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Dart: "Representative, this was a program... I had taken a look at it about a year or two ago about possibly having a pilot

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

program in this state. The folks that I had contacted over at the... on the federal side of this, told me though, that they'd have a difficult time doing this and when I inquired about... through the U.S. Attorney's Office and the like, they said that right now that they had such a backlog with their weapons offenses that they didn't see how this was going to be workable. Do you have some... I noticed that you had talked about some federal funding potential. there some commitment of money or resources to this? Т know it's only a pilot, but is there some commitment because as I said when I talked to 'em about a year and a half ago or so, they led me to believe that I could try passing something like this, but it'd be pointless because they don't have any resources and they wouldn't be able to do it."

O'Connor: "We met with ATF yesterday. There is no commitment of funding, but there is an existing program in process under which federal money is coming into Illinois right now. What we want to do is take this program Exile and see how we can coordinate it and jointly administer funding. One of the central components of this, Representative Dart, is that we get state involvement with a community outreach program to eliminate firearm violations. ATF commi... which does have funding, committed to work with us on it. But to answer your specific question, there is not a specific funding appropriated right now for Illinois. There is federal money available, but none of it is necessarily designated for Project Exile."

Dart: "Have they mentioned... Did they mention how many additional U. S. attorneys might be needed to make this work or how many cases they projected would be brought in as a result of this?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

O'Connor: "They did not mention it yesterday. The purpose of the study is to try to coordinate with the U. S. Attorney's Office, presumably, the Illinois Attorney General's Office, and ATF what the needs are."

Dart: "Would you happen to know... Did they happen to tell you just how much of a backlog they have right now? Because one of the arguments quite often I've heard from the other side of the gun issue has always been, we need to enforce the laws, we need to enforce the ones that we already have on the books. The U. S. Attorney's Office, when I had talked to them said, well, we'd like to do that, we don't have enough U. S. attorneys to do it, so we're trying to enforce 'em as well as we can. And there has been, I've seen numbers where they've talked about the drop-off of federal prosecution of gun-related offenses. Do you know what that backlog may or may not be right now?"

O'Connor: "Well, it's difficult to... Since the program isn't in place, to give you an estimate, but the concept is that only certain individuals who have some aggravating circumstance who might especially sensitive to the deterrent effect of being outside of the State of Illinois are the ones that are designated. The pilot program is supposed to give us a way that we can legally, appropriately, and constitutionally enforce such a system. So, it's really a work in process."

Dart: "And Representative..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart. Mr. Dart, let me advise you that you have one minute and 50 seconds left in your allotted time.

Proceed."

Dart: "I'm not gonna need more than 10 more seconds.

Representative, I agree completely with what you're attempting to do here, the idea of putting extra emphasis

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

on the offenders and hanging that over their heads, the federal prosecution which are much stiffer sentences and the potential of going... being sent out of the state are all very good things to do, as I say. My only concern revolves around the implementation of whether or not we're setting up the system where there just isn't gonna be the money or the resources to do it, but I agree with the concept though."

O'Connor: "It's a absolutely valid concern. I'll look forward to working with you on the administration of the program."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connor to close."

O'Connor: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Andrea Moore for the purpose of a personal privilege. Representative Andrea Moore."

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like the chamber to know that the Center For Independent Living is here today and we have a gentleman by the name of Roy Miller from Waukegan and several others in the gallery watching and talking to us about our legislation. And I would like you to give them a very warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Yarbrough, House Bill 1023. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1023, a Bill for an Act in relation to disabled persons. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1023 amends the Disabled Persons Rehabilitation Act by changing the asset limit for the home services program administered by the office of Rehabilitation Services. The asset limit is currently at \$10 thousand and will change to \$20 thousand. This limit has not changed since the inception of the home services program, over 20 years ago. The home services program is intended to prevent the unnecessary institutionalization of the disabled. House Bill 1023 is a companion Bill to House Bill 312 which raises the asset limit for the Department of (sic-on) Aging's community care program which is intended to prevent the unnecessary institutionalization of the elderly. I will entertain any questions."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves 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? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sommer, House Bill 2391. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2391, a Bill for an Act concerning animal control. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2391 is a Bill that's been worked on for several years between the veterinarians and the ASPCA. They have come to agreement on this Bill. It sets forth standards by which euthanasia can be conducted at animal shelters with proper training of individuals on the county or level of the maybe an individual society. Be happy to answer any questions Members might have."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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

Brosnahan: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Brosnahan: "I looked at... If I can direct your attention to page 24 of the Bill, I believe it states, 'a person cannot administer the sodium pentobarbital or Schedule III drugs unless the person has demonstrated adequate knowledge.' You know, I don't know if... Excuse me. I don't know if there was an Amendment or not, but that seems kind of vague, that language. How will that be determined whether a person has adequate knowledge?"

Sommer: "Well, what is required is that the individuals will obtain proper training and be licensed by Professional Regulation to conduct that activity."

Brosnahan: "Okay. Now, there was another... when I looked at the Bill, I think some groups may have expressed a concern about the storage of these dangerous drugs and that there could be a safety issue. How would you respond to those concerns?"

Sommer: "Frankly, Representative, I have not heard those concerns expressed."

Brosnahan: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear that."

Sommer: "Frankly, Representative, I have not heard those concerns expressed by any group or individual."

Brosnahan: "Okay. Now, just so I know. Why would a veterinarian... What would the reasons be... Why wouldn't they perform animal euthanasia in the shelters themselves?"

Sommer: "Why would they not?"

Brosnahan: "Yes."

Sommer: "In some areas, they choose not to participate. Some shelters have difficulty finding veterinarians to perform

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

euthanasia and that's why this has been requested."

Brosnahan: "Okay. And what is the position of the Medical Society on this Bill?"

Sommer: "They've had no comment on it that I know of."

Brosnahan: "They didn't file a slip. You know, did you talk with them at all about this Bill? Do they... If they support the concept, oppose it or they know... You did not speak with them at all?"

Sommer: "I've had no communication from them."

Brosnahan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Sommer has moved for the passage of the Bill. And there being no further 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? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Mr. Delgado seek recognition?"

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Delgado: "Today, we have another birthday in the House and it's one of our staffers. Mr. Froy Jiminez has reached the plateau of 25 years young. So, we just want to say happy birthday to Froy. And now, you start up that ride, that roller coaster ride to 30. Congratulations, Froy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

and Members of the House, I'd like to introduce in the gallery today, from the Illinois Drug Education Alliance, IDEA, up here to my left, including members from Safe Celebration from my hometown, Normal Community High School and Bloomington High School, as well as members from Chestnut Health Systems, all devoted to drug-free youth. Welcome to the General Assembly."

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie, House Bill 3329. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3329, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig in the Chair."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3329 would provide a \$2 million total boost for the 12 regional library systems in the State of Illinois. Funding for these programs has been a little above \$20 million for the last 12 years. These are the folks that do interlibrary loans. They are the ones who help our local librarians figure out how to use the Internet and make sure that library patrons can do so as well. They perform valuable services and this request for an additional small boost in funding is supported by our local libraries, as well as by the other library users who rely upon the regional systems. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support for passage of House Bill 3329."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of House Bill 3329.

  As we call upon libraries to provide more and more services with the new technologies, it's only fitting that we

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

provide them with the resources in order to meet that expanded mission. So, I rise in support of the Lady's Bill and I hope we have a unanimous vote here. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk would you read House Bill 1081. Representative Slone."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act concerning open burning. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is an initiative of the fire protection districts and allows the fire protection districts to receive notice of a planned open burn for the purpose of preventing and controlling unreasonable fire risks. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Moffitt. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Representative, do you wish to speak against the Bill or ask questions?"

Moffitt: "Ask questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah. Proceed."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, are there any fee increases in this Bill?"

Slone: "No."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Moffitt: "Are there any opponents at this time?"
- Slone: "I believe that through the several Amendments that have been adopted, we've dealt with any opposition that the Bill had in its original form."
- Moffitt: "We are requiring a permit with this legislation. Is that right?"
- Slone: "That's not right, Mr. Moffitt. There are no permits required. This is simply a notice Bill."
- Moffitt: "What would it do then? What would be required of this Bill?"
- Slone: "I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear Mr. Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "If open burning is to take place, what is required then under this legislation?"
- Slone: "That if the burning is to take place within the boundaries of the fire protection district, that the district be notified before the burn begins."
- Moffitt: "And are there exemptions for anything for agriculture?"
- Slone: "Yes. There are exemptions for any burn on agricultural land of 50 acres or more. There's also an exemption for the City of Chicago."
- Moffitt: "What is the enforcement of this? Are there fines that could be levied? What if someone violates the law?"
- Slone: "What this allows, Mr. Moffitt, is for the board of the fire protection district to adopt regulations. So, if they wish to adopt a penalty, they could do so, but the Bill itself carries no penalties."
- Moffitt: "Then you don't... The people that live in the country they may have some even... You said agriculture is exempted, but there might even be some burning that takes place in a container or something. You're not prohibiting that?"

Slone: "No. That would not..."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Moffitt: "You're not prohibiting..."

Slone: "That would not be considered an open burn. It would not be included."

Moffitt: "You're not prohibiting burning of seed sacks out in the field when farmers are planting in the spring and..."

Slone: "Not on over 50 acres, no."

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, thank you, Representative."

Slone: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black. This Bill's on Short Debate. Would you like to speak in opposition?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 52, I'm joined by seven people on my side of the aisle and request the Bill be taken off Short Debate."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. It's so ordered."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, in opposition?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "All right."

Black: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, how many Amendments are on the Bill?"

Slone: "Well, there are five Amendments, but I believe two of them were withdrawn, Mr. Black. So, I guess there are three."

Black: "All right. Well, let's go to that. The reason that I did what I did... there's so many Amendments on this Bill and this Bill has been all over the place. There have been people in opposition, people in favor, people in favor who now are in opposition, people who were in opposition now in favor and some who didn't care about the Bill now care very deeply. It's very confusing. Floor Amendment #2 became the Bill and you tabled that. Right?"

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Slone: "That's right. The Bill..."

Black: "Then you had Floor Amendment #3 which was adopted and that became the Bill, but did not remove opposition to the Bill. So, then you add Floor Amendment #4 which you have withdrawn. Correct?"

Slone: "That is correct."

Black: "All right. Now, Floor Amendment #5 is on the Bill. Does it become the Bill or does it add to the Bill?"

Slone: "It does not, Mr. Black. The Bill is, essentially, Floor
Amendment #3, plus a few wording changes that were adopted
by Floor Amendment #5."

Black: "Okay. So, let me look at Floor Amendment #3. I think Representative Moffitt and I were on the same page about this. When it started out, there was some concern that this was giving fire districts a great deal of authority over whether or not someone could burn in rural areas, i.e., burn off crop residue. This Bill does not prohibit that. Correct?"

Slone: "No, it doesn't. It doesn't really prohibit anything."

Black: "Well, and that's what I want to make sure. And I don't stand in opposition to your Bill, I just want to make sure what finally ended up in it. At one time, there was some concern about if a farmer wanted to burn an old, unused barn on his or her property. At one time, there was concern that they would have to go to the fire district and get permission to burn down an old building that they no longer wanted. That is not in this Bill. They do not have to get permission, correct?"

Slone: "They don't have to get permission, but they would have to give the district notice. And really, the purpose of that would be to protect the person who's doing the burn, so that the neighbors don't call the fire protection

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

district..."

Black: "Okay."

Slone: " ... and say, oh, my God. I see smoke. You know, come out, send the trucks."

Black: "All right. So, the person that's going to do the burning does have to give constructive notice to the fire district and that is primarily so if the fire district gets a call that farmer Jones' barn is on fire, they will know that farmer Jones was intending to burn down a building on his or her property that day. Right?"

Slone: "That's correct, yes."

Black: "All right. Now, what happens in the case where they get a call and instead of farmer Jones' old barn that he intended to burn, it is in fact his new barn that caught on fire? Then what happens when somebody calls the fire district and says, there's a fire on farmer Jones' property and the fire district says, oh, don't worry about it. He called and said he was gonna burn down an old abandoned corncrib. Well, I hate to tell ya, but this isn't an old abandoned corncrib. Is the fire district... have some liability? What if they don't come out? They said, oh, no, no, no. He called and he's just burning down an old corncrib. So, they don't roll on the fire and in the meantime, a farmer's building burns down."

Slone: "I would think, Mr. Black, that you have to rely on the appropriate judgement of the fire protection firemen to do... you know, firefighters to do the right thing here. You know, obviously, if you're farmer Jones and you intended to burn down an old building and somehow one of your buildings that's in current use caught fire, you would be making the call to the firefighters to say... you know, a building that we didn't intend to be on fire has caught

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

on fire. Please, send out your truck."

Black: "Okay. So, I mean, there is protection in the Bill so that there... the last thing you would want to do or I would want to do would create confusion where there could be a delay in response. And you think that's adequately addressed?"

Slone: "I believe so."

Black: "Okay. Now..."

Slone: "Keeping in mind that the local fire protection districts, you know, within the scope of what this Bill permits, can adopt regulations that will work in their own community."

Black: "All right. Now, in Amendment #5 it makes it clear that a fire district shall not require a permit for open burning.

In other words, I don't have to go to my fire district and get a permit if I want to burn down an old corncrib.

Correct?"

Slone: "Right."

Black: "All right. Now, is there any law and you have more expertise in environmental law than I do. Do I need a permit from the IEPA if I want to burn down an old..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black. Representative Hartke in the Chair. Representative Black, bring your remarks to a close."

Black: "I'll do my best, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you."

Slone: "Mr. Black, do they have to get a permit from IEPA?"

Black: "Yeah. Would a resident in a rural area or a farmer need an IEPA permit to do open burning?"

Slone: "As a general rule?"

Black: "I really don't know the answer to that."

Slone: "I would think not."

Black: "Okay."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Slone: "Because they're not what's called nonattainment areas for air quality. No, they probably would not."

Black: "All right. So..."

Slone: "Almost certainly they would not."

Black: "The only power in your Bill, as amended, that you're giving fire districts is that they could pass an ordinance dealing with an unreasonable fire risk, i.e., if the wind is blowing at 40 miles an hour, they would have the ability to tell somebody, I don't think I'd burn the south forty today, if I were you. And they could pass an ordinance so stating. Correct?"

Slone: "Yes. Along those lines."

Black: "All right."

Slone: "Yes."

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

Representative, thank you very much for answering the questions. I know you've worked very hard on this Bill and there was initially a great deal of confusion on it. I think..."

Speaker Hartke: "Please conclude."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just love that timer. But I would thank the Lady. I think she's done an excellent job of clarifying what at one time was a very confusing Bill and I appreciate all the effort that she's put on it to make it something I think most of us in rural areas can, in fact, vote for and I intend to do so. Thank you."

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

Slone: "I would appreciate your 'aye' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey, later. Okay. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1081?' All

#### 40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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? Representative Hannig, care to vote? Mr. Holbrook. Representative Garrett, would you care to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1081, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. ... recognizes Representative Poe."

- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, for an announcement. I would ask the Assembly to join me in welcoming Rochester and Pleasant Plains High School students. They're up here in the gallery and they're here for part of the Illinois Drug and Education Rally. So, thanks for coming kids."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Morrow, for what reason do you rise?"
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Morrow: "Yes, we also... I also have a high school from my district in the gallery. Hirsch High School, will you please stand so you can be recognized. Hirsch High School."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Johnson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Johnson: "Same thing, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege here, would like to welcome the students from the beautiful city on the Fox of St. Charles who are down here for the day from St. Charles High School."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. And Representative Fritchey."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Fritchey: "Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I have the honor of welcoming, I think, the loudest contingent here. Earlier you heard in the rotunda, the voices of several hundred students who are down here on the front line in the battles against tobacco use, and drug use, and alcohol use by teens. We had a rally downstairs in the rotunda by the Illinois Drug Education Alliance. And I'm very happy to welcome, on behalf of myself, Representative Kosel, and Minority Leader Daniels, the board and the members from the Illinois Drug Education Alliance."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, do you have Committee Reports?"

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 4, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Amendment #3 to House Bill 241, Amendment #2 to House Bill 280, Amendment #3 to House Bill 403, Amendment #2 to House Bill 475, Amendment #1 to House Bill 546, Amendment #1 to House Bill 850, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1722, Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1814, Amendment #3 to House Bill 1975, Amendment #4 to House Bill 2138, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2139, Amendment to House Bill 2148, Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2204, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2228, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2298, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2358, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2438, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3037, Amendment #2 to House Bill 3157, Amendment #2 to House Bill 3241, and Amendment #2 to House Bill 3377."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 282?

Representative Garrett."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 282, a Bill for an Act concerning enterprise zones. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. before you today House Bill 282, a Bill allowing five new enterprise zones in our state beginning in 2002 until December 31, 2006. This legislation allows Illinois municipalities to apply to DCCA for enterprise zone status. This Bill does not require expansion of enterprise zones, but simply allows for the process to be reopened again. Currently, the state has 92 enterprise zones, 12 were established in 1984. And in each subsequent year, the original legislation was amended and additional zones were added through 1990. Briefly, in order to qualify for an enterprise zone, municipalities must meet at least one of the following criteria; one, the poverty rate of at least 20% unemployment, which would be 120% of the state's rate; three, 80% of the households would have low income; and four, population decrease of 20% or more between census years. And finally, they must demonstrate the ability to create jobs when there would be an investment of million or more to offset poverty and unemployment. Secondly, enterprise zones provide incentives, such as investment tax credit, sales tax exemption, job tax credits to new businesses locating with any... within a designated zone. Since enterprise zones were established in Illinois in 1984, businesses in these areas increased from 98 to 1,837 by 1999. During that same period, investment increased from 68 million to 1.33 billion. The number of full-time jobs in these areas increased from 4,600 to Enterprise zones were brought to my attention 28,126. because two important communities that I represent, North

#### 40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Chicago and Waukegan, are working very hard to attract new business and boost employment. In short, we are working very hard to launch revitalization and redevelopment programs. And, in fact, enterprise zones provide a viable tool, a meaningful incentive to attract new businesses. House Bill 282 seeks to expand the total number of zones within the entire State of Illinois. However, it is important to point out that, as of today, Lake County does not have any enterprise zones. Lake County provides a perfect example of the need to offer incentives to businesses to get them to locate in depressed and less well-off communities. Just north of our state line, Kenosha County, Wisconsin has an aggressive and proactive enterprise zone program in place to allure businesses who may otherwise locate in Illinois, to Southeast Wisconsin instead. I'm ready to answer any of your questions."

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

  Representative Black, you're recognized for five minutes in response."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just in case, pursuant to Rule 52, I'm joined by seven Members on my side of the aisle that request this be taken off the Order of Short Debate."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. It's on Standard Debate. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Black: "Well, Representative, in Floor Amendment #3, on page...

  Excuse me, I can't turn the pages here. Be on page 2 of your Amendment, line 12, you struck language that says in Vermilion County, however, an enterprise zone shall be in

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

effect for 30 calendar years or for a lesser number of years specified in the certified designating ordinance. I had a heck of a time passing that a few years ago, why are you striking that?"

Garrett: "I didn't strike that, it was stricken."

Black: "Why is it stricken?"

Garrett: "I don't know the answer to that. It was in the Bill when I received it. I think it was... I was told it was a Reference Bureau change, I didn't have any..."

Black: "I'm sorry, you told what?"

Garrett: "It was the Reference Bureau, we didn't make that change."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm at a loss. I... You know, if the Black: Lady wants to pursue with her Bill, she's having economic problems in parts of her district, I certainly empathize with that. I've certainly had more than... my district has certainly had more than its share. But I can't, in good conscience, vote for this until I... somebody will have the common courtesy to tell me why a provision that affects my home county, which certainly has a higher unemployment rate than just about any county represented in this chamber, an item that we tried very hard to include some years ago, is stricken. I mean, if there's a reason, I'm certainly willing to listen to that reason. If the Reference Bureau did it because we changed it somewhere else, I'm willing to listen to that. But I... Until I can get an answer and... Again, it's not my point to tell anybody how to vote, I mean, it's part of the job I have is try and convince you sometimes. But I would simply say to the Sponsor and anybody else, when you present a Bill to enhance your district, or your concept, or your idea, but within that Bill is language that hurts another Member's district, then

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

there's something wrong. Either it was done inadvertently or the Reference Bureau changed it somewhere else. But I would ask you to please vote 'no' or 'present' or for the Lady to take the Bill out of the record until we can find out, because the language that's stricken has a detrimental effect on my home county. And I can't, in good conscience, vote for that, and I don't know why anybody would bring a Bill that would harm one Legislator's county while trying to help their own. It doesn't make any sense. And I'm not saying that she did it, I don't know why it was done. I just discovered it, staff called it to my attention. So, I would ask that we either... if she can't delay, and I know time is short, I would ask you not to harm my county in order to help someone else's county. And I intend to vote 'present' until we can get it straightened out."

Garrett: "Can I respond to that? Representative Black."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed, Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Apparently, this was stricken by the Reference Bureau because the preceding paragraph addresses that. But, there is no way that I would introduce legislation that would hurt your legislative district. And if you would prefer to keep that back in, we would promise that, when it gets to the Senate, it would be included. But what I was told by staff is that the paragraph preceding that actually addresses that particular concern. But again, we will put it back in if that is your desire."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will yield."

Osmond: "Representative Garrett, I stand in support of this legislation. As you know, the areas up along the Wisconsin

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

border from Lake Michigan to Iowa are always being beseeched by Wisconsin to come in and steal our businesses. Enterprise zones have worked in other parts of the state to encourage businesses. And I would like to see this number expanded to include five more new enterprise districts. One question, though, that did come up in committee that I'd like you to clarify is that it's your intention to increase that number by only five, and not five per year, thereafter, is that correct?"

Garrett: "That's correct, it's by a total number of five. But this is entirely at the discretion of DCCA. And, in fact, if they don't receive any qualifying municipalities, they may not approve any municipalities. But the total number would not exceed five."

Osmond: "Yes, thank you very much. And I'd urge my Members to support this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor (sic-Speaker). Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Cross: "Representative, I know that Representative Black's already spoken. And I, unfortunately, just used his name in debate and he may want to get back up. But I think it was pretty clear that he had one concern on your Bill and that if you could either take it out of the record for Amendment... a minute and get some clarification or, if we have to, take it out of the record and put on the proper Amendment to address his concern, my understanding is he would support your Bill if his concerns are addressed. And my sense from listening to the debate is that you have no problem addressing his concern. So, is there a problem with taking this Bill out of the record and either getting

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

some clarification..."

Garrett: "No..."

Cross: "...and if need be, make some..."

Garrett: "Well, there's absolutely no problem. I think we're getting that clarification as we speak. So..."

Cross: "Well, why... Can't you just take it out of the record..."

Garrett: "Yes."

Cross: "...for a minute?"

Garrett: "I'll take it out for a minute or whatev... however long
 it takes. Thank you."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor.

Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 242 for Representative
Flowers?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 242, a Bill for an Act regarding education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 242 adds that a curriculum on health problems and comprehensive education be added as an instructional course in secondary schools on clinical depression and suicide prevention. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to House Bill 242."

Speaker Hannig: "This question is on the Order of Short Debate.

Is there any discussion? And on that, Representative Cross is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Cross: "Representative, is this a Bill we've... Yeah, this is one we've done in the past. What's the cost to local school districts to implement this mandate?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Flowers: "I'm glad you asked that question, Representative. Very little, because there is so much information out there on the Internet and all the school will have to do is pull down that public information. And... So, it'll be a very minimum cost."

Cross: "Well, do we have an actual figure?"

Flowers: "No, because if my memory serves me, Representative, there was no opposition from the state board in regards to..."

Cross: "You know what, I apologize, Representative, it's a bit chaotic out here. I just... I'm trying to ascertain the costs to local school districts to implement this Bill and I just wasn't able to hear the answer, what the actual cost was. I'm sure she gave that answer, I just can't hear her 'cause of the noise level on the floor."

Speaker Hannig: "Could we have a little order in the chamber, please. A little order in the chamber, please. Okay, Representative Cross, would you restate your question? Representative Cross."

Cross: "Yeah, I apologize either to you... maybe you heard it,

I'm just trying to ascertain the cost to all of our local
schools to implement this program. Grades nine through
twelve to teach clinical... about clinical depression and
suicide prevention. All I'm looking for is the cost."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, I don't know a dollar amount. No one has ever given me... As a matter, there was... According to my analysis here, the fiscal impact was undetermined because, as I stated in committee, we don't have to contract out with anyone, we don't have to look for a publisher, we don't have to rewrite the information. The information is already out there, is on the Internet, and all you would have to do is go to that section, pull it

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

down, make the necessary copies, and distribute it."

- Cross: "Representative, I guess I have a couple thoughts on that.

  One, there are school districts, believe it or not, in this state that don't have computers and don't have access to the Internet. So, that's one concern and it's just the reality of school districts and I guess it's a cost issue. So, that's a concern. I don't know if you have a response to that."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative, I did not hear the last part of your sentence."
- Cross: "Do you have a... There are school districts that don't have access to the Internet for a variety of reasons. What will they do in terms of ascertaining this information to give to their students?"
- Flowers: "Well, I think the first thing that we should do for those particular school districts, Representative, is make sure that they have the funds to have access to the Internet because I think that's a disservice that those children and those teachers are being... a burden that's been placed on them. And then, secondly, if not, I'm sure there's a public library within that school district that they would be able to get that information, make the necessary copies, and to disseminate in order to teach."
- Cross: "All right. The other question... And I agree with you, we ought to make sure those schools have access to the Internet, but apparently they..."
- Flowers: "You know, just like the prisons, because all the prisons have Internet and different things like that. So, I just want to make sure that our schools have the same."
- Cross: "I don't quarrel with that, but the reality is they don't and we don't have a mechanism for them to get this information. My second question is, apparently because

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

you're saying we just go to the Internet and get the information, there's no set course or set type of information or criteria, just whatever's on the Internet about suicide prevention, we are happy and we're satisfied that school teachers can just go to the Internet, get whatever's on there about suicide prevention and hand it over to the students?"

Flowers: "Oh no, Representative. You know, I really have the utmost respect and confidence in our teachers. And I'm sure that they would use their discretion, go on the Internet, and pick what is applicable to that particular grade in which they would be teaching. So, therefore, I don't expect for them to willy-nilly just go and get anything and just pass it out to the kids. The purpose of this legislation, Representative, is to educate the teachers, the parents, as well as the student, on mental illness to a certain degree. And..."

Cross: "All right. Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: "Yes, Sir."

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

Representative Mitchell, do you wish to speak in opposition?"

Mitchell, J.: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Five minutes in opposition, then we'll close. Representative Mitchell."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Flowers, the information that is given would be a part of health education for students."

Flowers: "You're absolutely right, Representative. What we're doing with this Bill is adding it to the Comprehensive Health Educational Program that's already in existence."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Mitchell, J.: "The Bill itself, does it state to the school districts how they will handle this curriculum? Will there be tests on suicide prevention? Will there be quizzes that are given to kids on terminology so that they understand the subject matter that they're studying?"
- Flowers: "No, Representative, the only thing the Bill says is that it will be part of their comprehensive program which they're already doing."
- Mitchell, J.: "So, the comprehensive program that they're doing, they do have tests, and they do have quizzes, and they do have curriculum that must be handled. And so, what your Bill is saying is that now students are going to have to pass tests and quizzes on this particular subject matter as part of a comprehensive health program. So, what do we leave out?"

Flowers: "Pardon me? I didn't hear the last."

We Mitchell, J.: "What do we leave out? have full comprehensive health program now and so many parts of that that have to be covered, something's gonna have to go if we add something in. I mean, we're not lengthening the school day. We're not lengthening the school year at this point, what we're doing is adding more curriculum to a subject that's already full. You know, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. And I have the utmost respect for the Sponsor of this legislation. But downstaters, you've got to understand that we continually chip away at the curriculum. continually tell our school districts, our local boards, our local administrators, this is what you'll teach. Whether or not, locally, this is important as some other part of the curriculum doesn't matter. It's coming from high and mighty. It's coming from the State the Legislature. You will do this, we don't care what you

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

leave out, we don't care what you think is important, this is what we think is important. Whether or not this is important in Barrington and not important... as important as something else in Southern Illinois, doesn't matter because local control, at this point, is gone. You will do what the state tells you. I, for one, am tired of it. tired of us being the omnipotent one that will tell every superintendent what they must teach. I have the utmost respect for our teachers, I have the utmost respect for our administrators, and I think they know whether or not this is important, they will teach it. They know their students much better than we do. They know their situations better than we do. We can't anticipate everything, that's true. But I'll bet you ten bucks that the administrator in Southern Illinois can tell you what's important more so than I can from my vantage point north of I-80. I, respectfully urge a 'no' vote from downstaters that have to understand that we can't afford what we got now, not what we're gonna tell 'em to do. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had one speak in favor and one speak against. The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate.

So, Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I'm always amazed at this Body to talk about what we can't afford to do on behalf of the least of thee. And I'm talking about our children. And if we were talking about building more prisons, this matter would not even be up for discussion. But what I'm trying to do with this legislation is what we usually do after there has been some type of school shooting or some type of crisis in the school. Every time there's a crisis or shooting, we manage somehow without the intervention of the legislation,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

without mandates, to send psychiatrists, psychologists, and everybody else into the school for counseling. school, we find out the same thing. And what is that? That is, that that child gave a warning sign, that child was begging for help. And I just want to read to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an article that was Chicago Sun Times dated October 15, 2000. It turned out, this is in regards to a school shooting that happened in another part of the state. And it says it turned out that the kids at the school usually knew what was going to happen in regards to the shooter. But because they were afraid to tell, they were afraid that they were going to be betraying their friend. And it goes on to say, the disturbing pattern gives hope, if kids plan their... if there was intervention in time, the kids would've been able to tell the teacher, tell the parents about what they had learned about the student who was planning to do the shooting. But the students did not know. No one ever told them what to look out for, no one ever told them that it's their lives that are in jeopardy. So, therefore, it is incumbent upon them to protect themselves by telling, they know, about what has happened in regards to a conversation, in regards to a shooting. And I just want to bring to you another article. And this kid here, he wrote, he says, 'I'm not insane, I'm angry, I'm not spoiled or lazy, but murder is not a weak or slow wilted, murder is for a gutsy and daring person. I kill because people like me are mistreated every day. I am malicious because I am miserable.' Ladies and Gentlemen, the kid was crying out for help. He was saying he was miserable. He was not a weak-minded person. It took a strong-minded person to do what he did. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, the only thing

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

I'm asking you to do is to pass House Bill 242 that would have a very minimal effect in regards to our school system. And if I may, in closing, Mr. Speaker, read to you what the state board said as far as the fiscal impact. The state board said that the fiscal impact of this legislation would be minimal. And this is regarding fiscal note for House Bill 242. And I want to remind the Members of the House that we pass House Bill... I'm sorry, we passed House Bill 2962 last year with 95 to 23. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for the do passage of House Bill 242."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cowlishaw, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you a group of students in... mostly in yellow shirts who are sitting in the gallery here who are from Naperville area high schools and who are all members of something called REACH. The Naperville REACH Program supports a drug-free Illinois and a drug-free support group for Naperville teens. The acronym REACH actually stands for Responsible Educated Adolescents Can Help. And to not only recognize the importance of what they do in their own community, but also

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

because they have made this long trip to emphasize their support for a drug-free Illinois everywhere among all teens, I would ask the Members of the House to join me in giving our round of applause for these wonderful high school students."

- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Brady: "I'd like to welcome to the Illinois General Assembly, from Bloomington, the senior class of the Illinois Wesleyan University nursing students and their director, Ms. Donna Hartweg, which is also the home of Representative Tom Cross. Welcome, ladies."
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, we want to return to House Bill 282. Representative Garrett had presented this Bill and there was some debate and then she took it out of the record. And I believe that that's been resolved. Representative Garrett, would you like to give us a one minute explanation?"
- Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The issue that Representative Bill Black brought up has been addressed. His issue is included in the legislation, his legislative district is included in the enterprise zone legislation. And he may want to speak to this, but it has been resolved."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to publicly thank the Sponsor for taking it out of the record, letting us check with the Reference Bureau and see that the language deleted was language superfluous, that we...

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Vermilion County had been in there but we were covered under a subsequent change after we had done that. It was very kind of the Sponsor to do that, I really appreciate it. There are times on this floor when I wonder if any of us are ever on the same page. But most of the time, we work well together. And this is a prime example of that. So, Representative Garrett, I thank you very much for what you did. You certainly didn't have to, but I appreciate it and I intend to support your Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. And so now, on the Bill, the question is,

'Shall House Bill 282 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye';

opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

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

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are

115 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 524."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 524, a Bill for an Act to create the Agriculture Producer Protection Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 524 as amended, creates the Agriculture Producer Protection Act. This Bill has to do with contracting in agriculture and how we structure or what the design of those contracts will be. About a year and a half ago, some local farmers in my area brought this problem to the forefront. I accompanied them to a meeting which was held in Iowa of the 16 agricultural states throughout the Midwest, where this Bill was the subject of that conference. This Bill was originally drafted by Attorney General Tom Miller and the Attorney Generals of those

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

agricultural states. It says that in contracting, there should be readability and clarity to these contracts. Bill would ask that they be printed in a 10-point, one-point leaded font, that they would meet readability guidelines, that it would have a summary page which would tell your farmers or producers where within the contract that followed they would find the material terms of proposition. It would put limitations on confidentiality clauses. Currently, in agricultural contracting there are some companies which utilize clauses which do not allow for the farmer to discuss the terms of the contract with his banker, with his financial advisor, member of the family We tried to address that to allow those points farmhand. to be discussed. We did not outright ban gag confidentiality clauses, but did, in fact, limit to what they could apply for because we know that there is a protect intellectual properties and proprietary information. The Department of Agriculture will be able to, under this Bill, review these contracts for the contractor. This is called a safe harbor provision. State of Minnesota does this provision, the language is taken directly from their law. And what it says is that using, for example, the flesh-scale model, the contract... and this is a computer program that they use by having a first year law student run the program, do the determination on the contracts. That they meet... Once they meet this guideline, then it becomes exempted from the other provisions of the Act. So, it's a safe harbor provision. Should there be violations of the farmers or the producers' rights under this Bill, then there are penalty provisions which would be determined by the Attorney General. We have had many negotiations on this

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill. And one thing, through all of the agricultural groups, that I have found is that clarity of the contracts is a problem, readability is a problem. And what we've found with the usage of this legislation in Minnesota, that once you get by the clarity and readability, make a contract that someone who is within that industry can understand, then a lot of the problem that exists now goes Very few of the people turn these contracts in in Minnesota because once the language shows you where to find your material terms, delivery dates within the contract, it's understandable by that farmer, he can show it to his attorney if he needs to. That's what this Bill asks. Farm Bureau is in support. Pork and Beef Producers Association are neutral on the Bill. The staffs of the House Republicans, House Democrat, and Senate Ag Committee worked through very arduous negotiations. Each group at the table received the provisions and changes that they wanted within this legislation itself. It does apply to seed contracts, because in Illinois that is part of the And with that, I will answer any questions that I want to thank the members of staff. you have. appreciate the Members also who've joined me as cosponsor of the legislation and have worked through this process. I believe it is necessary and good protection for the farmers of the State of Illinois. We will continue to work on this Bill in the Senate. But at the point where we're at now, I think it's in the best form that we can get. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

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

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've been asked by some Members on my side of the aisle, pursuant to Rule

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

52(1), to remove the Bill from Short Debate."

Speaker Hannig: "Very good. And Representative Black..."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speak..."

Speaker Hannig: "...proceed."

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

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

Black: "Representative, I do commend you for the work you've done on this. And had it only stayed with livestock producers, I would probably be with you on this Bill. I rise in opposition because of the expansion to seed and fertilizer contracts. And I... That's what I'd like to focus on, if I could. In Amendment #2, if you'll look on page 7, line 13, it says, 'in addition to remedies, a court reviewing may change the terms.' On line 13, it says, 'if the violation caused the producer to be substantially confused about any of the rights, obligations, or remedies.' Where in the world in the law is there a definition of 'substantially confused'?"

Mautino: "And actually, we leave questions like that... but it's a good question... but we leave that to judges and juries all the time. As a matter of fact, I remember a Bill which passed this chamber which said that if a farmer's dog substantially worried a ratite, he would be allowed to kill that dog. If you remember that legislation."

Black: "Yes, I..."

Mautino: "And the i..."

Black: "I remember that."

Mautino: "The idea about confused actually relates back to the flesh-scaled model which says very simply that you and I, if we're in that industry, we may use terms in the contract which would be understandable to a person of average intelligence within the industry itself. And that's part

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

of the original Bill which hasn't changed."

Black: "Okay. Look on page 8, if you would, on line 7. I'm still on Amendment #2. It says, 'limitation on application of confidentiality'. Now, I know what you're trying to do, but it is not unusual in the seed contracts today, if a company has a genetically modified or disease resistant strain, they may offer me a premium of ten cents or 12 cents a bushel to grow that particular seed, let's say corn, for that company. And they're going to, then, give me some, if you would, some intellectual property rights that they have to their procedure. And they would expect me to maintain the confidentiality of their intellectual property on how they want this seed to be planted, harvested, maintained. So, I know what you're doing and I know that some of the contracts in the past that have said you couldn't even discuss it with your wife, that's kind of silly. But if I read this sentence right, you're limiting my ability as a seed company to enter into an agreement on a confidential product that I expect to remain confidential. If I interpret this right, I could go to a competitor and say, let me tell ya, let me show you what your competitor does on this particular strain of seed corn. And then the competitor could look at it and say, well, I'll be, that's how they do that. I'll tell you what, since you brought this to me, I'll give 15 cent a bushel premium if you ditch them and grow for me. I mean, why would you just want to completely throw out an intellectual property right under a confidentiality agreement?"

Mautino: "Actually, and I would like to refer that question to...

I'll give you my answer, but also David Winters, who is my cosponsor of the Bill..."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "...just explain the seed contract and how it works.

Where, in fact, there are no intellectual properties within the contract themselves. You may have a seed variety number which is listed on that. And the intention of the language that you're looking at, let me read you two things and I'll turn it to Dave. The first is, a typical confidentiality clauses taken from an Illinois seed corn contract..."

Black: "No, and I understand that. And I said..."

Mautino: "Okay. But I think for the record..."

Black: "...some of those were really ridiculous."

Mautino: "...I'd like to put that in there..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Mautino: "...real quickly."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "Grower agrees to keep all information relative to this agreement confidential including specifically and without limitation, patent, pedigree, or code designation information and to make no disclosure through relating the same without expressed written consent of the family of the company, overly-broad standardized form of the contract. What we're trying to get to, and I do want to protect intellectual property, that is in the intention as well. But we want to allow them to look at... to show that to a bank, who they currently can't do under the definition I just read, to a financial advisor, to a family member, to your farm manager. And that's..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Black: "Well, I'd be more than happy to, but he referred my last question to Representative Winters."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "Well, we ran out of time. Okay. Representative Bost, will yield you five minutes, Representative Black.

Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have produced under probably 15 different contracts. Bill, your first question was about why we're including commodities, not just livestock but grains. As we're moving to a much enhanced... the genetics are modified, many, many more of corn and soybean production fields are going to very specific varieties grown under contract rather than growing #2 yellow corn. The specific question that Representative Mautino referred over was about the intellectual property rights under the contract and the need for confidentiality. I have raised Seed 4, the largest seed company in the world. And their contract, basically, is calling for agronomic practices. Usual... You know, plant the male hybrid at a certain time, three days later you'll plant the female hybrid. It's production practices, it's nothing to do with their intellectual property. The genetics of their seed is totally hidden by codes. I don't see anything that would stop them, in this state, from using the new contracts and still perfectly protecting any of the rights to their own intellectual property. So, I don't see that as a major concern."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Bost yield this time."

Speaker Hannig: "That's correct. He yielded you five minutes."

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

Back to the Sponsor. Representative, has a Bill like this passed in any state in the country?"

Mautino: "This..."

Black: "I know that there's been several introduced."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Mautino: "Actually, there were 16 that were introduced. This is the Bill in its entirety. It will be the first in the nation to pass in its entirety. However, now a lot of this is modeled after existing law in Minnesota, it's been in place since 1985. Many provisions from this Bill have been taken in South Dakota, other states, and passed out. They've broken the Bill into different pieces. So, in its entirety as an Act, this would be the first state where this legislation would pass to, I'm very proud to say."

Black: "Rather optimistic, aren't you?"

Mautino: "Funny how that works."

Black: "Oh, okay. Well, thank you very much, Representative.

Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Thank you very much. I do appreciate the work that Representative Mautino has done and the cosponsors. And it's not an easy Bill to rise in opposition to. As Representative Mautino and I first discussed this weeks ago, I thought it would concentrate on livestock, and I can understand that, because there are fewer and processors, particularly, of livestock. And some of those contract terms and pr... Well, I hate to use price fixing, that's not right, I have no evidence of that. But if you're not in some of those contracts, you don't... you may not get the same price for your hog, or your cattle, your sheep, or whatever if you don't enter into a contract. But when the Bill was expanded to cover feed... grain farmers... and I certainly defer to Representative Winters' expertise. My uncle farmed all his life, but I don't portray myself as a farmer. But when you enter into contracts with food grade operators, there are certain things that that food grade operator does not want you to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

particularly share with the person who farms next to you. that's why they have these confidentially... confidential agreements and contracts. And I admit, some these contracts are written in a very outrageous, outlandish way. And that should be addressed. think, Ladies and it is in the Bill. But Ι Gentlemen, when you let... what this Bill does, let me just boil it down. My fear is that what this Bill does is to set up a situation where, to my way of thinking, one of the last bastions of free enterprise and independence, although not like it was 35 years ago I admit, is the American farmer. And this Bill, while well crafted, is going to make the farmer, the producer, and the processor probably go to court far, far more often than they do now. does nothing to raise the income of the farmer, it does nothing to lower the price to the consumer. And think that such terms as substantially confused and no confidentiality whatsoever would be allowed in contracts is not the best public policy to have in any business relationship. Albeit one that is so important, and I say important, but quite frankly, this country does not attach a great deal of importance anymore to agriculture, I wish they did. We give it a lot of lip service, but little else. I... Again, it's nothing against what the Bill is attempting to do, but as I have read it..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black to conclude his remarks."

Black: "Thank you. As I have tried to read and understand this Bill, I wish it had stayed with livestock. I do have some concerns about extending it to the grain production. And that's why I stand in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had two stand in opposition.

Representative Hartke in opposition. Five minutes to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

explain your vote."

Hartke: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Now, I happen to be one of these farmers that Representative Mautino is trying to protect. And I'm not crazy about this Bill, either. I think it has some inherent problems, it is too broad, and I'm not sure that the analysis that I have here is an accurate reflection of the support of this Bill. I think that when he talks about the Illinois Pork Producers being for it or neutral, I think they're less than neutral. And I think the Illinois Farm Bureau is a diverse group, that they may be in support of it in some areas. But I have some real problems with this piece of legislation. And I... Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Hartke: "Representative Mautino, can a producer who is doing a contract with a company go to the Department of Agriculture and... or the Attorney General's Office and have them approve of this contract?"

Mautino: "Mr. Hartke, would you repeat that? I didn't catch the last part."

Hartke: "Can the individual producer, who is maybe wanting to sign a contract for his commodity that he is producing, go to the Department of Agriculture and have the contract renewed?"

Mautino: "No, the individual producer may not..."

Hartke: "Well, then it's not..."

Mautino: "If you'll let me answer."

Hartke: "Yes."

Mautino: "That was done at the request of the Department of

Agriculture and modeling it after the Minnesota law, which

makes a safe harbor provision so that farmers don't end up

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

in court over this. They get a simpler readable contract."

Hartke: "Would you not call this, then, the Company Protection

Act rather than the Consumer Protection Act or the Farmers'

Protection Act?"

Mautino: "That's probably the most creative spin that I've heard placed on it. No. As a matter of fact, most of the provisions in here which would protect the farmers were taken out by negotiation. The super priority lien, which in the case where the company... that was taken out, a three-day right to review, a right which we give every door-to-door vacuum cleaner salesman was taken out of the Bill. It's just designed to give a readable contract."

Hartke: "Mr. Mautino, I would think that if you wanted to call this any kind of Act at all, then, you should call it the Company Protection Act and not the Producer Protection Act because it's not gonna be there to protect the producer at all. And I think that any farmer today, in today's modern agriculture, who is signing a contract with a huge company should know full well that they must look out. I mean, when you're signing a contract it's your livelihood and you should take it on your own to take that contract to an attorney to have it reviewed before you sign that contract. I mean, that only makes good sense to me. And I really don't think that this is a wise piece of legislation at all. I commend you for the amount of time that you've worked with spent and the various agencies and associations. But I think it's a look in from being what it is reported to be. And I think it's gonna raise false hopes among many producers in Illinois, thinking that when they sign a contract, that they're protected and they're gonna be okay. And when the contrary is true, many of these producers are gonna get a false hope. And so, I

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

would stand in opposition to this Bill and hope that many of my colleagues who respect my opinion would do the same as well. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had three now speak in opposition, one in favor. Representative Winters is recognized in favor of the Bill."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Illinois agriculture is in a depression right now. House. Corn and soybean prices are the lowest that we've had for There are a lot of Illinois producers that are years. under significant economic pressure and they're looking for that straw that they can grasp, that contract that they can hope to make a killing on so that they can keep their farm We have some companies that are taking advantage of that by writing contracts that are not readable, that require that the producer sign them without showing them to his attorney. The most vulnerable producers are those that are least likely to go an attorney, pay'em a hundred and fifty dollars an hour to look at a contract, they believe the guy that's standing in front of 'em. What we're trying is to make the contract readable in plain English. That is the major advantage of this Bill. I really think that it is something that Representative Mautino has worked on long and hard to make these understandable, readable, consistent contracts that they can take to an advisor and have them look. As I said in the earlier remarks, I have signed many of these contracts for many different crops. They are not very readable, particularly if you're not an attorney who's used to reading this kind of language. Let's make it readable, let's pass this Bill out to the Senate and do what Minnesota has done. The companies that have been complaining are still producing, they are signing

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

contracts in Minnesota. They have not moved out of that state. So, I urge the adoption of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We've now had two speak in favor and one in opposition. We can have one more in favor. Representative O'Brien, are you in favor? Okay, you'll be the last speaker and then we'll close."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. As a member of a farm family and a recent purchaser of a farm, I recognize the crisis that Illinois agriculture is in and I also recognize the fact that many times the producer is not on the same playing field. And that's what this Bill does, it levels the playing field, it says that you need to have a... provide a contract that you can read, and that you need to be able to take it to your attorney. Another thing that I don't think is a bad idea, being an attorney, so that they can review it and they can tell you whether or not this is in your best interest. And that when you can take it to your banker and say, you know, this is what's gonna happen, this is the deal that I have with this company, what do you think? It doesn... It just makes sense that we should be in the same playing field, that we share the same terms and conditions as defined by the UCC. And I want to applaud the Sponsor. And I would ask the rest of my colleagues to cast a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had three speak in favor and three speak in opposition. As provided by the rules, now Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative. Representative
Turner, for what reason do you rise?"

Turner, J.: "Point of inquiry."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."
- Turner, J.: "I only recall two Members speaking in opposition, unless you're counting differently than I am."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black spoke, then Representative Bost yielded his time. So, that was the second in opposition. Then, Representative Hartke."
- Turner, J.: "All right. I don't see that particular provision under 52... Rule 52 where..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, Representative Bost, and Representative Hartke were the three that were in opposition. So, we spent..."
- Turner, J.: "I move to take it off Standard Debate then."
- Speaker Hannig: "Pardon me?"
- Turner, J.: "I move to take this off Standard Debate then."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative, we'll put this on Extended Debate at your request. So, Representative Turner, do you have questions of the Sponsor or would you like to address the Bill?"
- Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for taking it off Standard

  Debate. I had one question for the Sponsor if he would

  yield."
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Turner, J.: "Representative, did I hear you indicate in your opening remarks that the seed company dealers are now in support of this measure or did you specify..."
- Mautino: "No, no, actually..."
- Turner, J.: "...that they were opposed?"
- Mautino: "They are opposed. The seed dealers are opposed. I believe I said the Corn Growers Association is in support."
- Turner, J.: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hartke has spoke in opposition to this Bill. I personally have spoken to many of the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representatives who are engaged in agriculture. And I know that they're opposed to this Bill. A couple of speakers have indicated this is someway gonna help the farmers or the price of soybeans and the price of corn. Well, this Bill isn't gonna do any of those things. What's remarkable this particular Bill, at least in my estimation, is the fact it's being portrayed as assistance to farmers. And we can talk about ethanol, we can talk about tax breaks on ethanol, or the like, or expansion of the use of ethanol. Those things might help the commodity prices. But is this particular Bill, what does it do? All it does is suggest that farmers who have not been able to read their contracts appropriately, therefore, we're going to legislate what contracts must state with regard to raising As Representative Black pointed out, it not only includes the beef and pork industries, it also includes all of our commodities. Well, in my district and as I indicated... the Sponsor, who I have a great deal respect for, I know he's worked very hard on this. But as I said in committee, the largest town I have in my district is 16,000 people. It's basically just a bunch of small towns and a whole lot of farmers and a whole lot of people engaged in agriculture. I've been in the General Assembly since the end of 1994. I represent folks who raise yellow corn, white corn, soybeans, green beans, melons, beef producers, pork producers, popcorn, seed corn. And not once, not once since 1994 has any of them ever me and said, gee, we need help on these contracts. Representative Turner, what can you do about these contracts, they've been a problem? Not one time has any farmer ever came to me and said that. Now, this Bill's been pending, it's been back to committee two or three

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

It's been pending before the Legislature for several days now, if not several weeks. It's now been out and brought to the public's attention through the newspapers. And since that has occurred, not one farmer in my district has come to me and said that they supported this Bill. Now, I understand that the Farm Bureau supports this Bill. I understand that originally the beef producers and the pork producers who were against it, but they've now become neutral. But to suggest to the Members of this Body that this is some remedy for the farm situation and the price situation that we have is simply, I believe, not a misrepresentation by the Sponsor, but certainly something that everyone should consider before they vote for this. speak on behalf of the farmers in my district. They have not come to me and asked me to support this Bill. asked the Representative who sponsored it to take it out of the record, to continue to work on this. Because I don't see it as a crisis since no one has come to me and they've raised all these different kinds of speciality crops in my district. I think it's something that can be worked on. think it can be worked on over the summer. brought back in the Veto Session or brought back next year, but it's not a crisis of immediate concern. It should not be passed out of this House for the sake of the farm community. The seed companies are against it. Many of you may have seed companies in your district. There's some suggestion that if we pass this, we may lose those seed companies, they may go out of state, they may even go out of the country. I think it is a bad idea for the Members of this General Assembly to assume that the farm community supports this legislation when I stand before here today to tell you, a person who lives in the farm community, in a

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

district made up of agriculture and agribusiness, that the farm community has not come to me to say that they support this. And I ask those of you who are not familiar with the farm community and with agriculture and agribusiness to the extent that those of us who live in those districts are, to vote 'no' on this and ask the Sponsor to bring it back this fall or bring it back next year. It does not have to be done today. It's not a good piece of legislation. It's not ready to be passed. I hope you'll vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wirsing. You speak in favor or in opposition, Representative?"

Wirsing: "I'm speaking in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Proceed."

Wirsing: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Wirsing: "Representative, I... You know, in my past before I came here I was a pork producer for many many years. It's curious to me as to the two livestock organizations are neutral on this Bill. And that's of great concern to me. The whole contract issue, as everybody I think... if you think about in the past few years, has evolved because of the pork industry. The contracts is something new to the pork industry and some of those contracts have not been well-written, some producers has not been good managers in addressing and thoroughly reading and hiring somebody to read the contracts for them. Do you know why pork producers are only neutral and not enjoining to support this Bill and/or the Beef Association, as well?"

Mautino: "Well, in the case with some of the groups who are neutral is because they have membership within their organization that are on both sides of the issue. Some

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

write these contracts, others are living within the contracts. In the course of the negotiation with the pork producers, the dollar limitation was removed at their request. Language on the lien provision was taken out at They're in full support of the concept and their request. are neutral on the Bill and have said that appreciate the work that we've done toward it and will continue to work with us on the Bill. You are correct, this contract originated out of the Cargill Pork Works contracts, where a lot of the legislation came from. those contracts, farmers were actually being, in many cases, financially hurt because the contracts allowed them to change the material terms without repercussions to the company. That's where a lot of this came from. And it has been the livestock side. Those groups I look to continue to work with. They're neutral, they were opposed, and at the negotiating table, they received all points to their credit that they were asked for... they had asked for."

Wirsing: "Well, Representative, it seems to me that you're on the right track. But it does seem to me that the legislation is premature at this time. And I know you've been.... I asked you to keep me in the loop on this and you've done that and I appreciate it. But now we're here today and there's got to be a decision made on how I vote. And I'm really having a problem with this. And as a past president of the Illinois Pork Producers Association, I really have a problem with this. As a producer who has, over the years, signed many contracts in the... within the livestock industry, I really have a problem with this because it was my job, because it was my money on the line when I signed a contract that I thoroughly understood the contract and it met my needs, not just the needs of the person on the other

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

side of the table. So, I'm encouraging you to take some time and seek this out and detail it. I don't like to vote when we've got entities within agriculture itself on opposite sides of an issue. That's very troublesome for me, coming from agriculture as I do. And I just would hope that you could not get caught up in the fever of this Session, but seriously take some time and sit down and bring those people back to the table and discuss... and get something that we can support. As I've looked at this and watched it evolve, I was really hoping to see that agriculture, in general, would be listed as in strong support of this Bill. Because of that, it's troublesome to me. I'm not opposing your concept, I'm opposing the legislation. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Under the rules, five can speak in favor and five in opposition. We've now had five speak against, three speak in favor. Representative Mitchell, do you rise in support? Then, proceed."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Mautino, I've watched and talked with you through this entire piece of legislation. I know when you started, the Farm Bureau itself, was opposed to this Bill. And I see now on... at least on my analysis, they're now in support of the Bill?"
- Mautino: "Yes, they are. As a matter of fact, the Farm Bureau is in strong support of the Bill. They rewrote... And Amendment #2 was their draft language."
- Mitchell, J.: "And you've brought many other groups around by negotiating, by changing pieces of the legislation so that they were happy with the Bill, from a time when they were not very happy with the Bill?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Mautino: "That is correct. Some of the groups who are opposed are writing the contracts which tend to be one-sided. The basis of the Bill is a readable, understandable contract with a summary page. And most of those companies do that in Minnesota now. They just object to the fact that the law may tell 'em they have to."
- Mitchell, J.: "Now, Frank, let's look into the future a little bit. Do you have a Senate Sponsor ready to pick up this legislation if it does pass the House?"
- Mautino: "Yes, I do. I have Senate Sponsors for the Bill, some who have had problems with their own seed contracts."
- Mitchell, J.: "And do you anticipate that they will continue the negotiations and continue to discuss the nature of this Bill..."

Mautino: "Absolutely."

Mitchell, J.: "...further in this? And you may, quite frankly, get this Bill back with Amendments on it that could, in fact..."

Mautino: "I would imagine..."

Mitchell, J.: "...bring more groups..."

Mautino: "I would imagine this Bill will return to this Body with some changes to it."

Mitchell, J.: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's seldom that we have an issue that divides downstaters. This is one that's a new concept, at least for Illinois. It's breaking new ground and we're going to have those that are opposed and those in favor. But I have watched and really marveled at Frank's ability to bring the groups to the table, to work with them, to get them on board when they were not on board. And I know I've watched many of the suburban folks as they've listened intently to this debate because it's really, I guess, not your bailiwick,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

but you are concerned about agriculture, as you should be. I think it's a new concept, but I think it's one that we need to take a look at. We need to continue on with the negotiations in the Senate, bring it back here. I'm sure we'll have another vote on this. I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang, do you stand in support?"

Lang: "I stand in support, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Five minutes to explain your vote."

Lang: "Thank you. Surprisingly enough, I won't need that long. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this Bill. Mautino has worked long and hard to put together a piece of legislation that he thinks is important. And I agree with Mr. Mitchell who just spoke, we'll probably get another bite at this apple. And this is a Bill that should move along in the process. There's two key elements to this that I think are really critical. The first is the provision of the Bill that requires that these contracts be readable and understandable. Many of you will recall when I've had Bills on the floor of the House requiring that all consumer contracts be written in form that any consumer can understand without needing to hire a lawyer. So, the fact that these contracts would be written in simple terms that could be understood by anyone is a real plus. Second, Mr. Mautino has discussed thoroughly the issue of some of these contracts which forbid you from discussing it with a third party; your lawyer, your accountant, a spouse. And in essence, some of these contracts are written in secret and when you sign them, you're required to keep these contracts Why shouldn't you be allowed to consult your a secret. financial advisor or your attorney when you sign an important piece of paper? And so, I think Representative

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Mautino and the sponsors are right on target here. And I would recommend your 'aye' votes?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Mautino to close."

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

This Bill, as it stands now, will ask and provide that in contracting agriculture, the contracts are readable, 10-point type, that they are understandable to one in that industry. It has a summary page telling you where your delivery dates, material, terms are. It's been brought forward and contracting is on the rise. Any more, for those of you who don't realize it, there is no live market in poultry, it is all contract. There is no live market in beef or it's on its last breath, most of it is contracted. Pork is going the same way. And the reality is, with commodity prices at an all-time low, a lot more people are looking to contracts when they used to look to the market. So, in doing that, what we're saying with this Bill is allow them to have and put some equity and clarity into the contract process. Every group, the beef industry, the pork producers, the grain and feed people, the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union who are at the table all said, there is a problem with clarity and equity in these contracts. That's what we're trying to address. We will be also making some changes in the Senate. We're gonna continue negotiating the Bill and working on it there. But if you eat, Bill affects you. It is not just a farm, nonfarm issue. More and more, as the ag industries consolidate, we see these contracts. If you want to continue to grow and to have a stable producer market within the industry itself, then we should say, as Minnesota has said, as some parts of law have said, there should be certain basic Iowa provisions given to the farmer. The companies are against

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

it because they write one-sided contracts. Everyone in this chamber is one or two generations removed from a That's what this Bill does. farmer. It should be supported. Every once in a while you got to plant a flag just say, look, we're gonna put basic protections in that says if I'm a farmer going against Monsanto, going against a major corporation, writing a contract that may change the terms materials so I lose money, then I am going to support this Bill. We are one of the leading agricultural states, we hope to remain so, but the processors and a lot of the companies are making it more difficult for the people who live in your district and in my district to compete or even to stay alive. If supporting the farm groups, they might not have called you on this, but I'll tell you what, I've had calls. reality's there because their associations, some who are afraid to upset Members on both sides of the argument, have sat around the table and said, there is a problem and it should be addressed. That is the attempt and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', and 41 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

Winters: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. I'd like to draw the attention of the House to the Speaker's gallery where the only high school in state history to ever win championships both in the boys and girls sports in the same

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- year, the Harlem High School boys and girls bowling team, both state champions this year. Congratulations."
- Speaker Hannig: "Congratulations and welcome to Springfield.

  Representative Garrett, for what reason do you rise?"
- Garrett: "I wish to acknowledge the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges that are in Springfield today, Jodie and Don Moon. Don Moon, who is President of Shimer College in Waukegan, are up in the gallery. And I hope the General Assembly gives them a big welcome. Thank you"
- Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "I beg to differ with my colleague, Representative Winters. The Teutopolis High School boys and girls won the State Class AA basketball in 1987."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"
- Biggins: "Well, coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me, the Elmhurst High School... or York High School boys and girls cross country teams each won state titles just last November. Representative Hartke and I have better memories than our colleague, who apparently has been very busy working on his Bill last week, gathering those votes that he got. We wish him well, anyway, in the future. I'm very happy for his team from his area, by the way."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege. I was going to introduce Danville High School, my alma mater, but they didn't win anything."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1819?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1819, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Shirley Jones."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Jones, S.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1819 provides that the department shall develop a Certified Nurses Assistant Career Ladder Program. And I ask for your favorable vote. And if there is any questions, you can ask Mary Kay about 'em. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 1819. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Okay. Then, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 904."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 904, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias in the chamber? Okay.

  Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Mr.

  Clerk, read House Bill 1941."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1941 is a reasonable attempt in trying to deal with some of the most pressing issues we have in our communities, especially mine, and that is gun violence. What House Bill 1941 does is it will license gun dealers in this state so that much like we license virtually every other thing under the sun, we would now license individuals who deal some of the things that are wreaking some of the greatest havoc in our community. I think it's fascinating when you look at

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

it that there are over 2,100 federal licensed gun dealers in the state, and yet there's only 15 inspectors to monitor them, and they are also monitoring alcohol and tobacco at the same time. So, you can imagine there's very little, if any, monitoring going on, whatsoever. At the heart of this Bill, though, is in addition to the licensing aspect, is it can keep a database, database of information that we already presently keep now but is not accessible. this would allow us to do is to do something that very rarely we ever talk about here when we talk about gun control is to get something on the front end, not be talking about picking the gun out of the person's hand who had just shot somebody and they were just arrested for In talking about it in terms of the gun that was recovered in a homicide. We'd be talking about the fact we'd be actually able to get to some of the illegal sales beforehand or some of the illegal transactions beforehand by the use of this database. So, this is probably as an important a measure as we're gonna get in this General Assembly when it comes to the issue of gun control. Very few will actually get to the heart of the problem before it becomes a problem. The law-abiding citizen will not even realize this law is on the books. It will not affect them, will not impact them. The only person who will be impacted by this will be the people who are handling guns and giving guns to people who are using them in crimes. So, as I said, this is a commonsense piece of legislation that goes at the heart of the problem and tries to get it up front. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1941. Is there any discussion? Representative Cross."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes. The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Cross: "Representative Dart, I see that the EPA and, for some reason, IRMA are both opposed to this Bill. Do you recall, from committee, the source of their opposition... or the basis for their opposition?"

Dart: "I could not figure out, for the life of me, why EPA would be opposed to this Bill. I can't see how it has... they have anything at all to do with this Bill. I've got to imagine that's an error. As far as IRMA, I can only imagine it has to... their opposition may... They didn't testify, so I'm just guessing here, but I can only imagine that their opposition might have to come from the fact that these are business people maybe."

Cross: "What... I see the penalty provisions in here and I know that some of the questions that have come up in the past...

What, if any, application would this have to someone that inherits firearms in terms of their ability to dispose of them either in giving 'em away or selling them if they inherited something? I see it just says, any firearm dealer who sells or possesses with intent to sell. Would they be exempt from this section, Tom?"

Dart: "Correct, Representative. Those folks are exempted both in the definition Section, but also in the heart of the Bill. It exempts individuals who are the hobby collectors, who inherit, get them via an estate sale, or those who use it for competition... gun competition."

Cross: "Tom, can you help us out in the difference between the Federal Law and how this either coincides or differentiates between... with the Federal Law?"

Dart: "Well, the heart of it, Tom... The problem is, is that there's no ability whatsoever for the Feds to enforce

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

anything right now. As I mentioned when I first started explaining the Bill, we have 2,100 federally-licensed gun dealers and yet we only have 15 people to inspect them. This would allow for the state to inspect them because of the fact they're licensed by the state and the state would be able to do so. So, that's primarily the heart of the difference."

Cross: "All right. I don't have any other questions. Thanks."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold"

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Brunsvold: "Tom, would you give me an idea again how this works?

Evidently, you don't have any gun dealers in Chicago,
right?"

Dart: "Correct, we do not."

Brunsvold: "So, the City of Chicago's gonna try to control the downstate gun dealers?"

"No, no, no. At the heart of this... One of the reasons Dart: why... Yeah, I'll be the first to admit, there's been laws that we've done around here before where you sit there and question if someone's coming up with a Bill to chase a problem that doesn't exist. At the heart of this one, what it talks about is having a statewide licensing, not so that Chicago can regulate downstate but because, for example, like in my district, just literally on the border of my district is a suburban town called Riverdale. They've had a gun dealer there for years who has sold handguns to people who have had licenses, but he has sold them to people who then subsequently sold them to... they were straw purchasers... subsequently has sold them throughout the City of Chicago, all illegally. And so, what this would do would be having a statewide licensing so that,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

throughout the state, individuals who are engaged in this we'd be able to somewhat regulate them."

Brunsvold: "I understand what you're trying to do, you know, and I think everybody on this floor that supports the gun side of the issue doesn't want dealers selling guns illegally. I mean, we don't even want that. The problem we've got is how do you enforce this situation? I mean, those people that are selling guns like that are felons anyway. And how are we gonna get rid of the bad guys as far as dealers are concerned without getting the good guys?"

Dart: "Well, I truly believe that this Bill is written in such a way, where the good guys, the vast majority of the folks, they'll have no idea that this law is even on the books. It's not gonna require them when they come up to the gun dealers to purchase..."

Brunsvold: "Not to do anything?"

Dart: "They're not gonna do anything. Because right now they're already required to fill out certain forms when they purchase a weapon."

Brunsvold: "Sure, exactly."

Dart: "Exactly. So, they're not being asked to fill out additional forms. All we're saying though is the gun dealer now, when that form, which they're required by law, existing law, to keep right now, take that information, fax it to the State Police where they'd keep a database. And the way that this would be enforced then is the State Police or local law enforcement would then be able to scan the database. Like in my example, in my area, what they would have been able to do, they would have been able to target some of these people such as the individual who bought the gun that killed Officer Ceriale, they would have been able to find out ahead of time that this individual

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

was buying a heck of a lot of guns. And they would have been able to have done a sting operation or numerous other things they could have done on that person to try to find out, now why is this guy buying all of these guns even though he lives in the City of Chicago where handguns you can't have, and that's a whole nother issue, but where you can't have handguns, why is he buying all these handguns? And they could have... you'd have had a sting operation, numerous operations could have been done so they could have got those guns beforehand, before they got out in the market."

Brunsvold: "I think you were probably involved in some of the gunrunning Bills we had around here and that's gunrunning, right?"

Dart: "That could be gunrunning. Yeah, it could be charged with gunrunning. As I say, the heart of my legislation though which is of the unique aspect of it is we get the guns before they get out in the market this way. There's no other way to do that."

Brunsvold: "Is the State... Yeah, is the State... are the State

Police gonna do this?"

Dart: "Yeah, the State Police would do it."

Brunsvold: "I guess, you know what is a concern for us downstaters is... what's happened in Chicago, you know, I don't want to happen downstate. Because to me this is opening the door... The City of Chicago, for example, as you said, require citizens to register all firearms, all firearms. That'd even mean long guns, right? That's what I understand. That's what my sheet says. And it says for the past several years the City of Chicago has closed registration. Is that true?"

Dart: "I believe on handguns."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Brunsvold: "Well, this says all guns. And I don't know if that's true or not. 'Cause if that's the truth, then I guess you can't even own a shotgun or a rifle for sporting activities in Chicago."

Dart: "That, I'm unaware of, Joel."

Brunsvold: "Well, you know, that's the kind of thing we worry about. When you come in here and you put an agency in charge of coming out here and trying to take guns away from honest citizens and that's where we're coming from. And you know, dealers are licensed. They are controlled by the Federal Government. ATF officers come around and check these places. Yeah, there are not enough of them, hell, there's not enough inspector for anything. But you do the best you can. And yeah, we have illegal guys that sell guns illegal and they should be arrested and they should be put in jail. But I don't think this is the way we ought to go about it because, frankly, if that situation exists in Chicago I don't want that to come downstate. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Black: "Representative, it's difficult to hear in the chamber.

It's my understanding that Representative Brunsvold asked you a question and if I heard the answer incorrectly, I want to get the correct answer. Did he, in fact, ask you if there were any firearm dealers in the City of Chicago?"

Dart: "He asked me that and I said there are not."

Black: "All right. So, is that because they are prohibited by local ordinance?"

Dart: "I believe that is the case, yes."

Black: "All right. So, even if I had a federal firearms license

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

I could not legally sell a firearm in the city limits, the corporate limits of the City of Chicago?"

Dart: "That's my understanding, Representative. And I could be off on that, but my understanding that if you attempted to do that you would be violating a city ordinance..."

Black: "Okay."

Dart: " ... by doing that."

Black: "All right. I know you've heard this argument and I won't demean your intelligence, but it's one of these things that we always bring up, so I know you expect it. If all of these licensure restriction Bills worked, then wouldn't it stand to reason that there would be fewer guns in the City of Chicago than any city in the State of Illinois, since you have no licensed dealers?"

"It would in theory, but in practice the reason it does not occur, though, is because of the scenario that I was talking about with Representative Brunsvold. What happens though is people are aware of those laws. And what we found out in the City of Chicago that for starters, over 52% of the guns that were used in the crimes that were traced back later were actually guns that were legally purchased. We found out, though, that what was happening, though, is people were very aware of the law prohibiting sale and the like in the city and so what they were doing they were setting up gun shops around the periphery of the city, which they were legally allowed to do but their practices were such where individuals were coming from the City of Chicago, out there buying guns, large amounts of guns at times and bringing them right back into the city. And those were the ones that were the source of the problem. If there was this underground dealers dealing out of shops in Chicago, I'd be in full agreement with you, but

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the reality is they're legally purchasing most of these right across the border and then bringing them all back in. So that's where, as I say, in theory it would make sense..."

Black: "Okay."

Dart: " ... in practice it hasn't."

Black: "All right. So, you're saying that the firearms that are often in the City of Chicago... would you say the bulk of them are purchased legally and brought into the city illegally or the bulk of them purchased illegally?"

Dart: "The bulk of them, initially, are purchased legally."

Black: "Okay."

Dart: "An individual would go into the gun shop with the FOID card and all the rest of it, but in a sting operation the city conducted about, I think it's two years ago now, Representative, they actually had extensive video taping where they sent people in themselves, people who didn't have FOID cards or people who had the FOID card but the guy sitting right next to him was the one saying, well, I'm going to be buying the gun, I don't have a FOID card and he's looking at the gun going through the whole thing. And so it was obvious to the dealers what was going on..."

Black: "Okay."

Dart: " ...there too. I'm not trying to take up your time..."

Black: "No, no, I understand."

Dart: "It was... that's what was going on, though."

Black: "Okay. One thing I don't understand about this and you're not that far from the Indiana border; I'm only eight or nine miles from the Indiana border. Now, if I go to a gun show across the border and I can be there in ten minutes I don't have an Illinois license but I could buy a gun in Indiana or I could go set up a table in Indiana and sell

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

guns. I wouldn't need an Illinois license to do that,

would I?"

Dart: "Correct. And under this Bill there is an exclusion for gun shows, so that individuals if they have the license... say I can get a license to sell the guns, I could then go to a gun show without having to get any new licensing or anything like that. So, we had excluded that out of here.

And so this wouldn't impact that scenario, I believe."

Black: "Could an Indiana resident come to Illinois to sell firearms at a location he might rent just for weekends, a vacant storefront, and he's an Indiana resident, would he have to have an Illinois license?"

Dart: "I believe, two things. I believe a) he would have to have a license because he would come underneath our definition but, b) and this is the one part I'm not 100% sure on, Representative, I believe they'd be in violation of some Federal Laws for doing that."

Black: "Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I don't in any way demean the crisis that this country is faced with, with the misuse of firearms. And yet, earlier today in the debate on Representative Bill O'Connor's Bill about setting up a Project Exile that has worked very well in Virginia. And Project Exile is simply a federal task force that says, we will not tolerate the illegal use of guns. If you use them illegally, you're going to prison under existing Federal Law. And what did I hear in debate? Well, there's a backlog of gun laws. Well, it isn't very important in the overall scheme of the federal court system. There's your problem. We don't enforce the laws we have, but we continue to debate and try to pass more and more laws. What we need is uniform, tough enforcement like..."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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

Black "Yes, just in summation. What we really need is a concerted, dedicated effort to enforce the laws that we have on the books and then if we'll do that, then we might find that we do need additional laws. But when I heard debate earlier about, well, Project Exile isn't a very high priority with the U. S. Attorney and we have a backlog of gun cases. There's the problem. And until we fix that problem, all the new laws in the world we pass if they're treated that same cavalier fashion aren't really gonna attack the problem."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've now had three speak in opposition and one speak in favor. The Rules of Standard Debate allow for two more to speak in favor. Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, I have just a few questions. I intend to support your Bill, but I have a few questions I'd like to clarify. The State Police assume that this is gonna cost our state it's gonna cost about \$450 thousand to put together the database and to do the program. And you're charging \$300 per license. Is there some reason why the Federal Government would not kick in for the technology for this? They do in the Human Service area where they use computers and it's paid for in vast amount which would then lower the cost of the license."

Dart: "I'm unaware of any reason why the Federal Government could not get involved and do this in an effort to save some of the expense. I'm unaware of whether or not that could be an avenue... We thought that the amount of money that it was gonna cost originally to get this up and running in the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

bigger scheme of things was pretty minimal and that just keeping it updated was also not gonna cost too much, too. So, could the Federal Government help on that side of it? I suppose they could."

Mulligan: "I was under the impression, and I'm not sure maybe you can check this out, that although they are allowed to pay maybe 90% of technology under Federal Law for human services, that there might have been a Bill passed a number of years ago that was lobbied strongly by the NRA that would prohibit the Federal Government from kicking in any money towards this which would then make the license cost this much."

Dart: "I believe you are correct, Representative. I believe that is one of the reasons why we'd have to do it in the form we have it here now."

Mulligan: "So, if that law were changed nationally perhaps the Federal Government would put in some money as they do in other areas to assist..."

Dart: "Yeah. If that wasn't there, I think they would be able to do that."

Mulligan: "And then lower the license?"

Dart: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Who would run the check? Who would be responsible for running a check... if there was a crime? Would it be just the local authorities or wherever the crime took place with the State Police?"

Dart: "It could be either. Under the way that the legislation's drafted, either the State Police or the local municipality could do the analysis of the database."

Mulligan: "What number of sales do you have to make to be considered a dealer?"

Dart: "To be considered... I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

question."

Mulligan: "I know it says here that not everybody would have to buy a dealer's license if you were going to sell maybe one gun. I'm just wondering what number would it take or what types of sales would it take for you to be considered a dealer?"

Dart: "We put in specific exemptions in here for individuals who are hobby collectors, individuals who are in sports, shooters in the competitions, people who have estate sales and people who are... through inheritance, who they get them that way, to actually come under this. This would have to be the principal objective and livelihood of profit would be the individuals who would be covered under this. So, it would have to be crystal clear. You're not just someone who is fixing a gun or two here or there. This is your principal livelihood and at that point you would come under this."

Mulligan: "All right. 'Cause I had some concerns particularly about estates previously, in previous years when we were talking about this Bill. If you're gonna do an estate sale this would impact my family. My father-in-law recently died. He has a collection. Would they just have to have a death certificate or something to prove that it was an estate sale if you were to sell a large number of guns that were a collection?"

Dart: "Yeah. They would be exempted from the Act. And we made that clear in like two different Sections particular so there wasn't any confusion about that."

Mulligan: "Okay, how does this differ from a federal license?"

Dart: "Well, part of it, the vast majority of it would be just because of the enforcement side of it. Because the federal license right now in a certain sense, it's resource driven,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

cannot be enforced. It's just plain and simple. This would allow for the state agency to enforce it, a); but b) the thing that I keep harping on which is the key to this Bill is this ability to have this database which could be used to try to get guns before they get out on the streets in the wrong people's hands. So, the licensing is somewhat similar but you can have a licensing Bill and if there's no teeth to it, it's a waste of time."

Mulligan: "Can a local municipality request from the state agency, the State Police, a list of registered gun dealers in their municipality?"

Dart: "Could they..."

Mulligan: "Could a local municipality request from the State Police, without any cost, a list of..."

Dart: "Sure."

Mulligan: "Okay. And this Bill also still leaves the authority for a local municipality to license also."

Dart: "They would have to comply with local ordinances as well."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Dart: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We now have had two speak in favor and three in opposition. Representative May, are you in favor?"

May: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in strong favor of this legislation. In this state we require a state license to sell a hot dog. We require a state license to give a manicure. We require a state license to give a haircut. And I think this is only common sense that we require a state license to license the handgun dealers. I have right here letters that came in just today from medical students in my district. I have heard from parents. I hear from parents all the time. When I had my town hall meetings they really want to know why we aren't

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

managing some commonsense gun control in our state. And I believe this is commonsense gun control to help keep guns off the street. I speak strongly in favor of it. And urge your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've now had three speak in favor and three speak in opposition as provided by the Rules. So, now we'll have Representative Dart to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The heart Dart: of this Bill is the fact that we could actually do something around here in the area of gun control that would in a proactive way. We could actually do something that would actually decrease crime, not just to licensing for the sake of licensing, not so we're tracing people who have guns, nothing of the sort. What we would actually be able to do for the first time, we'd have real gun control legislation that really makes a difference. This would talk about the situations like in Officer Ceriale who was murdered with a gun that was lawfully purchased. Numerous other cases, as well, of people in my very district where guns had been purchased legally were then subsequently used and people were murdered. This Bill would allow us to get to this beforehand. The arguments about Project Exile... Listen, I'm not gonna sit here and defend the Federal Government. The fact they decided to cut funding to ATF and they've decided not to give enough Attorneys to prosecute these cases, that's not our concern. Our concern is what can we do in this state to actually make a difference when it comes to people who are illegally obtaining guns and killing people. Children, adults are being murdered on a regular basis. We have that unique opportunity today to do something about that by putting together a system that will work. This can make a

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

difference, this will make a difference. And I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross, you spoke in debate. For what reason do you rise?"

Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, several Members on this side of t.he aisle have had their lights on throughout the debate. We... This obviously is a... I don't want to use... I don't know if it's a controversial Bill but it's a Bill that has opponents as well as proponents. We ought to, at least on these Bills that have... where there's some legitimate differences, we ought to have an opportunity to fully debate this Bill and other Bills like this. actually, over the last couple of weeks had, you know, we've actually voted on some Bills twice after the Sponsors have lost their Bill and we've come back to 'em. ought to be enough time in this process to fully debate Bills of this nature, and to ignore two Representatives I know who are standing to my right who know this issue, are former prosecutors who have some legitimate questions to ask and to not even have an opportunity to ask 'em is unfair to this process. And I don't know why we're so intent on limiting debate on issues such as this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, whenever anyone on your side of the aisle has asked to extend the debate, whether it's from Short Debate to Standard..."

Cross:\$"Well..."

Speaker Hannig: "...or from Standard to Extended we have granted them that... "

Cross: "Obviously..."

Speaker Hannig: "...but someone has to ask."

Cross: "They had their lights on. We're asking now to extend the debate with all due respect to the Sponsor. I know

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representative Turner and Representative Durkin both had their lights on and they want to ask legitimate questions about this Bill. I think it's a simple request, so I'm asking for an extension."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, Representative, we will grant your request."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "All the Chair would ask is that someone would please make that request before we close."

Cross: "Well, I don't want to speak for them, but they had their lights on. I assume they were asking for that extension."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "So, now we will have two additional speakers on each side. And Representative Durkin has had his light on.

The Gentleman is recognized for five minutes."

Durkin: "I'll be brief. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Representative yield for a question?"

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

Durkin: "Representative Dart, Section 20 under subsection 11, it talks about the records of the licensed dealer have to be made available upon demand. I'm in support of your Bill, Tom, but I just want to just explore this area a little bit. It seems like in the beginning of this Bill we have a very long list of a definition Section. One thing that I'm just... work with me on this. What do we mean by 'records'? It just says here that the the licensee must make available the licensee's records. What types of records are we talking about? Firearm records, tax records, employment records, what types of records? I think that that's a problem that I see with your Bill, if this does become law, there's gonna be a vagueness

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

question, a vagueness issue about what exactly do we mean by 'records'. Do you understand what I'm getting at, Tom?"

Dart: "Jim, can you direct me, I didn't hear the Section you were talking about."

Durkin: "Sure. It's Section 20, subsection 11, 'The licensee must make available the licensee's records to any officer,' et cetera, et cetera. It just doesn't explain what records we're talking about 'cause you don't have it in the definition Section what records as you do with a number of other items under the legislation. And I just want to know what exactly, what types of records we are gonna limit this to, because it's not clear in the Bill."

Dart: "Well, the records that we're talking about for purposes of this Bill would be the ones in regards to the sale of weapons that have occurred in there. The fact that it's not specifically mentioned. Could it be later a subject of a lawsuit? I suppose it could, but then you and I would both agree that anybody can sue anybody for anything anyway. So, could it be more clear? I suppose we could, but I think because of what the heart of the Bill references I think that it's easy enough and legislative intent what we're referencing here are records in regards to the sales of the weapons that go on. We're not talking about the other records that may be there."

Durkin: "All right. I just think it may be problematic if someone's gonna raise the issue in the future. You know, what exactly records we're talking to. If they wanna go from firearms records and maybe a revenue agent wants to start looking at some of their, you know, sales tax records. Just one last question and this has been asked of me a million times, how do you get around the Fourth

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Amendment, search and seizure issues when it says that a police officer can walk in on demand and inspect the records? How are you gonna... How do you counter that argument? If their... Under the Fourth Amendment you have a right to... I think you have a right not to, you know, your records, anything in your home are personal and cannot be abridged absent, you know, warrant establishing probable cause. Just think about the situation where there is an inspection and there is some legitimate information, however, it leads to further evidence. Motion to suppress is brought and you have a fruit-of-the-poisonous-tree problem because... Do you anticipate that that may be problem along the line 'cause I don't see any type of probable cause requirement in this. Is it necessary? this an administrative search and seizure which doesn't require that type of standard? Explain to me how we're gonna get around the Fourth Amendment on this."

Dart: "I don't see there being a problem. Under existing law right now, the law enforcement does have the ability to come and examine those records, as it is, right now and that has not posed a problem because it was something that was not seen as being a seizure. It was part of their doing the business there that they were allowed to examine their records. Much like in other areas where a business where individuals from the different departments have the ability the Department of Revenue to examine records. that wasn't a new creature we are creating here. under present existing law they would have the ability to come in and examine it but the problem as I say, Jim, got to be a very pragmatic, practical problem, namely, that you would have to have an officer from a department who would go to every single shop, go through the records by hand to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

try to draw any of the conclusions you can do by via database."

Durkin: "Well, I think whenever the Department of Revenue goes in I think it's called the spook... the subpoena duces tecum in which you go to the grand jury and you get the blessing of the grand jury to retrieve documents. But I think that... Ya know, I'm gonna support your Bill. But I just see that, you know, there is gonna be problems with this Section in the future. If this does become law and there is someone charged under the Illinois Statutes and there is evidence which leads to other crimes, you're gonna run into that type of situation. But I plan on supporting your Bill and I appreciate your work."

Dart: "Thanks, Jim."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative John Turner."

Turner, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I kind of got a defective
 microphone here, but will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Dart: "John, I was almost getting disappointed that I wasn't gonna hear from ya. I was gonna have to ask the Bill to be held so we can get you out here."

Turner, J.: "Well, I don't want to waste too much of my time at the microphone, Tom, but I'm not quite sure how to describe this thing. Representative, in all seriousness, it's my understanding that these dealers are already licensed federally. That is true, is it not?"

Dart: "Yeah. The dealers that we're talking about here, right now, do presently have federal licenses, FFLs, they have them right now. What we're talking about is going beyond that to require an additional one."

Turner, J.: "Okay. If they are federally licensed, why do we need to heap on this additional license? What is it that

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

you're trying to protect in doing this? And by the way, before you answer that... Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."

"I've missed you, John. The reason, John, at the heart Dart: One, because of one of the things that was alluded to earlier, because of the lack of enforcement capacity both... as I say, there's 2100 FFLs, there's only 15 people to monitor them, alcohol and Physically impossible. Cannot be done, tobacco. for starters. That's part of it. Two, just the cutback on the federal level of the funding for ATF and others has led to the fact that the Feds cannot enforce this appropriately. That leads us to the third reason is, is that we would have the ability to do that here in this state through the State Police and the local municipalities. They would have the ability to do this, whereas right now they just don't. it was something, I'll be honest with you John, if the FFLs were being monitored appropriately, I wouldn't be here with this Bill. They aren't doing it. They would candidly tell you they aren't doing it. This is an ability to try to do it."

Turner, J.: "Well, I'm looking at a... I'll call it a flyer here that suggests that in 1982 Chicago began the process or passed an ordinance which required registration. That eventually led then to the ban of all handguns in the Chicagoland area and I believe all long guns now, as well. So, you can see where some of us would have a concern that if we get the licensings and registration, is this not then the first step for ultimately banning guns in the State of Illinois and starting off probably the same way the City of Chicago did with handguns and then eventually going to long

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

guns, as well. Okay, here's a question for you, you don't

like that one."

Dart: "No, John. John, no. To be honest with ya..."

Turner, J.: "By the way, Mr. Speaker..."

Dart: "John, I'll answer that ques..."

Turner, J.: " ... I had asked for a verification and okay, you're nodding your head in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative, you'll be given the opportunity."

Dart: "John, no, to answer that, I didn't know if that was a question, I thought it was a statement."

Turner, J.: "No, it really wasn't. Here's my question, though.

Downstate we might have a pawnshop dealer. A pawnshop
dealer's gonna be dealing a lot of things, jewelry, other
kinds of items. There may be four or five guns in there as
well. Now, will this pawnshop dealer need to be licensed
under your Bill?"

Dart: "Yes, he'd be required to be licensed as well. But as I said, there would also be referenced back to the fact that this individual would have to have this, would have to be its principal objective and livelihood for profit would be the sale of these guns. So, if that's part of what he's doing there he would have to be licensed. In some pawnshops, I would think, that would be the case. Pawnshops that do not have guns in them they would not be affected by this."

Turner, J.: "Okay, just a couple of other matters. I guess I didn't notice this in committee, but does your Bill require that anyone who would be in the position to own the shop to sell the guns that the windows would have to be positioned in such a way or perhaps, I don't know, maybe they need to be covered in some way so that firearms cannot be visible

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

from the outside? Do you see this perhaps as to a legitimate person who sells firearms to some way hinder their right to do business or their ability to do business?"

- Dart: "I don't. There was a specific case in Elgin where there was a theft of a lot of guns because they were all in the window in an open display right at the window as they passed by. This is an attempt to deal with that situation by saying that it is part of your license, you cannot be having guns displayed in the window where they could be stolen. I mean, I don't think, frankly, it's gonna cut back on too many sales. I don't know of too many people who go out looking for guns who do slow crawls by the front of the store looking at what's in the window. They know what they're going in to get."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner, could you bring your remarks to a close?"
- Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I thank you for extending the debate and allowing me to ask my questions. I don't have any other questions. I just want to make sure that we do get our verification. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "You'll be given that opportunity. There being no further requests for discussion on the Bill, Representative Dart is recognized to close."
- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have previously given a closing on this, but as I say, briefly, this Bill will make a difference. This will be a Bill that we could say to ourselves, we have done something to stem the flow of guns getting into the wrong people's hands and we can actually do it in such a way that we can get it before the crime was committed. It's not something we can do too often around here. This Bill will do it. It's eminently reasonable.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

This is not part of a large Chicago scheme to try to expand downstate with laws banning this, that, and the other thing. This is a law that has one single purpose and that is to try to stem the guns getting into the wrong people's hands, so it will be less carnage on the streets. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', and 57 voting 'no'. Representative Dart, do you request Postponed Consideration? No. The Gentleman does not and so this Bill is declared lost. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 904. Excuse me, Representative Cowlishaw, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have just come recently from a press conference held by out state school superintendent, Glen McGee, who announced for all of us the results that have now been received here and throughout the world for the most recent set of examinations given in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study. The acronym for that is TIMSS. And the TIMSS results are scrutinized by educators all over the world, because it is an international set of tests that are highly respected and highly controlled by the TIMSS organization itself. So that, in fact, the results are comparable, one nation to another, one state to another, one school district to another. And I am very, very proud

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

to announce to you, because I want to share this as source of pride for all Illinoisans. In this most recent round of these tests these school district, not the state, not the nation, the school district in the entire world who came in first in science achievement is Naperville School That school district, thank you, District #203. school district did very well in mathematics achievement. In fact, it ranked it higher than any other school district in America. But the most remarkable achievement is in frankly, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and science. And Gentlemen of the House, I know that a lot of families other parts of what make up the life of a student are what produced those kinds of results and yet somehow it is the school district itself that has to bring all of those factors together. And I find it highly notable that number one performance on science achievement in the entire world is in the Naperville School District in the State of Illinois. I am very proud of them and thank you for recognizing me to share this wonderful news with my colleagues."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 904?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 904, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under current law, municipalities have the right to purchase or lease real estate or personal property. House Bill 904 amends that Section to allow them also to accept real estate or personal property whether it be by gift or grant. And I urge your support for House Bill 904. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Black: "Representative, in the language of the Bill it states, 'whether the land or personal property is located within or outside the municipal boundaries.' Now if the intent is to get a gift of land to add to a park or to build a road, I can understand that. But what if somebody who used to live in community 'A' passed away and gave community 'B', where he grew up, 500 acres that happen to be in my municipality. This Bill would say that's okay, that's fine. So your municipality would then own 500 acres located in my municipality."

Mathias: "That's correct and they would be subject to all of the rules, zoning, and other ordinances of your municipality, could not build on it the subject to following the rules and regulations and getting the necessary approvals from the municipality that the property happens to be located in."

Black: "Would the land in question then be ruled tax exempt because it is now owned by a municipality, property tax exempt?"

Mathias: "Well, since the municipality owned it I would assume that that may be the case."

Black: "That's an interesting proposition. I mean, I can see where in rural counties where we don't have a great deal of commercial real estate or retail property or industrial property. What I don't understand is if a farmer who grew up in your area upon his death said, you know I always loved the mayor, you know, Mayor Sid, and I'm gonna donate my 3500 acre farm to his municipality. Now that takes 3500

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

acres off of the tax rolls in my municipality. It would seem that you would want to clarify this Bill that the land must be contiguous to the existing municipality. Wouldn't that make this much simpler than to have parcels all around the State of Illinois being deeded to another community that may, in fact, may be 200 miles away?"

Mathias: "I assume they probably could purchase that property in your municipality and still take it off the tax rolls, so I don't think it would make any difference."

Black: "Wait a minute, I don't understand."

Mathias: "In other words, nothing would stop a municipality from purchasing property in another municipality and that also would take it off the tax rolls."

Black: "I understand that. But my scenario is the owner of 3500 acres dies and under your Bill, should it become law, gives that property to a municipality where he grew up. And that municipality may be 200 miles away from where I live. Now I have 3500 acres off the tax rolls and then I would assume... what's your municipality gonna do with the land? I mean, you gonna farm it or you gonna sell it to a private owner? I could understand your Bill if you limited the Bill to contiguous property, but this seems to me to open up a real can of worms where municipalities may own parcels of land, real estate, or personal property anywhere throughout the State of Illinois and I think that's gonna be a real... I think you're gonna pit one community against the other if we're not careful here."

Mathias: "I understand, although like I stated, I don't think there would be anything that would prohibit the municipality from buying that land and also taking it off the tax rolls. So I don't think this is any different."

Black: "Well..."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Mathias: "I don't think there's... let's put it this way, I don't think there's too many situations where that would happen. Yes, it's possible, but now we're looking at something that's, you know, it hasn't happened yet that where somebody purchased it. So..."
- Black: "Let me ask you a question. You're saying that a municipality could buy that property. Now maybe I'm wrong, your municipality cannot come down into my district and buy 3500 acres, can you?"
- Mathias: "I know of no prohibition in the Code that would stop them from doing that. I may be wrong, but I don't know of any prohibition that would stop'em from doing that. You still have to follow all the rules and regulations."
- Black: "I would think that the taxpayers of your village for example, if you purchased a 3500 acre farm in my district I would think your taxpayers would say, what in the world are you doing?"
- Mathias: "And obviously, that's why it probably wouldn't be done, why it hasn't been done and..."
- Black: "Well, that's why I was trying to clarify..."
- Mathias: "Right. Well, I think even in your situation, I don't think it would be pretty rare that somebody is going to give property away to a municipality, to our municipality that belongs in your community. I just, I think it's more likely that it may be and the reason..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"
- Black: "Yep, I'll try to cooperate, Mr. Speaker. Although there are times I think I could go to some banana republic and have more rights than I do here, but whatever. Representative, the only thing I'm concerned about, obviously it doesn't happen now because the law doesn't

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

allow it. If your Bill becomes law there is nothing to prohibit someone who has moved elsewhere in the state, done very well, maybe created a factory or farmed thousands of acres from saying I always loved my hometown and when I die I'm giving the factory or the farm ground or my house to my hometown. And I think that that's gonna be... could conceivably, once the law allows this, I could see some very difficult situations with communities going around and saying, you know you grew up here, you're eighty years old, when you sell your factory, hey, why don't you just give it to your old hometown? We then could sell it, we could use the money. My hometown would then go to your hometown and say, hey butt out of our business. Don't come down and try and talk your native son into giving you a major gift that you're then taking from our hometown. And the reason it doesn't happen now is you can't do that. I wouldn't have any problem with your Bill, and I'm sure your Bill's gonna pass. I wouldn't have any problem with it if you'd limit it to contiguous real property. I could care less about personal property, but I see real property anywhere in the state can get to be a real hassle. I appreciate your indulgence."

- Speaker Hannig: "We've had one speak in support and one speak in response. Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise? This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate."
- McCarthy: "I thought I'd bring up some interesting topics that were covered in committee on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, if that's okay."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll take it off Short Debate at your request and you can proceed, Representative."
- McCarthy: "Okay. The Representative of Danville asked a lot of the questions that did come up in debate, in committee.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

And we had spoken about making some changes to the Bill concerning contiguous property. Could you tell us what was the reason why we came back and did not do that?"

Mathias: "It was my understanding that after reviewing it with the Members of the committee that they were fine with the Bill as it existed and in fact it did, I believe, pass out of committee unanimously without that requirement or without any... there was nothing on... I did not state at that time that I would do an Amendment. We had looked into it and I came back after, if you recall, we discussed it at one meeting, we then looked at that possibility, came back at the next meeting. I thought that all the Members were okay without putting that provision in and the Bill went through unanimously."

McCarthy: "Now, we had some interesting anecdotes that... in committee. I remember one particularly that was, if an imaginary town came up with an imaginary piece of land to give to another imaginary town, that one is vividly in my memory but there was also one about a sidewalk that I think you brought up. Could you share that with the Body?"

Mathias: "Well, I had a situation in our town when I was mayor where we needed to purchase, where we had a sidewalk that had a gap in it that was adjacent to a major highway and we really wanted to have that sidewalk put in to, you know, to complete the gap and, obviously, for tax reasons the owner wanted to donate that sidewalk but, obviously, that parcel was not within the village. So there was an issue of whether or not he could donate it or whether we actually had to purchase it. But it was for a public purpose and I assuming that this is similar situation, that someone would may want to donate property for sewer or road or something like that and donate it rather than having the municipality

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

purchase it so that they could get a tax write-off for it and it's probably property that's needed to complete a municipal purpose."

McCarthy: "And this in no way would help people get an inflated assessment of their property by giving it as a charitable donation to another municipality instead of selling it on the open market, correct?"

Mathias: "I certainly would hope not."

McCarthy: "I would hope not, too. Very legitimately, if there was an Amendment in the Senate that said that if the property is currently on the property tax rolls and is not contiguous to the village receiving it, would you welcome an Amendment or would you accept an Amendment that would say that that property had to be sold within a certain amount of time?"

Mathias: "Yes."

McCarthy: "'Cause otherwise you're gonna have like, you know, one town is owning a piece of property for no reason other than it was donated to it and we'd like to see them make them, you know, have the benefit of it if the citizen wanted to do that. But, so you would welcome such an Amendment?"

Mathias: "I would work with the Senate Sponsor to come up with a reasonable restriction."

McCarthy: "Well, thank you. I enjoyed the work on this Bill in committee and I enjoyed the little intercourse we've had here tonight, so thank you."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "There being no one else seeking recognition, Representative Mathias is recognized to close."

Mathias: "I urge your support of House Bill 904 which is needed by your local municipalities to accept property by grant or inheritance. Thank you."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1945."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1945, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 1945 is an initiative of Mayor the House. Richard Daley and the City of Chicago. concerted and consistent effort to attack the problem of criminals acquiring firearms illegally. We have all too much tragic experience that criminals have discovered how at gun shows large number of private buyers and sellers can do business and frequently without background checks, because only those transactions which involve a federally licensed gun dealer require these safeguards. Gun shows are a supermarket of lethal produce and right now they're a recipe for unnecessary violence and tragedy families. And many of these firearms are obtained by criminals in the parking lots of racetracks and fairgrounds without the necessary accountability protections in place. In the year 2000 alone according to the records of the Illinois State Police there were 47 gun shows in Illinois, throughout the state. Briefly, House Bill 1945 does the following: It provides a new Section to the FOID Card Act to define a gun show, specifically the geography of it, and to determine how background checks will occur at the show;

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

It ensures that a transfer of a firearm by a person who's not a federally licensed dealer has to go through a federally licensed firearm dealer. That background check has to go through these procedures and State Law as if the dealer were the seller of the firearm. Any transfer of a firearm taking place on the grounds of a gun show, the grounds not only include the fairground, racetrack, flea market, or any other site but the parking areas, as well. And all the transfers would fall under this law. Gun shows are defined almost identically as they are under Federal And in addition the grounds of Section 3.1 of the Law. FOID Card Act has to be followed for these procedures. people have asked if there's any real evidence that criminals obtain guns at gun shows. According to a year 2000 study completed by the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms on gun trafficking investigations, gun shows represent the second leading source of illegal guns recovered by Federal Law enforcement. And they represent 20% of the total trafficking cases between the years studied, 1996 and 1998. Now, some others have argued that requiring background checks will hurt legitimate gun dealers, will cut into their business, that these are hardworking, honest men and women only trying to make a Well, according to the data provided in the most recent study by the Federal General Accounting Office, all background checks are completed within two minutes. That's 120 seconds. Ninety-five of those are completed within two hours. The remaining 5%, which may take longer, those checks are 20 times more likely to uncover a felon. In short, the time is long overdue to close the gun show loophole. Regardless of where you are on this very important debate, I believe that you can support it. I

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

urge your support for House Bill 1945 and I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold is recognized."

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

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

Brunsvold: "Jeff, I probably should've asked Tom this question, too. But, you know, we're dealing with individuals here that are criminals, probably drug-related in most cases. And as you look around the country and look at the big cities and a few of the states, why do the states or the cities with the toughest gun laws have the most gun deaths? And let's use Chicago if we want to do it, you know, Chicago has a lot of gun deaths and a lot of gun violence and they have probably some of the strictest laws in the nation. Why is that?"

Schoenberg: "To answer your question, I believe that what this Bill does is get at the root cause of some of this violence which is how the supply of these firearms end up in the hands of those who shouldn't have them. Now, how does that happen? Happens as we've seen time and time again through straw purchases. It happens because, for example, while all arrest records are computerized, conviction records are not. So therefore, gun dealers may be unknowingly selling to people who are convicted of offenses. I think that it's... I don't think that you can make an assumption that all these people are nonviolent drug offenders."

Brunsvold: "You know, most of them probably have drug dealings and, not all of them, but a lot of them."

Schoenberg: "I don't, you know what, I think, I don't know what the data is to support that claim, so I can't argue for that, I can't argue against it. But one thing that this does, Representative Brunsvold, is that this also provides

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

protection for all gun... for people who want to make their living selling firearms, this provides protection for them, as well. Because right now, unless they're a federally licensed firearm dealer, all it takes for someone is to flash very quickly a FOID card, a FOID card that could be fraudulently obtained or one that could be invalid. All that person... all the buyer has to do is flash a FOID card momentarily and there's no protection in place."

Brunsvold: "Well, Jeff, just to try to answer the question that I asked you. It's my view that the cities and some of the areas that have the toughest gun laws have the most gun because they have a crime is people problem, Representative. I think it's the people. The rural areas have six times less gun violence than the city areas, the inner city areas. And you know, it's a people situation and passing a lot of laws dealing with the tool, in my view, is not gonna make a big difference. But let's go on from there. I'm looking at the Bill now and you know, I'm a sports, you know, sportsman and I do trap shooting and skeet shooting and, you know, rifle target shooting and things like that. And I notice you've defined gun show as function sponsored by national, state, or local organization devoted to the collection or competitive use or sporting use. You know, I don't know if you've ever been to a DU dinner or a Pheasants Forever dinner, or a Wild Turkey Federation dinner. National Three, four hundred people go to these, wives, kids. I don't see a lot of criminals there, Jeff, I really don't. And really, you know, at these dinners, you know, they go through an FFL I understand that. Even anyway. our sportsman's fundraiser for the DNR over here at the fairgrounds, we process some gun sales over there. And those gun sales go

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

through an FFL. They do. Is that gonna change? You know, I don't know why you use that language there. Was there any reason why you targeted that language?"

Schoenberg: "As I... Representative Brunsvold, as I indicated in my opening remarks, this language in the Bill mirrors federal language and that's done in order the ensure greater consistency. Now, what I'd like to add to my, in response to the questions that you just raised, Representative, I think the data that I, the statistics and the data that I cited on gun trafficking provides the compelling..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brunsvold, could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will. Can I ask one more question?"

Speaker Hannig: "One more."

Brunsvold: "Okay. On the... down below it says grounds of a gun show and I know you're trying to deal with the parking lot.

But if I want to transfer a gun to my friend Phil Novak and we're at a gun dealer and I want to buy a new gun at a DU dinner and I want to sell my old gun to Phil Novak, can I do that? I don't think I can do that."

Schoenberg: "I don't see why you couldn't."

Brunsvold: "I can at that show, that's considered part of the... that's a show, I mean, it's a gun show."

Schoenberg: "There's nothing preventing you from doing that transaction somewhere else with your friend."

Brunsvold: "Well, yeah, I'm just saying..."

Schoenberg: "As long as your friend..."

Brunsvold: "My point exactly, Jeff. I mean, I can't deliver this shotgun to Mr. Novak at the DU dinner but I can walk across the street and deliver it to him, which is exactly what's

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

happening now. If they can't deliver a gun at a particular place, a criminal's activity is I'll do it where I can do it. And this is gonna solve no problem, so I stand against the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had one in favor and one in opposition.

Representative Black is recognized. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, the number of laws that deal with gun shows, federally licensed firearm dealers, et cetera. The instant background check that they have to do, what exactly are you trying to close here? I mean, what... are you just simply saying that a private individual cannot go to a gun show and sell a gun? Is that what you're closing off?"

Schoenberg: "No. What we're saying is that there would be consistency in the standards of accountability for people selling and obtaining firearms. Right now a double standard really exists. As I indicated this is as much for protection for the dealer as it is for everybody else. If it's a federally licensed dealer then you go through the federal screening process. But if a person is not a federally licensed dealer and is selling guns at a gun show, they're required to do nothing else more than see somebody's FOID card, without any further checking as to whether or not that person has any convictions, whether or not that person has a record that precludes them from having that card in the first place. All it is, is ensuring uniformity in the accountability standards."

Black: "The person buying the weapon or transferring the weapon still has to fill out all the paperwork and keep it on file

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

for 10 years, do they not?"

Schoenberg: "They do. But Mr. Black, the inconvenience level is virtually eliminated because of the fact that the overwhelming majority of these checks are, according to the General Accounting Office, are found, 72% of them, they're completed within two minutes, 95% of them within two hours. So 95% of the time somebody buying a firearm at a gun show is gonna be, have their background check completed before they leave that gun show."

Black: "Representative, I voted for the instant background check and I'm very glad I did, so I'm very familiar with how it works. We had some start-up problems but it works very As the... to paraphrase Tom Brokaw's book, 'As the greatest generation passes from the scene, the World War II veterans are dying at about a thousand a day now.' Many of them came back from the war with a collection of firearms. Some that they picked up on the battlefield, some that they traded. I'm not sure all of it was according to the rules and regulations of the Department of the Army at the time, but they did so. And many of their children are now taking these weapons to a gun show and selling them. don't want them in the house. Times change. So they'll take an M1 or an M18 Colt 45, or a Belgium rifle that their father picked up on a battlefield somewhere and somehow managed to get it home 55 years ago. You're telling me that these people under your Bill could not go to a gun show and dispose of their father's property. have to have some kind of license to do so. Is that what you're after?"

Schoenberg: "No, I'm not telling you that, Mr. Black. What I do agree with you that it's tragic that we live in a different day and a different time where we have to address the root

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

causes of illegal gun trafficking more aggressively. But I'm not telling you that at all, Sir. What I'm telling you that they would have to go through an FFL and that's as much protection for everybody, for all of us who are neighbors and have a sense of community as it is for those whose relatives have served our country so honorably."

Black: "All right, so in other words, I could not set up a booth and sell them, I would have to seek out a federally licensed firearm dealer, correct?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct."

Black: "Would that dealer then charge me a commission or fee for that transaction? And I don't know the answer to that.

I..."

Schoenberg: "That's between you and the dealer."

Black: "Staff informs me that the standard practice is they would, in fact, charge a fee or a discount so that they could resell and there is also a fee that they would pass on to you for the dial-up. So, as far as I can see the only individual impacted by this is a private individual who may wish to dispose of a weapon. And if the recordkeeping provision is there I don't see where that would be waived, but I do appreciate your response. And, Mr. Speaker, part of the problem with the five minutes is you get to ask three questions that take 90 seconds and you get three answers that takes the remainder of the time. But that's..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, would you like to bring your remarks to a close? Representative Dale Righter is recognized for five minutes. Are you in favor or in opposition, Representative?"

Righter: "Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Sponsor but I think..."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman will yield."

- Righter: "Representative Schoenberg, is, in your Bill is there any threshold insofar as the number of attendees at a what you've defined as a gun show in order for these requirements to kick in?"
- Schoenberg: "Well, Mr. Righter, it's not like applying for the Museum Grant Program administered by the Department of Natural Resources. There's no attendance requirement."
- Righter: "Okay. Is there any requirements in there with regards to the number of guns that may be at the gun show?"
- Schoenberg: "No, Sir. No, this Bill, to reiterate this Bill is very narrow."
- Righter: "The questions that Representative Brunsvold asked earlier I'd like to elaborate on those just a little bit.

  You've made the comment that you were looking to level the playing field."
- Schoenberg: "No I never used that cliche. I think it's over..."
- Righter: "Okay, what is the phrase you've used to try to...

  consistency maybe is the term you've used if that's not
  right."
- Schoenberg: "Right, to have applied consistency in the standards of accountability for obtaining firearms."
- Righter: "Can you elaborate on that, 'cause I'm not sure that I understand that argument."
- Schoenberg: "Certainly. As I indicated earlier, on more than one occasion, a person who right now... we have federally licensed firearm dealers at gun shows side to side with those who are not federally-licensed dealers. If someone walks up to the person, to the booth on the left who's a federally licensed dealer to obtain a firearm, that person would be required to undergo the federal background check. However, if that person would go and turn to the right to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

buy the same firearm and that person just so happens is not a federally licensed firearm dealer then the standards of accountability are far more liberal, they're far more lax. And that all that would be required was the quick flick of a FOID card and there'd be nothing to preclude that person from obtaining the firearm."

Righter: "Representative, the reason I question the term or the argument that this creates consistency is because it's my understanding of the Bill, the way it's drafted, is that if a person who is at a gun show showing guns has a person come to their table and want to buy one single gun that if they purchased it there they have to run it through a licensed dealer. If they wanted to purchase it in the parking lot they would have to, but if they walked across the street they would be exempt from your legislation. Is that fair to say?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Righter, let me give you another analogy."

Righter: "Representative Schoenberg, I appreciate that but my clock's running, if you could just tell me whether or not that hypothetical is accurate or not under your Bill, I'd really appreciate it."

Schoenberg: "If you wanted to leave the fairgrounds, go outside to the parking lot, go all the way across the road to make that transaction, you certainly, physically would be able to do so. But right now, under the studies that have come out under how gun trafficking is occurring, many of these transactions are occurring in parking lots to circumvent the existing law which I might... existing standards which I have to add that this system was proposed by the National Rifle Association back in 1991 and actually became law in 1992."

Righter: "Why would anyone under the law now, have to go out to

- 40th Legislative Day

  April 4, 2001

  the parking lot of the gun show to buy a gun,

  Representative Schoenberg?"
- Schoenberg: "A person who wanted to obtain that firearm quickly and get out of there as soon as possible, I would think, would want to be able to be as close to the exit as they could."
- Righter: "Well, you're talking about illegal sales, then."
- Schoenberg: "That's correct and this is really what this is directed at. As I said this is a narrow Bill designed to close the gun show loophole on illegally obtained firearms."
- Righter: "Well, Representative Schoenberg, then the inconsistency that this Bill creates now is that the private seller and the private buyer who can now engage in a private transaction will not be able to if they're on the grounds of a gun show or in the parking lot of a gun show but will be able to go across the street and do that. Or if I sell a shot gun or buy a shot gun from my uncle I'll be able to as long as we don't do it at a gun show. If you're worried about consistency... "
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Righter, the inconsistency that exists is that we won't have a weaker standard that criminals are currently using..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Righter, could you bring your remarks to a close? Okay, Representative Cross is going to give you his time, Representative Righter."
- Righter: "Representative Schoenberg, if you're concerned about consistency why don't you have a Bill before the House that would simply require that all firearm transactions go through a federally licensed dealer? That would be consistency along the arguments that you're using."
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Righter, for the very reason that we don't want

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- this burden on hobbyists and sportsmen. If there wasn't data to track these trends and disturbing patterns I don't think I'd be before you today with this Bill."
- Righter: "Do you have a number insofar as how many crimes with guns were committed in the state last year, where those guns were purchased legally at a gun show? Like a percentage?"
- Schoenberg: "I can give you the national figures and I believe that the state figures are consistent with the trend in the national figures."
- Righter: "Is there a reason why we don't, in considering this legislation, we don't have a number that applies just to the State of Illinois since this is legislation that's only gonna affect the taxpayers in this state?"
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Righter, as I said the data in Illinois, I don't have the exact figures, the data on Illinois mirrors the federal trend and that is, according to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, more than 20% of illegal gun sales come from gun shows and that felons who are associated with selling or purchasing firearms in 46% of the gun shows that were investigated. Therefore, gun shows ended up being the second leading source of illegal firearms that were recovered in gun trafficking investigations. I don't have the exact numbers for Illinois..."
- Righter: "I didn't hear all you said, Representative Schoenberg."

  Schoenberg: ...but they mirror the federal, but they are consistent with the federal trends."
- Righter: "Did you say 20% of the illegal sales that go on, go on at gun shows? And I'm sorry I could not hear what you were reading."
- Schoenberg: "Twenty percent of the total trafficking cases

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

between 1996 and 1998."

- Righter: "So, that's illegal gun purchases were made at gun shows. When you say trafficking cases are you talking about illegal gun purchases?"
- Schoenberg: "Yes, what I'm saying is that gun shows according to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, they ended up being the second leading source of illegal guns being required, being recovered, I'm sorry, by Federal Law enforcement."
- Righter: "If a person is intent on going to a gun show, Representative Schoenberg, for the purposes of buying a gun that perhaps under law they are not allowed to have, why won't they just walk across the street? How is this gonna stop anything? They simply walk across the street and buy it from the person who's showing the guns. How is this Bill going to stop that and therefore stop one sale of this illegal trafficking that you're referring to?"
- Schoenberg: "For starters, by expanding the geographical area where we have proven evidence that many of these transactions are taking place, we will be able to address this. Will we be able to address all the cases? As I pointed out to you even in the case of, where federal background checks have been done there have been 5% of them where they haven't been completed within a couple of hours. But the overwhelming percentage based on the data that we have collected by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the General Accounting Office, we have more than adequate reason to believe that this will go a long way towards addressing the root cause of this problem. Will it eliminate it? It probably won't eliminate it, but I do believe in my heart of hearts that it will solve an overwhelming part of the problem."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in strong support of this legislation. Earlier in the debates one of my colleagues talked about some municipalities having people problems and in certain respects he was right. In certain municipalities like mine in the City of Chicago we have people that are getting shot, injured, and killed with guns. A lot of these guns are bought at gun shows. Okay? When I was down here for a freshman orientation earlier this Session, there was a gun show out at the Crown Plaza Hotel. And I had walked in 'cause I had not been to a gun show before and picked up a semiautomatic weapon that was for sale there and I asked them, you know, what do I need to buy this? And they said all you need is a FOID card. Much to my surprise he didn't mention a background check, or three days or anything like that, all he said was a FOID card. Now, if it was somebody else who was going to buy that gun, someone else is gonna turn around and sell that gun to someone who's gonna use it in a crime, right now it's not covered. What this Bill tries to do is to provide some uniformity so that there is a background check. These guns that are being used to kill people in our streets, not only in Chicago, but throughout the state, some of these guns are being bought at gun Those guns are injuring Illinoisans. So, I stand in strong support of this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've had two speak in favor and four in opposition. Representative John Turner is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- Turner, J.: "Representative, I'm trying to find the definition
   for 'transfer' in your Bill and I can't. Is there a
   definition in there, I'm just not seeing it?"
- Schoenberg: "Within this Bill the definition of 'transfer' is not explicitly stated. However, the existing law which defines 'transfer', that would be applicable."
- Turner, J.: "You say existing law defines 'transfer'. Do you know for what particular Code chap that would be in? Is that in the Criminal Code or... 'cause I don't know. I'm not... if I knew the answer I would supply it, I don't know the answer to that."
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Turner, I can't give you the exact citation but you should understand it as the existing definition of 'transfer'."
- Turner, J.: "Okay, well does that include a loan then, or gift?"
  Schoenberg: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."
- Turner, J.: "Well, okay, I had asked for a definition of 'transfer'. You said it was someplace else in our statutes. I had followed that question up and said I belive or asked, whether a loan or a gift is included in your definition of transfer. I don't think I had a response to that and that's what I'm waiting for, Mr. Speaker."
- Schoenberg: "I'm checking on that answer right now. Is there another question in the meantime? I don't want to eat into your time."
- Turner, J.: "Yeah, I can go on and ask some other questions. In your Bill and in the definition, in your Bill of a gun show, does it differentiate between members, for example,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

meaning locally for a gun club versus what would be typically classified as a gun show? In other words, it's a local gun club where the guys come in, they have guns and they swap them back and forth, for example, under the loan or gift, is that your intent to include those folks, as well? Is that a gun show under your Bill?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Turner, on line 16 of the Bill, on lines 16 through 22 of the Bill, it does reference, 'local organizations devoted to the collection, competitive use, or other sporting use of the firearms, or an event or an organization or association that sponsors functions or events devoted to the collection, competitive use, or the sporting use of firearms in the community.'"

Turner, J.: "Right."

Schoenberg: "Right. So the answer to that would be 'yes'. And as I indicated..."

- Turner, J.: "All right, so if I go to Ducks Unlimited in Logan County and do my sponsorship, purchase my tickets, and I win the long gun. Can I take that gun or are they gonna be persons subject then, under your definition, to the transfer under gun show? It looks like to me that would be a gun show. So, is DU a gun show?"
- Schoenberg: "So, this is another way of your asking if you win it as a prize or if it's a gift as to whether or not that qualifies as a transfer, is that what your asking? I mean, you're asking... you're providing me a hypothetical, the question that I just told you that I was looking for the answer. So, maybe you ought to ask me a question in a different subject area."
- Turner, J.: "Yes, Representative. Okay, are you saying then that you're... on whether Ducks Unlimited is a gun show? That you want me to go further and you're looking for a response

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

to that question as well, is that what you just indicated?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner, we're gonna give you a

little more time since the a ..."

Turner, J.: "In deference to the Sponsor, I've asked some questions that he wants some time to respond to. I certainly appreciate that and I suggest we just take it out of the record 'til we get those responses instead of delaying the entire Body from going about the other business on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, while we're waiting ya know, I'm still operating here with a defective microphone. As you can see I can lean all the way over like this, and all the way back to the right, back to the left. I'm wondering if we have a mechanic, a technician, some pundit of some sort that can come and help me out here. It's difficult to try to engage in dialectic and debate when you have this kind of defective equipment."

Speaker Hannig: "You might be aware you could be subject to electrical shock doing that, Representative."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Turner, I think I have the answer to your questions and I appreciate the indulgence not only of yourself but of all the other Members who have been waiting so patiently for me to scrounge up the answers. And that is, if this is a private transaction between individuals in an area not quite... under circumstances other than those expressed as the definition of a gun show and other than in а geographical, including the geographical area as defined, not just that immediate area where the show's taking place but the parking lots, as well. If it would fall within that definition, I would say 'yes' that that would have to... it would require that check."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Turner, J.: "Okay, trying to follow you then, Representative, it sounds like to me that Ducks Unlimited, and they're in many, many counties throughout the state, maybe in every county, those would be gun shows under your Bill. Quail Unlimited would be gun shows under your Bill. Pheasants Forever would be gun shows under your Bill. White Tail, whatever they call that particular one, that also would be a gun show then under your Bill. Is that a correct statement, fair statement?"
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Turner, that would not only be correct under my Bill, that would be correct under existing Federal Law, as well."
- Turner, J.: "Okay, I..."
- Schoenberg: "Because the definition of 'gun show' is virtually identical, both in my Bill and the existing definition for the process that was initiated by the National Rifle Association in 1991 and which became law in 1992."
- Turner, J.: "Well, Representative, I'm not gonna try to cite the Federal Law nor quote it. I will tell you that I've gone the Quail Unlimited. I've gone to many Ducks Unlimited shows. If they are doing the procedure outlined in your Bill, because there are shows that require the type of federal licensing or in order to give the guns, I have not seen that occur in any of the shows I've attended, Ducks Unlimited or Quail Unlimited. But having said all that, let's move back into the very first question I asked on the definition of 'transfer'. Does transfer include a loan or gift?"
- Schoenberg: "If they're taking possession of it under the... in the context as described in the Bill, the answer would be 'yes'. Just as it would be that... "
- Turner, J.: "Okay. Is that what we want to do, though? And

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

again, Representative, I'd like for you to assume that... I understand what you're trying to correct here, certainly, and I commend you for that. But many times these loans or gifts, they're among completely law-abiding, safe citizens. Do you really want 'transfer' to include those kinds of exchanges?"

- Schoenberg: "Well, Mr. Turner, who's going to... people don't go to... correct me if I'm wrong, but people go to gun shows and people go to parking lots in gun shows and transact out of the trunks of their cars. Not to do... in order to enact a genuine transaction where there's an exchange for... of cash for product, not for a loan or for a gift."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"
- Turner, J.: "Yes, I am actually finished, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Sponsor for finding the answers to my inquiries. I, obviously, am opposed to this particular measure. But you have been very kind in giving me time to explore all the questions that I had. And thank you, Representative Schoenberg."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg to close."

- Schoenberg: "This is a commonsense measure that's long overdue.

  We need to close the gun show loophole today for our families and for our communities. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2382."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2382, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Living Wage Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Soto."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2382 requires companies that contract with the state to pay their employees a living wage. Employees covered under the are companies that perform state contracts for services valued at a hundred thousand or more. orsubcontractors for services valued at \$25 thousand or more. A living wage means an hourly wage sufficient to provide a single wage earner with an income that is a hundred percent of poverty index. The living wage defined as mentioned would stand at \$8.20 an hour. And at a time when a well-connected... at a time when well-connected individuals are making a bundle of money off state contracts we need to stand up for the working-class families. They, ultimately, perform the labor on all projects. The City of Chicago and Cook County have already enacted a living-wage law. would urge my colleagues to permit other working-class families, around the state to the same benefit. your cooperation on this Bill, and am willing to answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2382. And on that question, Representative Cross is recognized."

Cross: "First of all, Mr. Speaker. In the event, this Bill gets the requisite number of votes, we request a verification."

Speaker Hannig: "You'll be given that opportunity, Representative Cross."

Cross: "And will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Cross: "Representative, I'm a little concerned about the criminal penalties in your Bill. Ιf I'm not mistaken, if an employer fails to follow this Bill he or she is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. It reads, 'An employer may not retaliate against an employee, solely, because the employee exercises the employees' rights, under this Act. who violates this Section, is guilty of a Class And I'm sure you know, that is a... misdemeanor.' punishable by up to a year in jail. Now, I understand, that there are disputes between employers and employees, and sometimes legitimately, sometimes not. Why do you desire to continue this... Or why do you desire to make an employer, potentially, serve a sentence of a year county jail?"

Soto: "It's only for retaliation for an employee who exercises his rights."

Cross: "Well, I think we have a... If I'm not mistaken, this is an area of the law, that I'm not all that conversant in, but I know we have a Department of Labor. I think we have departments at the federal, and both the state level. And there are disputes about employee and employer relationships, as a general rule, those are litigated, you in a civil courtroom, or in an administrative know, procedure. Do you realize, that we are, potentially, saying to employers in the State of Illinois, if this Bill passes, forget the civil aspect of doing something wrong, you're going to go to jail. And I mean, I don't still know, that's really where we want to go."

Soto: "That is a stiff penalty, and I'm willing to take it out of the Bill, on the Senate side."

Cross: "Well, you and I know... You know, as well as I do, that when something leaves this chamber, who knows what goes on

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

over in the Senate. If you're willing to take that out, I would encourage you to do it now; because with all due respect to the Senate, I'm not sure what is going to happen over there. I just, really, would caution you, that making employers, who have disputes about employees' rights, criminally liable is... for the violations in your Amendment, is really scary. And I can't believe, that we want to subject the men and women who own small businesses in this state, and big businesses to a year in jail."

Soto: "Are you willing to accept my word?"

Cross: "It's not a matter of accepting your word, it's a matter of what goes on over in the Senate. And there may be some other problems with this Bill, that we haven't even gotten to, and I know other people have their lights on, or I suspect they do. There are other ways to rectify this. One, is to take it out of record, as one Amendment. And as I said, there may be other problems, but why do we want to crimina... Why do we want to make criminals out of employers?"

Soto: "Okay. Time constraints of the House will not allow me to amend it at this time."

Cross: "Pardon me?"

Soto: "We don't have enough time left in the Session to amend it.

It has to be amended in the House side."

Cross: "Well, Representative, I would suggest to you, that the Chairperson of the Rules Committee is on your side of the aisle, the Speaker's on your side of the aisle, and if they want to get something out of here by the end of this week by doing an Amendment and running it through the Rules Committee, and kicking it back out on the floor, that's something that could happen within the hour, or even a little longer period of time, if they're really interested

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

in making this a better Bill."

Soto: "Okay. Representative, this is a good Bill, this is a labor Bill. It's good for hard-working families. I want to get this out of the House."

Cross: "Can you imagine, Representative, if all of a sudden, the owner of some small business in your district employed 25-30 people, and there was a mistake, or there was an issue that he or she wasn't aware of, and all of a sudden the State's Attorney of Cook County said, well let's charge that person with criminal violation, because House Bill 2382 passed, and with some language. And we're going to charge this person with a misdemeanor, and they're going to go to jail for a year. What do you think's going to happen to that business? It's going to go out of business, and those 25 or 30 people are going to be out of a job. That's not what any of us wants.

Soto: "Okay. You have to have clear evidence, that that's what's happening. And that's not what this Bill is about."

Cross: "I'm sure it's not, but nevertheless, there's very clear specific language in this Bill, that specifically says an employer can be held criminally liable. We don't see that often in employer/employee relationships. I just don't know why you have it in there. I've made my point. I'm sure other people want to talk. I apologize for a..."

Speaker Hannig: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Cross."

Cross: "No, I'm done."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she will yield."

Hoffman: "Representative, it's my understanding that the concerns with the Bill... It's your solemn commitment, and you're

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

giving your word, that you'll take care of what's wrong with the Bill in the Senate. Is that right?"

Soto: "Correct."

Hoffman: "And what exactly is that, that was brought up by Representative Cross?"

Soto: "That it makes retaliation against an employer a Class A misdemeanor."

Hoffman: "So essentially, what you're saying is you'll take out the criminal aspect of the Bill. Is that correct?"

Soto: "Yes. That's correct."

Hoffman: "The Bill then, as it ultimately would go to the Governor's desk if it was taken out, and passed through the Senate, and then we concurred. Could you just explain to the Body then what the Bill would do?"

Soto: "Okay. We'll take it out of the record."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We're going to take this Bill out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 644 for Representative Morrow."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 644, a Bill for an Act in relation to apprentice programs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 644... Just hold on a moment... creates the Apprentice Equity Act, provides that certain state contracts designated by the Capital Development Board and the Department of Transportation shall be subject to a plan under which goals for employment of minority and female apprentices shall be met, provides for administration of the plan and submission of reports concerning the plan. I'd be glad to answer any questions on House Bill 644."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 644. This Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. And on that question, Representative Black, is recognized."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to tell you, I had a thrilling five minutes stuck on the elevator out here. It's been a wonderful day for me, so I'm not even sure where we are. Oh, yes. Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Black: "Thank you. Representative, what if a contractor does not have an apprentice program?"

Morrow: "He's not covered in this Bill, Representative Black."

Black: "Not only is he not covered, he isn't going to be able to bid, right?"

Morrow: "This is only going to be on a few contracts, Representative Black."

Black: "On what contract?"

Morrow: "A few."

Black: "A few. Like a few where?"

Morrow: "Well, just dealing with the Capital Development Board and the Department of Transportation. We have millions of contracts, within State Government."

Black: "Okay. Let's say, that the Capital Development Board issues a contract for a new roof on a state office building in my district. Not that I have any, but that's another story. So, three roofing contractors bid on the job. One is a union roofing contractor, who does have an apprenticeable program, the other is a union contractor, who does not have any apprentices, and one is a nonunion contractor, who is not affiliated with any apprentice program, whatsoever. It's my understanding, if I read this correctly, that the nonunion contractor, who is not

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

affiliated with any apprenticeable program, would not even be allowed to bid. He would be disqualified. Am I right or wrong?"

Morrow: "That is correct."

Black: "Well, that's interesting. So, if you're not affiliated with an apprenticeable program you can't even bid on certain contracts to be administered by DOT, or the Capital Development Board. Correct?"

Morrow: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Again, a Bill, that I think would probably work very well in the Representative's area in Chicago where you have a higher-density population and a number of contractors. And I don't quarrel with what the Representative is trying to I wish we could find a way to open up state contracts far better than what we've been able to do in the past. But when you get downstate, and you have very few general contractors and things have changed so dramatically in the last 20 years, you may not have a union contractor within a may have a couple of general hundred miles. You contractors, who are not union, who are hanging on by doing other kinds of work, but they no longer have a need, or can afford to be in an apprenticeable program. And if this job is within a 25-mile radius of my district, then that contractor can't even bid. Again, I stand in opposition, simply because I don't think this Bill reflects and acknowledges the diversity of the State of Illinois. And I don't think we should be about telling certain contractors, you can't even bid. You don't have an apprenticeable program, so you can't even bid on a job. What I do think we should be about is encouraging more people to bid, and

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

then making sure that those contractors, who in fact, hire minority workers, hire women employees, whether they're apprenticeable through the union or another training school or not, we should be about broadening who does the work in this state. And then not trying to limit who can't even bid on a contract. I have no quarrel with what the Sponsor's trying to do. I just think there are parts of the state this won't work very well, and in fact, will deny opportunity to an awful lot of people who need the work."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think Representative Black, and he's a good friend of mine, has read the entire Bill. Representative Black, Representative Black, out of the 101 counties in the state, this Bill would only cover Cook, Peoria County, Sangamon, McLean, Rock Island, Madison, St. Clair, and Macon, and the collar counties, and of Cook. We put an Amendment Representative Black, that limited us to counties over 115 thousand in population. So, I don't know if that would change your vote on this issue, but we did try to address where there are areas in the state that do not have a large or diverse population as we do up in Cook County."

Black: "Representative, I just was handed the Amendment. And I appreciate you calling that to my attention. And I stand corrected. Thank you very much."

Morrow: "Also, Representative Black, Representative..."

Black: "And I'm going up and down a lot more then I was on that elevator, I'll tell you that."

Morrow: "Well, I'm concerned that you weren't as thoroughly briefed on my Bill, as you are on other Member's Bills, that you stand up to oppose..."

Black: "Yes, Sir."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Morrow: "So, we... If you look at Section (b), 'In selecting contracts for participation in the apprenticeship plan approved under this Act and in establishing the applicable goals for each selected contract, the Director of the Development Board and the Capital Secretary οf Transportation shall consider the following criteria: (1)The nature of a project to ensure, that it has the potential for providing effective training opportunities within the applicable apprenticeship program. (2) The duration of the contract, work schedules for project completion, and labor intensiveness of work areas. (3) The magnitude or dollar amount of the contract. (4) The scope of work to be performed. (5) The normal... The total normal building trade work force that the average low bidder could be expected to use.' And finally, number '(6) The ratio of apprentices to journeymen that would be feasible for the average low bidder to use as part of the contractor's work force during normal operations, including the consideration of the relevant provisions of any applicable collective bargaining agreement.'"

Black: "And I appreciate you calling that to my attention. I shouldn't come out here, after I've been stuck on the elevator. I don't think clearly. I panic when I get stuck on the elevator. Representative, let's continue down page 2 that you were just reading those six points. Section (c), 'the Director of the Capital Development Board, or the Secretary of the Department of Transportation shall establish goals for the number of minority and female apprentices.' Are those goals written in statute anywhere or will they fluctuate based on the contract?"

Morrow: "It would fluctuate based on the contracts and state appropriations, Representative."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: "Okay. And... That I would join you in. I've been on many a job site and I know you have. And I often don't like the lack of diversity I see in some apprenticeable programs. And I don't always like the lack of diversity I see in a journeyman who show up to work on some of these projects. That, I think, continues to be a problem, not only in your area, but throughout the state. And I am glad that you called those differences to my opinion (sic-attention). I apologize for not reading that Amendment. And obviously, it makes your Bill much more palatable."

Morrow: "So that mean, Representative Black, I've got your vote."

Black: "At this point I'd be afraid not to. I'd be afraid, you'd put me back in the elevator."

Speaker Hannig: "There being no one else seeking any recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3318, 3318."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3318 creates the Illinois Coordinating Committee on Transportation Act. This is Lieutenant Governor Wood's initiative. It came out of the Rural Affairs Council's recommendations."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jerry Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2435, as of the 4th, today, I've had the following notes applied to my Bill: notes requested for fiscal note, judicial note, debt impact note, and various others. I would move that those notes are not applicable to 2435 and wish that they be removed."

Speaker Hannig: "Let's get the Bill on the board. Representative Mitchell, what was that number?"

Mitchell, J.: "2435."

Speaker Hannig: "2435. And your Motion is, that...?"

Mitchell, J.: "The notes are not applicable and I would like them removed."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mitchell has moved that the...

Did you move on all the notes, Representative, or do...?"

Mitchell, J.: "I would like them all taken together..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Mitchell, J.: "...if that's the decision of the Chair. If not, we can take them one at a time."

Speaker Hannig: "Well. Representative Hoffman on that Motion."

Hoffman: "I would oppose that Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman, did you want to divide the question, or do you want to vote on all of them at once?"

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- Hoffman: "I think... Obviously, I think, that the question should be divisible."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, the Gentleman moves to divide the question. So...,"
- Mitchell, J.: "Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take them one at a time. The first note, the fiscal note has been requested and I would move that that note is not applicable and would like it removed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved that the fiscal note is inapplicable on this Bill. And on that question, Representative Hoffman is recognized."
- Hoffman: "Well, I think it's clear that we need to know any potential costs. I would say it's applicable."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Bill itself, the Bill has to do with food going to a free-food pantry from a food distributor. That same food is of a damaged carton or a damaged can, it would be destroyed. I can't see where there would be a cost to anyone. In fact, we've already had two notes that have been filed at the request of Representative Lang, a state mandates note, a correctional note. And both of those notes say that there is no cost, and no impact."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved that the fiscal note is not applicable. Those who agree with the Motion vote 'aye'; those in opposition vote 'no'. And voting is open. This requires a Majority Vote. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'yes', and 61 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. So, Representative..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I make the same request of the balanced budget note. I don't feel that that's

- 40th Legislative Day

  April 4, 2001

  applicable and I would like it removed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Gentleman's moved, that the balanced budget note is inapplicable. And on that question, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "I, once again, would oppose that Motion. Obviously, making sure that we have a balanced budget is extremely important. And I would ask that the Sponsor of the Bill please be refrained from yelling 'yes, yes, yes', whenever we're voting on these. Yeah, what it's doing is, it's confusing our side of the aisle. I think only people... You can only talk to people who are Republicans, and say..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, Representative Hoffman, those are my friends yelling that, not me. But I noticed you did not yell that, but that's okay."
- Hoffman: "Okay. Yes. We're yelling 'no', over on this side of the aisle."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Let's have a little order in the House. The Gentleman's moved, that the Motion is not applicable...

  Excuse me. Representative Mitchell, you made the Motion.

  Representative Hoffman spoke in opposition. The Chair now recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Chair, I cannot believe that we are playing this game because one powerful organization has come to somebody and said, we want to file a bunch of bogus notes on a Bill to give food to people in need. Is that what's it's come to? Is that what it's all about? One organization, who may have a concern about liability, wants to file a bunch of bogus notes in a Representative's name and then you stand up and defend it on a Bill that makes food available for the poor and the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

hungry? You want to politicize the issue? Your side of the aisle's usually fighting these battles. Now, all of a sudden, you fight us, on a Bill to give food to hungry people. Well, if you wanta sell out to that group, based on some bogus claim of liability go ahead and then answer to your own damn conscience about, no, I'm going to defend the right of a group to file bogus notes on a Bill to give food to the hungry. I hope to hell you can look in the mirror, tomorrow."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Motion, Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just echo what Representative Black has. This is a very simple Bill and it was brought to me by Crest Foods, out of my district, saying that they would love to give the food but they don't feel that they can do it because they don't have the proper exemption so that they can do this. So, the food is being thrown away, rather than being given to food pantries. Now, the notes have been filed. I worked with one Representative, and explained to them. And I worked with a group that was unhappy about this. I offered them the opportunity to give me an Amendment. They said, no. I went back to that Representative, he said, 'fine, I'll take the notes off'. And then lo and behold, today I find five more notes filed at a time when there's really not physical time for the departments to comply with that request. simply a political ploy not to have the Bill heard, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved that the balanced budget note is inapplicable. All those in favor of the Motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires a Majority Vote. Have all voted who wish?

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. The Motion prevails. And the balanced budget note request is ruled inapplicable."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the indulgence of Representative Hoffman, I would in the interest of time, take the next three notes together, if he doesn't mind. They are a home rule note, a state debt impact note, which has pretty much been answered already, and a... boy... Jay, these are really hard to read. We've done the fiscal note, right?"
- Speaker Hannig: "The fiscal note failed. The balanced budget note prevailed."
- Mitchell, J.: "The judicial note is the third one."
- Speaker Hannig: "And what's the third one, judicial?"
- Mitchell, J.: "All the rest of them, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, Representative Hoffman is recognized."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask, that... I would withdraw the home rule note, and the..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Judicial note."
- Hoffman: "But I would like to keep the judicial note. I withdraw the other two."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has removed his request for a home rule note. And did you say, state impact note? And you leave your request for a judicial note?"
- Hoffman: "I believe it's, obviously, applicable. The judicial note is, obviously, applicable when we're talking about civil liability."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, if we could have a Motion from someone that voted 'no' or in the negative on the first note. And we could revote that one, I would certainly give

- 40th Legislative Day

  up on my note request for the judicial note and let that stand."
- Speaker Hannig: "Well, Representative, on this Motion you can go around the floor and talk to the Members, get a Roll Call.

  That's your right. But right now, the question is on the judicial note. You have made a Motion that's inapplicable.

  Representative Hoffman is opposed to that. Representative Mulligan is recognized."
- Mulligan: "Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair. Since when do we put this to a vote of the Body, and not a question of the Chair, the parliamentarian?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the question is, he's making a Motion, that the note is not applicable. We, in the Body, have the right to make a ruling that it's not applicable."
- Mulligan: "In the past, I've thought we've always... we've asked the Chair on this, too and I don't understand why we're subjecting the Body to a vote. But actually, I think it's a pretty good vote, because as Representative Black stated before I think it's real simple."
- Speaker Hannig: "It's a Motion, that something... that a note is not applicable. And on the Motion, Representative Black is recognized."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, the note process, historically, has been used by both sides of the aisle to slow down a Bill until staff can analyze the Bill. Now, I can look over there and I can see 12 people that have come to me in the last three weeks and asked me, as Floor Leader, they're filed in my name. I don't file them. Twelve of you, more than that, but I can see 12 of you have come to me, and asked me to withdraw notes, on Bills. Have I ever refused you? Once staff has analyzed the Bill, and once we've had time to look at it, I have never turned any of you down on

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

withdrawing a note on a Bill, unless it was a Leadership position and then I told you, I can't do it. I can't do And this is what we get. You know, if this were a major Bill of major political or philosophical issues, would have no quarrel with what the Representative is trying to do. If this were a major political battle or philosophical battle, that's what the note process is for. But under the deadline that we're operating under, a Friday, under the de facto rule of limiting us to five Bills, I cannot understand how any of you, in good conscience, would hide behind the note process to deny a person's ability to vote on a Bill that simply would make food available to the hungry. Now, if you want to go back home and explain that vote to people who are poor, people who are hungry, you do that. You tell 'em, well, I would have voted for it, but see there was a note request and those dirty Republicans asked that the note be ruled I've taken dozens of note requests off of inapplicable. Bills in the last three weeks, once staff got caught up. And this is the way we're treated. And it isn't even an issue of philosophy. It is not an issue of what the Bill does, it's an issue that one group thinks might end up changing some rule of liability. That's wrong, That is absolutely wrong. And when this Body gets to that point, and hides behind a parliamentary rule to deny the majority in this... Do you think this Bill will fail? Make day. Call this Bill and let's see if it fails. don't hide behind bogus note requests to deny poor people the right to access food that otherwise, under the current legal climate in Illinois, is thrown away. It's thrown away and destroyed. What a waste. What a sham. Shame on you. Shame on all of you to hide behind this request.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Shame on you."

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

Hoffman: "Well, just briefly. I would just like to respond. First of all, it's my understanding, although I don't believe, or I may have been in the Judiciary Committee when this Bill was heard. It came through Judiciary Committee. And I recall at that time, there was an agreement to attempt to work this Bill out on Second Reading. As of this time it hasn't happened. All we're asking is the notes be filed. Once the notes are filed, just like any other Bill, we'll then hear the Bill. I would assume that the notes then will be filed, and we'll be able to hear the Bill before the end of this week. And that is contrary to the agreement that they would try to work it out on Second Reading. Okay? Contrary to that agreement. And I respect this Sponsor. And I don't want to unduly burden him. However, I think it's reasonable for our side of the aisle to ask that we know if there's going to be a fiscal impact, or a judicial impact. And I persist in my Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved, Representative Mitchell, that the judicial note is inapplicable. We've had some debate. Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I understand, exactly, what the Representative is saying. And I made the agreement to meet with the group that was opposed to this Bill. And I did so. I met with their group and I told them, point-blank, give me an Amendment to tighten this anyway you want. I'll be more than happy to embrace that and to work with you. My answer from that group was we feel that everything in this Bill is already covered except for damaged or bent boxes, therefore, we don't want to mess

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

with it. Well, Jay, I don't know how I'm supposed to work with a group that won't even come and talk to me or give me anything. I made that promise to Representative Lang and I went to Representative Lang and I said, Lou, I've done what I can and he says, I understand. Now, they may have darn good arguments to why they're opposed to this, won't come and talk to me, they won't give me that. that point, on Second Reading, I said I have no choice but to move the Bill, because it's been requested from Crest Foods in my district and from four food pantries in my district that really need the food. I mean, it's that simple a Bill. Now, I don't... Working it out of Second Reading doesn't mean you give up on the Bill when the answer is 'no'. I was willing to change the Bill, So, Mr. Speaker, I think didn't get that opportunity. that's what working it out on Second Reading is. group can just say we don't like your Bill, so don't move it. If that's the answer, then there's a lot. of legislation we would never move ahead. T think negotiations is a give and take process, but I never any give or take. I just got flat 'no'. So, Mr. Speaker, I think I did try to work out at Second before I moved I certainly would not have moved it to Third, or even tried to move it to Third, until that was done. These notes, and think the Representative knows, that the answer to these notes is going to be that they have no impact whatsoever on this issue. But if we have to play that game, I guess we have to play that game. But that's, quite frankly, what it And I'm real disappointed in the process, because there's an awful lot of people that could be helped, that won't be helped. I still wish that those notes be removed because they are inapplicable. Thank you, Sir."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved, that the judicial note is not applicable. All those in favor of his Motion vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', and 49 voting 'no'. And the Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2284."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2284, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jones."
- Jones, S.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 2284, creates the Epilepsy Disease Assistance Act in order to assist the hundred and twenty-five thousand Illinois citizens affected with this disease. I ask for your favorable vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2284. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 135, Representative Schoenberg's."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 135, a Bill for an Act regarding highways. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Actually, Mr. Speaker. Could you take this out of the record, momentarily?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 778."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 778, a Bill for an Act relating to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

procurement. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 778 amends the Illinois Procurement Code to establish and codify requirements for construction contracts on state public works projects. Specifically, House 778 requires compliance with all laws regulating business in Illinois, federal equal opportunity... Equal Employment Opportunity regulation compliance, a valid FEIN or Social Security number, prevailing wage compliance, and the issue of note here is the United States Department of Labor, the USDL Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training Approved Apprenticeship Program. It basically puts in one location the various requirements that construction contracts must already meet. So, I'm sure there'll be some questions on this. I'd be happy to answer them if I can. I'm looking for a favorable vote."

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

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point, Representative."

Black: "Yes. Perhaps, the parliamentarian can refresh my memory, and it certainly could be faulty, but I was under the impression that we were told earlier in the Session that no Procurement Code Bills would be called. I know that one Bill was taken out of the record and she changed the underlying Bill so that it wasn't in the Procurement Code. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I thought Speaker Madigan said early in the Session, that no procurement Bills would be called, unless through his... I don't want to say through his personal review, technical review staff, or whatever, but that was certainly my impression."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, I thought we had already passed, at least one procurement change. But I could be wrong, too."

Black: "The only one I remember and I'll use her name, Representative Hamos had one. And she took it out of the record, then changed it and we voted on it later. I mean, my memory isn't as good as it used to be but I swear to you I thought that that was the agreement. If I'm wrong, it would not be the first time and I assure you, it won't be the last."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I've been informed by one of the Members, that we made this argument when I wasn't here Friday, on the same issue, but the Representative from your side of the aisle did move a procurement Bill. So obviously, since it's already been done, I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1457 for Representative Hoeft."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act relating to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1457 is a Bill that is targeted towards finding a way around the year-round testing, and the whole question of student testing in the State of Illinois. We have created a council, a committee, of 16

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

individuals. And these individuals will take the ideas that we have generated in this Bill, and over a 15-month period come up with a plan for state testing that they will then bring back to the General Assembly for our implementation. It is the combined work of the IEA, IFT, Business Roundtable, State Board of Education, and LUDA. We have all come to agreement on this Bill, and it's sort of our next step forward in trying to find some meaning in the testing of the public school students of this state."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman's moved for passage of House Bill 1457. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye';...Excuse me. Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Inquiry of the Clerk."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes. State your inquiry."

Hoffman: "What Amendments are on this Bill?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

Hoffman: "A question of the Sponsor."

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

Hoffman: "Representative, our staff has told us that, potentially, there was supposed to be a second Amendment to the Bill. Is that correct?"

Hoeft: "There was a second Amendment that was floating around for the alliance and I withdrew it, because of the time constraints at this point. We will deal with that when it gets to the Senate."

Hoffman: "That's fine. That's your prerogative. We just wanted to clear it up. Okay. Thank you."

Hoeft: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 135."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 135, a Bill for an Act regarding highways. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In September of 1999, Governor Ryan gave a long overdue endorsement of meaningful reform at the Illinois Toll Highway Authority. Just recently the unveiled the proposal which while I believe he deserves credit for tackling a difficult issue that many of... that his predecessors skirted and while his proposal does provide some positive elements in the way of addressing congestion on the 274 miles of the toll highway system, nonetheless, I believe that House Bill 135 is a superior proposal in that it provides immediate accountability, greater accountability on this agency's spending practices and policies. Because despite incremental efforts in recent years to bring about greater accountability through requiring additional reporting to the General Assembly of data of information that's already available through toll way board meetings and some of those measures I've also sponsored in cooperation with the toll way authority, nonetheless, this agency still has a significant lack of accountability. If... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Toll Way Authority were a publicly held cooperation the shareholders and the board would be looking at a number of serious belt-tightening measures

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

that they would be talking about before they even considered or discussed increasing toll prices. This does not increase tolls. This very briefly provides immediate and direct legislative oversight of the Toll Highway Authority's spending practices and policies, creates a continuing appropriation to insure that the \$818 million outstanding toll way debt will be paid in a timely manner. It... And those of you who are from downstate will pay particular attention to this, unlike the Governor's proposal, this plan strengthens the existing bonds and makes them worth more by double-barreling them or pledging a second revenue source behind them in the way of General Revenue Funds as an insurance policy in the unlikely event that toll revenues would be insufficient to cover these bonds. To insure that there'd be sufficient means of covering these bonds, the debt to revenue ratio or that cushion that guarantees that there are sufficient funds would be written into law at a 40% level. So, for every dollar in toll way bonds the Authority would issue, a dollar forty would be required of revenues. And finally, this Bill would provide that it would require Three-fifths Super Majority Vote of the General Assembly to approve any toll increase. This is the most fiscally conservative and immediate accountability of any reform currently before the Legislature. I urge your support. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

Black: "Have we gone back to Special Orders of Call?"

Speaker Hannig: "No, Representative."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: "Okay. I thought we were on the Order of Schoenberg here for awhile."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, Representative, we're trying to assist all Members to get their five Bills called."

Black: "As well you should. As well, you should. And I appreciate the fact you're doing that. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Black: "Representative, does this Bill address the recent Illinois Supreme Court case that says that the toll highway, I think it's <u>Graham v. the Toll Highway Authority</u>, that the Authority does not have to clear spending decisions with the General Assembly?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black, if you're referring to the Supreme Court decision that overturned an earlier Cook County Circuit Court decision by Judge Stephen Schiller that the Authority is a creation of the General Assembly and that it is our discretion, not the discretion of the courts, as to whether a require an appropriation of its budget or not, yes, that's the case."

Black: "The answer was so long I forgot the question. In other words, this Bill will not have a problem with the Supreme Court decision of <u>Graham v. the Toll Highway?</u>"

Schoenberg: "Correct."

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "We're doing what the courts tell us is our job, not their job."

Black: "Well, I thought the decision said clearly that the Toll
Highway Authority does not have to clear spending decisions
with the Illinois General Assembly. Right?"

Schoenberg: "The decision states that it was not up to the courts... that it was not within the purview of the courts

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

to make that decision, but rather since the authority was created by the General Assembly, that it's up to the General Assembly to define its responsibilities and its powers. In this case, making them more accountable to us."

Black: "Okay. Representative, if you bring the budget to the...

And I think the board is misleading. The toll highway...

you're not making this a continuing appropriation. In

fact, you are making their budget contingent upon action of
the General Assembly, correct?"

Schoenberg: "Yes..."

Black: "A continuing appropriation means it just rolls over every year."

Schoenberg: "However, Mr. Black, for the purposes of repayment of debt service and other bond obligations in this case, \$818 million in outstanding toll way debt, the funds should be... The funds shall be considered continuing appropriations."

Black: "Well, now that's to the heart of the issue. Are you telling me that the State General Revenue Fund is going to assume responsibility for the outstanding bonds?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black, I'm telling you that like we al... just as we already with revenue bonds, we double-barrel these bonds. And I know as... since you have participated in the last debate on one of my Bills, I know that you're a big proponent of double-barreling anything and everything that... The General Revenue Funds are pledged, the state's full faith and credit are pledged as a backup insurance policy in the unlikely event that there would be insufficient toll revenues to cover it. So, it's not the primary source of paying off the bonds, it's an insurance policy. Think of it as the free safety before the goal line for the purposes of putting Wall Street at ease."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: "Representative, what I want you to do is to focus very carefully on this question. The current bonded indebtedness of the toll way is in no way a debt that the Illinois General Revenue Fund is responsible for, yes or no?"

Schoenberg: "Correct."

Black: "Under your Bill, if I understand it, the current indebtedness may become an obligation of the Illinois General Revenue Fund, right or wrong?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Black, I believe you're incorrect because the Toll Highway Authority has made that argument in their fiscal notes in saying that we would be assuming that indebtedness. However, the fis... the analysis provided by the Economic and Fiscal Commission points out that since this is a double barreling of these existing bonds that are covered by toll revenues, that we are actually not increasing the state's indebtedness. And in fact, parenthetically, we're increasing the value of the bonds both to bondholders and to taxpayers."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "The Gentleman is a very intelligent fellow. And when he can't answer a question that I ask, yes or no, right or wrong, and gives me some double-barreled answer that goes on for about 90 seconds, my antenna goes up. I'm no bond council expert, but if the bo... if the highway aut... if the Toll Highway Authority budget becomes subjected to the General Assembly's oversight or budgetary process and we fail to appropriate what is necessary, the bond council or the bonds may be at risk. And bond council will probably say, there'll be no more bonds issued because we are not gonna subject these bonds to the whim of the General

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Assembly. I'm not saying that's necessarily a bad idea, but I want a lot more information before I sign off on any plan to make the General Revenue Fund or..."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Black, would you bring remarks to a close, please?"

Black: "I want a lot more information before I will vote for this Bill that may make the General Revenue Fund responsible for all or part of the in bonded indebtedness of the Toll Highway Authority. And I certainly want more information before I vote for this to know if the overtaxed Road Fund would be tapped to pay some or all of these bonds or some or all of the maintenance responsibility of the toll road. That's a legitimate question, a very legitimate concern by people who are not served by the toll road. My fear is that if you bring the budget authority to the General Assembly and you destroy their bond rating, then somebody is responsible for the repayment of the bonds. And all I want to know before I vote 'yes' on this Bill, who is the responsible party? Because if part or a portion of it is the Illinois Road Fund or the Illinois General Revenue Fund, I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event this Bill gets the requisite number of votes, I request a verification. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cross: "Representative, if I'm not mistaken, you introduced this Bill and had a vote on it a couple years ago, at which time this Bill failed. Was it the same Bill as it was in the last time you introduced it or have there been any changes?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, your mistaking this for another toll way

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill. This Bill, which was 34... House Bill 3423 approx... it was voted on March 2, 2000, received 83 votes... 83 'yes', 33 'no', 0 voting 'present'. So, you're thinking about another Bill."

Cross: "I'm talking about House Bill 23..."

Schoenberg: "This Bill passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support..."

Cross: "House Bill 2..."

Schoenberg: "...and support. I should add, Mr. Black tried to raise the fear that motor fuel taxes would be jeopardized.

Downstate lawmakers, in particular, should be very comfortable voting for this Bill because it does not touch motor fuel taxes as either a primary or secondary source of funds to pay for the toll way debt."

Cross: "Well, Representative, I'm talking about House Bill 2321 in the 90th General Assembly so... which did fail. And I apologize if there was some confusion. But let me ask ya... Let's cut to the chase on your Bill. And I think people in this chamber right now ought to pay attention to this. You are now, under your Bill, saying that the General Assembly has the obligation to increase tolls that will take it away from the Toll Authority and then it's going to be up the Members of this chamber. Is that correct?"

Schoenberg: "This Bill... If this Bill were to become law, this

Bill would say that it would require a Three-fifths Super

Majority Vote of the General Assembly before... to

authorize any toll increase."

Cross: "All right. Now, do you really think that Members of this General Assembly want the responsibility of another increase, whether it's a toll, whether it's a tax, whether it's a fee? The reality of this place is I suspect that

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Members don't. We have a Toll Way Authority that's appointed by the Governor, why do we need to shift that burden from the Toll Authority over to Members of this Body? And remember, Representative, if we're gonna be responsible, and I think you're a responsible Legislator, there are times when perhaps the tolls need to be increased. And you are now putting up a wall that's gonna be almost impossible to climb. Is that your intention?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, you and the prior speaker have made a number of gross mischaracterizations in order..."

Cross: "I'm not mischaracterizing anything, Representative, I'm reading from the Bill."

Schoenberg: "Mr.... Excuse me, Sir. Let me answer your question.

You want an answer?"

Cross: "No, you're answering Representative Black's questions like you did the first time I asked a question."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, you are trying to raise fears that do not exist. I've worked extensively with bond attorneys and with investment bankers to insure that not only would the bonds not be jeopardized, but the value would actually increase. And as far as what responsibility... who assumes what responsibility, Mr. Cross, this is an issue of accountability. And if you want to do the Toll Way Authority's bidding and defend their spending practices and policies, that's your prerogative, Sir."

Cross: "Jeff, don't put words in my mouth. Now, if you want to answer a question, answer it and don't go off on your editorial comments."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, I'm just telling you..."

Cross: "The reality of this Bill is..."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, I'm telling you..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Let's have a little order in the chamber.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Please, have a little order and decorum, both sides."

Cross: "Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Calm down."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, if you're gonna bait me, I'm telling you that..."

Cross: "That's the problem, you like to tell us what we're gonna do."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Cross, this Bill calls for more accountability for this agency. If you don't want it, that's your choice."

Cross: "Is it true, Representative, that the Members of this Body will have to make a vote 'yes' or 'no' whether to raise tolls? Yes or no, that's all I'm looking for, is a yes or no."

Schoenberg: "Members of this Body would have to authorize it by Three-fifths."

Cross: "So, they'd have to vote on a toll increase, correct?"

Schoenberg: "They have the option not to vote for it."

Cross: "Well, thank you. I have no other questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is removed from Short Debate and is on the Order of Standard Debate. Representative Black, you've spoke in debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor of the Bill mentioned my name in debate not once, but twice.

Let me just respond."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

Black: "I'll try to lower the tone. I'm not accusing... I didn't accuse the Sponsor of anything. I didn't say that if 'a' was 'a', 'b' would be 'b'. All I said was, and I stand behind that, before I vote for this Bill, I want a lot more information about how the bonds will work if we become the party to appropriate the money. I know a little bit about

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

bond council. They're not going to rate those bonds subject to the whim of the General Assembly. I didn't accuse him of anything, I didn't say anything would happen. I just simply said, this Bill while it is as he portrays it, an accountability issue, there are side issues that are very important to many people in this chamber. side issues; who may be responsible for the cost of the bonds, if it's the General Revenue Fund or if perhaps, I didn't say it would raid the Road Fund. I said until I know a lot more about it, I don't want to get in that position where I'm forced to defend an action that may happen. I'm not... You know, I don't try to put words in his mouth. I don't like it when he tries to put words in my mouth."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I had no intention of speaking, but I will tell you that it is our responsibility, when asked a question, to answer the question. And it is not something that is improper is not to improper to ask a question. What is answer the question properly and to sidestep it. question was asked, very clearly, that if the General Assembly passes this legislation will we then also have to pass the toll increases? My understanding from discussion is that is true. And because of that many of us do not like to vote for increases. It would make it very difficult. I 'm still struggling to decide how to vote on this, but I listened to the debate and I would hope that the people doing the debating will at least answer questions straightforward. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Johnson."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Johnson: "Representative Schoenberg, the question that I have...

And I have traditionally supported this legislation or this type of legislation and have been pretty consistent about more accountability in terms of the toll road. And ultimately, I'm sure we'd like to all see it disappear, if we can. However, I believe that, and I guess I need you to respond to this, is that the Governor, bless his heart, has at least put forth a timetable and a comprehensive plan that, quite honestly, we have not even begun to debate in here. Now, it seems to me that your legislation, were we to move ahead with this particular piece of legislation, in effect, kills the Governor's plan at least as initially outlined before we even have a chance to get into it. Would that be a fair characterization?"

Schoenberg: "Mr. Johnson, first of all, I appreciate the support that you've given in the past to making the Authority more accountable. It would be my hope that a full and fair debate would be given to all proposals to make this agency more accountable. One of the major contrasts of this Bill versus the proposal that's currently pending is that the accountability would happen immediately. In my view, should have happened yesterday, but the Authority has fought us in the courts and in this building, at the courts and at the Capitol against just that. We simply can't afford to maintain the status quo. I would hope that the Governor's proposal would also have a full and fair hearing and Members could decide whether or not they wanted to increase, for example, the outstanding bond indebtedness from 818 million, which would remain under my plan, to over \$2 billion, which it would be under the Governor's more

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

sweeping proposal. I would like to think that people would judge the Governor's plan on its own merits. I have... find this to be a preferable alternative."

Johnson: "Well, Jeff, I guess what concerns me here is that, obviously, we finally have a Governor who is coming to grips with this overall problem that we've articulated in here for years. And that has not even hit our committees yet. Now, it just seems to me that wouldn't you be more prudent to turn around and let's see how those negotiations go, we have two months here. And that I'm with you, I believe that accountability needs to get built into this immediately. But, also in terms of this comprehensive plan. And I would only ask that we hold off, in terms of this particular Bill, until we... Let's deal with this whole thing in this Session in a comprehensive way. that's just my suggestion. And in the meantime, I'm gonna have to vote 'present', if you're gonna persist on this now."

Speaker Hannig: "So, we've now had one in favor, four in opposition. Representative Novak, do you rise in favor or in opposition?"

Novak: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it all depends how Mr. Schoenberg answers the question. I guess that's the best way I can put it."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman will yield."

Novak: "Mr. Schoenberg... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "All right. Jeff, my friend from Danville brought up a good question. The present bonded indebtedness of the Toll Way Authority, assuming this Act... this legislation would become law, would the present bonded indebtedness of the Toll Way Authority be subject to the General Revenue Fund

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

for retirement of principal and interest? Straight answer, yes or no."

Schoenberg: "Primarily, no. Secondarily, yes."

Novak: "Well, what does that mean?"

Schoenberg: "Well, I will try to keep this answer shorter, I tried to give a more detailed answer earlier, but..."

Novak: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "To avoid subsequent questions. But, what this does is back up, provide... for every dollar that the Toll Way Authority bonds out currently in the bond covenants and there's nothing in the statute, the bond covenants call for the Authority to have a dollar thirty revenues guaranteed for every dollar of that 818 million they've bonded out. That's a very conservative assumption. conservative than any of the other public debt that we have in this state. What this Bill would do would say... it would establish a continuing appropriation so that the bonds would not be jeopardized by any whim of the Legislature in holding up the budget or anything like that, that it would be a continuing appropriation where the toll revenues would pass through to ensure that the bonds were being paid off in a timely fashion, to strengthen the value of the bonds. I don't want to jeopardize the value of the bonds, I want to make them stronger. Making them stronger helps the taxpayers, making them stronger helps the toll payers... the bondholders. So, it's a secondary insurance policy in the unlikely event that there aren't the funds to do it."

Novak: "Okay. When you say..."

Schoenberg: "Like you've got to jump through a lot... you've got
to pass a lot of obstacles to reach that very distant
point."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Novak: "Okay. Just let me follow up on that. So, answer this.

Is the... Would this be similar to what you indicate as a secondary segment of this answer to my question? Would the full faith and credit of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois be behind these bonds then, under this Act?"

Schoenberg: "They would. And that's why their value would appreciate."

Novak: "Okay. I'm not arguing with that. But, what I'm trying to say, the taxpayers from all over the State of Illinois would assume the liability for these bonds, people that live outside of the realm of the toll way system would assume the liability to pay off the bonds?"

Schoenberg: "The liability... This keeps the Authority in business. The liability would be on the Authority's back. This is a way to increase the value... This is no different than what we do with revenue bonds, that we pledge a second source of revenue to provide additional insurance which, in turn, makes the bond rating higher and, in turn, makes it a better investment and more fiscally prudent. So, if you're asking if the taxpayers of the entire state would be on the hook for this, the answer's 'no'."

Novak: "Well..."

Schoenberg: "Because the toll revenues are... go through an continuing appropriation to cover it. And this is the identical mechanism which 80... For this Bill, this is the identical thing that everybody supported last year."

Novak: "Okay. But there isn't..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg."

Novak: "But there isn't..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Schoenberg, could you speak into your microphone, it's hard to hear it on this side of the chamber?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Schoenberg: "Sure."

Novak: "But there isn't... Let me ask you... All right, let me just ask one more question. Under the scenario of this Bill, if it would become law, would there ever be a possibility of a General Revenue Fund appropriation to retire principal and interest in these bonds that were incurred under the Toll Way Authority's auspices?"

Schoenberg: "The only way that would happen would be... is if the 40% margin... a cushion which is built into financing the bonds, would be exhausted. So, these bonds would be the best investment of any bonds issued in Illinois by any agency because it has the largest cushion as a backup. In that very remote case, only then the full faith and credit would be on the line."

Novak: "Okay, Jeff, how does..."

Schoenberg: "But that's a very remote scenario."

Novak: "How does this differ to the Governor's plan?"

Schoenberg: "Very briefly, the way this.. the key differences with the Governor's plan... And again, I commend the Governor for tackling an issue that some of his predecessors chose not to address. The Governor's plan phases in accountability by the Legislature for its annual budget several years out. This would provide immediate accountability and if... which..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Novak, would you like to bring your remarks to a close?"

Novak: "Mr. Speaker, I asked Mr. Schoenberg a question and he's attempting to respond and complete the answer."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah."

Novak: "So, I'm finished with my questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative."

Novak: "I just wanted to hear..."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hannig: "...we want to put you down as a 'no' or a 'yes',

Representative Novak. Okay. Representative Hassert."

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

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

- Hassert: "Jeff, could you just explain one thing to me? I've listened to this debate. Could you tell me that the General Assembly is responsible, by Three-fifths of a vote, to raise the tolls?"
- Schoenberg: "The General Assembly would... under this Bill, would be ab... by Three-fifths Super Majority, would decide whether or not a toll increase was warranted."
- Hassert: "Could you tell me what happens with the system under currently with the new report that was just issued by Toll Way Authority actually requiring a total rebuilding of the system here within the next 10 to 15 years, what happens if the system starts deteriorating and we, as the General Assembly, won't vote for a toll increase to repair it, where does the revenue comes to repair the roads and keep it into a condition that's suitable to drive on?"
- Schoenberg: "Well, Mr. Hassert, I would agree with you that we need to ensure that the resources are there in order to...

  Pardon me, in order to rebuild... in order to maintain the existing roads and rebuild portions of the existing system.

  What I have to tell you is that, compared to other... I believe the resources are there in cash and investments that the Authority currently has in that cushion... 30% cushion that's built in to provide a soft landing for its bonds... through the administer... by imposing a number of cost-saving measures like reducing their administrative line. A study was released this week that found that the Authority spends 55% more on administration and 33% less on maintenance than its average counterpart from 1995 through

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

1999."

Hassert: "Jeff."

Schoenberg: "In examining 32..."

Hassert: "Jeff, I understand. I understand you're..."

Schoenberg: "So, you're asking me where the money would come from?"

Hassert: "No, I understand what you're upset with the Toll Way Authority. This has been your issue for a long time. we have a major rebuilding program that's going to be taking place on a toll way system. We'll never be able to add any additional lanes, any extensions, 'cause this Body's never, ever going to support a toll increase. what we'll have, our existing toll way systems will probably deteriorate to a point where it's going to be unbearable and you're gonna ask the General Assembly to be responsible now with everybody, throughout the State of Illinois, to support a tax increase which you know won't happen. This is a ill-thought out Bill to bring that responsibility back to the General Assembly. That's just my opinion, but we do need the toll system in place to be a viable source of regional transportation. I mean, you can have all your disagreement about what the toll way should or should not done in the past, but we should go forward. And I think this is a bad Bill. It's gonna put us in jeopardy in the future, something that we just won't want to do, and we will definitely be revisiting this issue. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We have one more Representative looking for some recognition and then we're gonna close. So, Representative Mathias is recognized and then Representative Schoenberg will close. Representative Mathias."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Mathias: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Mathias: "I just urge all of my colleagues here that have proposed toll way extensions in their district, whether it's the north extension of 355, the south extension, some of the extensions that are proposed around the airport, to vote against this Bill. While I... And I've told the Sponsor this, I'm certainly in favor of portions of his Bill dealing with oversight, because there should be oversight of the Toll Way Authority. However, once we put limits in there for the Three-fifths Majority needed to build... to raise tolls, we've, in effect, killed any future expansion... Not only have we killed any future expansion to the Toll Way Authority, we've also killed any future repairs that are necessary to the toll way... to the existing system. Because as the reports show and the Governor's report that just came out showed, we do need a toll way... a toll hike in order to even make necessary repairs. So, I urge everyone to vote against this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "I've been advised by the parliamentarian that because this Bill increases state indebtedness or potentially does, that it will require 71 votes.

Representative Schoenberg to close."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an opportunity to make the Toll Highway Authority more directly accountable for its spending practices and policies. It provides greater protection for the existing financing for the system. It is the one opportunity we have to insure that we're squeezing the absolute most out of our taxpayer dollars and to make this agency, finally, more accountable to the people we work for. I urge an

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

'aye' vote."

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

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This requires a Three-fifths vote.

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there ae 63 voting 'yes', and 46 voting 'no'. Representative Schoenberg, do you request Postponed?

Pardon me, yes?"

Schoenberg: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3024."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3024, a Bill for an Act to create the Land Banking Beneficial Disclosure Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3024 would require before any property can be purchased for a new airport or correctional facility, that beneficiaries of any land trusts would have to be disclosed at the time that agreement is entered into. We feel it's in the... best interests to develop confidence in the procurement of state property used for these public functions. There's an Amendment to the Bill, at the request of Mr. Daniels. I am not sure if Mr. Black would like to address that issue. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

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

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I won't ask many questions. Obviously, you're losing your voice, which is, may I say, is the best news I've had all day. No, actually, I... in a lighthearted vein, does this apply to anybody who's up gobbling up land in Gary, Indiana, for the expansion of the Gary-Chicago International? I want to know who's buying up that land."

Granberg: "As much as we'd like to do that, Representative, we are limited to applying our law to other states."

Black: "It's limited to Illinois?"

Granberg: "Yes, it is."

Black: "I'm telling you, there are people running over to Gary, as we speak, buying up thousands of acres. I'm concerned about it, but we can't do anything about Indiana, right?"

Granberg: "Well, after reapportionment, you and I might be in Indiana."

Black: "More truth to that, than either one of us would like to admit. I just simply rise to support your Bill. I think you've done an excellent job of working it out. We certainly appreciate the courtesy extended to Leader Daniels and I don't know why anybody would be opposed to knowing what is going on if somebody is buying up thousands of acres of land that they may then turn around and sell to the taxpayers of Illinois. I think everybody should have a right to know that. I commend you on your effort."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Black."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 3024. And I'm glad to hear that my good friend, on the other side of the aisle, Representative Black, is in favor. Because

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representative Black, since you're talking in favor of the Bill, I won't have to show you the Peotone map. This is the map that lists all the land parcels out at Peotone. And over 70 parcels of land in Peotone are in blind trusts. This is why this Bill is important. Any of you want to come to my office and see the map? Some of the parcels aren't in trusts. You'll see the names that own the land out at the map. And I'm not going to mention some of the names that are on this map, because they don't need to be known right now. But I rise in strong support of House Bill 3024. This Bill is needed because remember last week many of you voted to pass House Bill 418, which also dealt with land banking and land purchases. So, I rise in very strong support of House Bill 3024."

Speaker Madigan: "Lyons."

- Lyons, J.: "Speaker? Mr. Morrow, I have a question. Do you have any other maps, at your office, that we might be interested in looking at?"
- Morrow: "Well, I've tried to get our Leader to take us into the war room, because really, the most important map is the reapportionment map."
- Lyons, J.: "If they do well on this map, they won't have to....."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg to close."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate your favorable support. We need to instill public confidence in our procurement of properties for these large, large projects. 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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention, please. The Republicans are going to go to a caucus, where they estimate that they'll be gone for about one hour. That means they'll be returning neighborhood of 5:45 or 6:00. We are estimating that we have about two hours of work to do on the floor, after the Republicans return at 6:00. And there will be committees after we finish with the floor work. Now, these are all estimates. So, in terms of your dinner plans, that's the best estimate we can give you, right now. We'll be back on the floor, 5:45, 6:00, and we're estimating about two hours of floor work, and then they'll be committees after we finish the floor work. So, the Chair recognizes Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would request an immediate caucus for approximately an hour."

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall stand in recess until, approximately, 5:48."

Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of House Bills to be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 203, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to create the Home Construction and Repair Fraud Act. House Bill 204, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Promotion Act. House Bill 237, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. House Bill 252, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Use Tax Act and the Retailers' Occupation Tax

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 263, offered by Representative Madigan, a for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Act. House Bill 273, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act that creates the Automatic Sprinkler Contractors Act. House Bill 330, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 342, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 346, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 347, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Dry-Cleaner Environmental Response Trust Fund Act. House Bill 350, offered by Representative Novak... House Bill 350, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of this House House Bill 356, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill Bill. for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 359, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Second Reading of this House Bill. House Utilities Act. Bill 380, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act Amending the Metro East Solid Waste Disposal and Energy Producing Services Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 381, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for Act amending the Bond Authorization Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 423, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Clean Air Standards Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 499, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 601, offered by Representative

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Daniels, a Bill for an Act creating the State Agency Land Transfer Act... House Bill 601, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act creating the State Agency Land Transfer Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. Bill 631, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Higher Education Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 640, offered by Representative Capparelli, a Bill for an Act amending the Liquor Control Act of 1934. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 649, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading House Bill 660, offered by Speaker of this House Bill. Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 664, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 665, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 666, offered by Madigan... House Bill 666, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act creating the Airport Development District House Bill 667, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 668, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Department Human Services Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 667, offered by Representative Garrett, a Bill for an Act amending the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 774, offered by Representative Persico, a Bill for an Act amending the Trust and Trustees Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 822, offered by

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the River Boat Second Reading of this House Bill. House Gambling Act. Bill 828, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act amending the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 855, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill 856, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. House Bill 920, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Mechanics Lien Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 926, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Firearm Owners Identification Card Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1042, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act creating the High Tech Business Incentives Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1043, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act creating the Corporate Accountability Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1101, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1102, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1103, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1104, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1105, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1106, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1107, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1109, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1110, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of House Bill 1111, House Bill. offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House House Bill 1112, offered by Representative Daniels, Bill. an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1113, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1114, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1115, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1116, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1117, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of this House

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1118, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1119, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Bill 1120, offered by Representative Daniels, amending the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1121, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1122, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1123, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1124, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1125, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1126, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1127, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1128, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1129, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1130, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 1131, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Unified Code of... amending the Criminal Code House Bill 1132, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1133, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1134, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1135, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code House Bill 1136, offered by Representative 1961. Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1137, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1138, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1139, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1140, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1141, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1142, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1143, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1144, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1145, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1146, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1148, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1149, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1150, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1151, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1152, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1153, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1154, offered by Representative Moore, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1155, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1156, offered Representative Daniels, an Act amending Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1157, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1158, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1159, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1160, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Retail Installment Sales Act. House Bill 1161, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the Predatory Lending Act. House Bill 1162, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the Payday Loan Act. House Bill 1163, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Credit Card and Debit Card Act. House Bill 1164, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1165, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the House Bill 1166, offered by Installment Loan Act. Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Debt Management Services Act. House Bill 1167, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Sales Finance Agency Act. House Bill 1168, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Transmitter of Money Act. House Bill 1169, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Foreign Banking Office Act. House Bill 1170, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Residential Mortgage License Act. House Bill 1171, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Corporate

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Fiduciary Act. House Bill 1172, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Electronic Fund Transfer Act. House Bill 1174, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Pawnbroker Regulation Act. House Bill 1175, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Exchange Act. House Bill 1176, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Credit Union Act. House Bill 1177, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Savings Bank Act. House Bill 1178, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. House Bill 1179, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Banking Act. House Bill 1180, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Home Repair Fraud Act. House Bill 1181, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act. House Bill 1182, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Consumer Fraud Deceptive Business Practices Act. House Bill 1183, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act. House Bill 1184, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Interest Act. House Bill 1185, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Securities Law. House Bill 1186, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. House Bill 1187, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending House Bill 1188, offered the Mortgage Act. Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Trust and Trustees Act. House Bill 1189, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1190, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1191, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1192, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1193, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1194, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1195, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1196, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1197, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1198, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 1199, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the General Assembly Reapportionment Act. House Bill 1200, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the General Assembly Reapportionment Act. House Bill 1201, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the Illinois Congressional Reapportionment Act. House Bill 1202, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act creating the Illinois Congressional Reapportionment Act. Bill 1203, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act Judicial creating the Cook County Subcircuit 1204, offered by House Bill Act. Reapportionment Representative Daniels, an Act creating the Cook County Judicial Subcircuit Reapportionment Act. House Bill 1205, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Great Lakes Naval Station Tax Exemption Act. House Bill 1206, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Children of Deceased Veterans Act. House Bill 1207,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act amending the Military School Scholarship Act. House Bill 1208, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Community College Act. House Bill 1209, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Military Leave of Absence Act. House Bill 1210, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Military Code House Bill 1211, offered by Representative of Illinois. Daniels, an Act amending the Military Property Act. Bill 1212, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Military Code of Illinois. House Bill 1213, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Military Code of Illinois. House Bill 1214, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1215, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1216, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1217, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1218, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1219, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1220, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1221, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1222, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1223, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1224, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Counties Code. House Bill 1225, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1225, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1226, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1227, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1228, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1229, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 1230, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1231, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1232, Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1233, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1234, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1235, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Township Code. House Bill 1236, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Township Code. House Bill 1237, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Township Code. House Bill 1238, offered Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Township Code. House Bill 1239, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Township Code. House Bill 1240, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Northern Illinois University Revenue Bond Act. House Bill 1241, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Northern Illinois University Law. 12... 1241, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending Northern Illinois University Law. House Bill 1242, offered by

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Southern Illinois University Management Act. House Bill 1243, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Southern Illinois University Revenue Bond Act. House Bill 1244, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Northeastern Illinois University Law. House Bill 1245, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Governors State University Law. House Bill 1246, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Chicago State University Law. House Bill 1247, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Eastern Illinois University Revenue Bond Act. House Bill 1248, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Eastern Illinois University Law. House Bill 1249, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the University -Building Authority Leased Lands Act. House Bill 1250, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public University Energy Conservation Act. House Bill 1251, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Nonresident College Trustees Act. House Bill 1252, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Higher Education Cooperation Act. House Bill 1253, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Consortium for Education Opportunity Act. House Bill 1254, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Western Illinois University Law. House Bill 1255, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Western Illinois University Revenue Bond Law. House Bill 1256, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Public Community College Act. House Bill 1257, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois Financial Assistance Act. House Bill 1258, offered by

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Nursing Education Scholarship Law. House Bill 1259, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Higher Education Loan Act. House Bill 1260, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Illinois 1261, offered by Tuition Act. House Bill Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. House Bill 1262, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Private College Act. House Bill 1263, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the State Universities Civil Service Act. House Bill 1264, offered by Representative Daniels, an Act amending the Senior Citizens Assessment Freeze Homestead Exemption Provisions in the Property Tax House Bill 1265, an Act amending the Property Tax Code. House Bill 1266, an Act amending the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1267, an Act amending the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1268, an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 1269, Act amending the Service Occupation Tax Act. House Bill 1270, an Act amending the Property Tax Code. House Bill 1271, an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 1272, an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 1273, an Act amending the Retailer Occupation Tax Act. House Bill 1274, an Act amending the Service Tax Act... Service Use Tax Act. House Bill 1275, an Act amending the Use Tax Act. House Bill 1276, an Act amending the Property Tax Code. House Bill 1278, an Act amending the Horse Racing Act of 1975. House Bill 1279, an Act amending the Illinois Lottery Law. House Bill 1280, an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amending the Riverboat Gambling Act. House Bill 1281, an Act amending the Riverboat Gambling Act. House Bill 1282, an Act amending the University of Illinois Act. House Bill 1283, an Act amending the University of Illinois Act. House Bill 1284, an Act amending the University of Illinois Act. House Bill 1285, an Act amending the University of Illinois House Bill 1286, an Act amending the University of House Bill 1287, an Act Illinois at Springfield Law. amending the University of Illinois at Chicago Act. House Bill 1288, an Act amending the University of Illinois at Chicago Act. House Bill 1289, an Act amending the University of Illinois at Chicago Act. House Bill 1290, an Act amending the University of Illinois at Chicago Land Transfer Act. House Bill 1291, an Act amending the University of Illinois Exercise of Functions and Duties Law the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1292, an Act amending the University of Illinois House Bill 1293, an Act Construction Financing Act. amending the University of Illinois Trustees Act. House Bill 1294, an Act amending the University of Trustees Act. House Bill 1295, an Act amending the University of Illinois Revenue Bond Financing Act for Auxiliary Facilities. House Bill 1296, an Act amending the University of Illinois Revenue Bond Act. House Bill 1297, a Act amending the Illinois State University Revenue Bond House Bill 1298, an Act amending the Illinois State University Law. House Bill 1299, an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. House Bill 1300, an Act amending the Illinois Act on Aging. House Bill 1301, an Act amending the Illinois Act on Aging. House Bill 1303, an Act amending the Elder Abuse and Neglect Act. House Bill 1304, an Act amending the Juvenile Court Act of 1987.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1305, an Act amending the Juvenile Court Act of House Bill 1306, an Act amending the Child Care Act of 1969. House Bill 1307, an Act amending the Child Care Act of 1969. House Bill 1308, an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1309, an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1310, an Act amending the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act. House Bill 1311, an Act amending the Non-Support Punishment Act. House Bill 1312, an Act amending the Non-Support Punishment Act. House Bill 1313, an Act amending the Non-Support House Bill 1314, an Act amending the Punishment Act. Non-Support Punishment Act. House Bill 1315, an Act amending the Non-Support Punishment Act. House Bill an Act amending the Children's Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 1317, an Act amending the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act. House Bill 1318, an Act amending the Department of Public Health Powers and Duties Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1319, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1320, an Act amending the Department of Veterans Affairs Act. House Bill 1321, an Act amending the Home for Disabled Soldiers and Land Cession Act. House Bill 1322, an Act amending the Department of Veterans Affairs Act. House Bill 1323, Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 1324, Act amending the Department of Natural Resources Conservation Law of the Civil Administrative Code. 1325, an Act amending the Department of Veterans Affairs Act. House Bill 1326, an Act amending the Veterans Burial Places Act. House Bill 1327, an Act amending the Veterans Advisory Council Act. House Bill 1328, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1329, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1330, an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amending the Election Code. House Bill 1331, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1332, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1333, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1334, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1335, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1336, an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 1337, an Act House Bill 1338, an Act amending the Election Code. amending the Election Code. House Bill 1339, an Act amending the Fire Equipment Distributor and Employee Regulation Act. House Bill 1340, an Act amending the Real Estate License Act. House Bill 1341, an Act amending the Illinois Dental Practice Act. House Bill 1342, amending the Naprapathic Practice Act. House Bill 1343, an Act amending the Health Care Worker Background Check Act. House Bill 1344, an Act amending the Home Medical Equipment Service Provider License Act. House Bill 1345, an Act amending the Real Estate Appraiser Licensing Act. House Bill 1346, an Act amending the Podiatric Medical Practice House Bill 1347, an Act amending the Physical Therapy Act. House Bill 1348, an Act amending the Pharmacy Practice Act. House Bill 1349, an Act amending the Illinois Optometric Practice Act. House Bill 1350, Act amending the Athletic Trainer Practice Act. House Bill 1351, an Act amending the Veterinary Medicine and Surgery Practice Act of 1994. House Bill 1352, an Act amending the Nursing Home Administrator's Licensing and Disciplinary House Bill 1353, an Act amending the Clinical Act. Psychologist Licensing Act. House Bill 1354, offered... an Act amending the physical... Physician Assistant Practice Act. House Bill 1355, an Act amending the Clinical Social Work and Social Work Practice Act. House Bill 1356, an Act

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Illinois Speech-Language Pathology and amending the Audiology Practice Act. House Bill 1357, an Act amending Professional Counselor and Clinical Professional Counselor Licensing Act. House Bill 1358, an Act amending the Hearing Instrument Consumer Protection Act. House Bill 1359, an Act amending the Illinois Occupational Therapy Practice Act. House Bill 1360, an Act amending the Interior Design Profession Title Act. House Bill 1361, an Act amending the Professional Engineering Practice Act. House Bill 1362, an Act amending the Structural Engineering House Bill 1363, an Act amending the Practice Act. Illinois Architecture Practice Act. House Bill 1364, Act amending the Illinois Plumbing License Law. House Bill 1365, an Act amending the Health Care Worker Self-Referral Act. House Bill 1366, an Act amending the Detection of Deception Examiners Act. House Bill 1367, an Act amending the Illinois Roofing Industry Licensing Act. House Bill 1368, an Act amending the Perfusionist Practice Act. House Bill 1369, an Act amending the Professional Boxing and Wrestling Act. House Bill 1370, an Act amending the Child Care Act of 1969. House Bill 1371, an Act amending the Water Well and Pump Installation Contractor's License Act. House Bill 1372, an Act amending the Medical Practice Act. House Bill 1373, an Act amending the Medical Practice Act. House Bill 1374, an Act amending the Medical Practice Act. House Bill 1375, an Act amending the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetics and Nail Technology Act. House Bill 1376, an Act amending the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetics and Technology Act. House Bill 1377, an Act amending the Nursing and Advance Practice Nursing Act. House Bill 1378, an Act amending the Nursing and Advance Practice Nursing House Bill 1379, an Act amending the Nursing and Act.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Advance Practice Nursing Act. House Bill 1380, an Act amending the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act. House Bill 1381, an Act amending the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act. House Bill 1382, an Act amending the Illinois Public Accounting Act. House Bill 1383, an Act amending the State Employees Group Insurance House Bill 1384, an Act amending the State Employee Group Insurance Act. House Bill 1385, an Act amending the Limited Health Service Organization Act. House Bill 1386, an Act amending the Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 1387, an Act amending the Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 1388, an Act amending the Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 1389, an Act amending the Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 1390, an Act amending the Health Maintenance House Bill 1391, an Act amending the Organization Act. Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 1392, an Act amending the Voluntary Health Services Plans Act. House Bill 1393, an Act amending the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. House Bill 1394, an Act amending the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. House Bill 1395, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1396, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. 1398, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1399, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance House Bill 1400, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1401, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1402, an Act amending the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1403, an Act amending the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 1404, an Act amending the Illinois

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 1405, an Act amending the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 1406, an Act amending the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 1407, an Act amending the Condominium Property Act. House Bill 1408, an Act amending the Condominium Practice Act. 1409, an Act amending the Trust and Trustees Act. House Bill 1410, an Act amending the Trust and Trustees Act. House Bill 1411, an Act amending the Freedom of Information Act. House Bill 1412, an Act amending the Freedom of Information Act. House Bill 1413, an Act amending the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 1415, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1416, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1417, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1419, an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 1420, an Act amending the Adoption Act. House Bill 1421, an Act amending the Adoption Act. House Bill 1422, an Act amending the Mechanics Lien Act. House Bill 1423, an Act amending the Hospital License Act. House Bill 1424, an Act amending the Labor and Storage Lien Act. House Bill 1425, an Act amending the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. House Bill 1426, an Act amending the Judicial Vacancies Act. House Bill 1427, an Act amending the Judicial Vacancies Act. House Bill 1428, an Act amending the Good Samaritan Act. House Bill 1429, an Act amending the Good Samaritan Act. House Bill 1430, an Act amending the Mortgage Act. House Bill 1431, an Act amending the Real Estate Time Share Act of 1999. House Bill 1432, an Act amending the Conveyances Act. House Bill 1433, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1434, an

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1435, an Act amending the General Obligation Bond Act. House Bill 1436, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1437, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1438, an Act amending House Bill 1439, an Act amending the the School Code. School Code. House Bill 1440, an Act amending the School House Bill 1441, an Act amending the Illinois Educational and Labor Relations Act. House Bill 1442, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1443, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1444, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1445, an Act amending the House Bill 1446, an Act amending the School School Code. Code. House Bill 1447, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1448, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1449, an Act amending the State Aid Continuing Appropriation Act. House Bill 1450, an Act amending the State Aid Continuing Appropriation Act. House Bill 1451, a Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1452, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1453, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1454, an Act amending the House Bill 1455, an Act amending the School School Code. Construction Law. House Bill 1456, an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 1458, an Act amending the School Construction Law. House Bill 1459, an Act amending the School Construction Law. House Bill 1460, an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 1461, an Act amending the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 1462, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1463, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1464, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1465, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1466, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1467, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1468, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1469, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1470, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1471, an Act amending the Pension Code. 1472, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1473, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1474, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1475, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1476, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 1477, an Act amending the Illinois Pension Code. Bill 1478, an Act amending the Regional Transportation Authority Act. House Bill 1479, amending the Local Mass Transit District Act. House Bill 1480, offered by... an Act amending the Local Mass Transit District Act. House Bill 1481, an Act amending the Illinois Highway Code. House Bill 1482, an Act amending the Illinois Highway Code. House Bill 1483, an Act amending the Illinois Highway Code. House Bill 1484, an Act amending the State Finance Act. House Bill 1485, Act amending the State Finance Act. House Bill 1486, an Act amending the State Finance Act. House Bill Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1488, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1490, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1491, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1492, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1493, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1494, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1495, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1496, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1497, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1498, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1499, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1500, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1501, an Act amending the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 1502, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1503, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1504, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1505, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1506, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1507, an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of these House Bills, to be held on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1508, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1509, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1510, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1511, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1512, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1513, the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1514, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1515, amends the Vehicle Code. House Bill 1516, amends Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1517, amends the Boat Registration and Safety Act. House Bill 1518, amends the Permanent Noise Monitoring Act. House Bill 1519, the Joint Airports Act. House Bill 1520, amends the Zoning Eliminate Airport Hazards Act. House Bill 1521, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 1522, creates the Northern Illinois Airport Act. House Bill 1523, creates the Chicago Regional Airport Act. House Bill 1524, creates the Greater Chicago Airport Act. House Bill 1525, creates the Meigs Field Airport Act of 2001. House Bill 1526, amends the Nursing Home Administrators Licensing and

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Disciplinary Act. House Bill 1527, amends the Children's Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 1528, amends the Childrens Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 1529, amends the Children's Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 1530, amends the Children's Health Insurance Program House Bill 1531, amends the State Finance Act. Bill 1532, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 1533, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 1534, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 1535, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1536, amends the Illinois House Bill 1537, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. Public Aid Code. House Bill 1538, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1539, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1540, amends the House Bill 1541, amends the Senior Public Aid Code. Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1542, amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1543, amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1544, amends Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 1545, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1546, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1547, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1548. amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1549, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1550 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1552, amends the Health Facilities Planning Act. House Bill 1553, amends the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. House Bill 1554, amends the Mental Health and Developmental

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Disabilities Code. House Bill 1555, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 1556, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 1557, amends and Developmental Mental Health Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 1558, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 1559, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 1560, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. House Bill 1561, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. House Bill 1562, amends the Abused and Neglected Long Term Care Facility Residents Reporting Act. House Bill 1563, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 1564, amends the Illinois Commercial Feed Act of 1961. House Bill 1565, amends the Animal Welfare Act. House Bill 1566, amends the Illinois River Water Shed Restoration Act. House Bill 1567, amends the River Conservancy Districts Act. House Bill 1568, amends the Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act. House Bill 1569, amends the Illinois Family Farmer Support Act. House Bill 1570, amends the Illinois Lake Management Program Act. House Bill 1571, creates the Resource Planning Act. Bill 1572, creates the Resource Protection Act. House Bill 1573, amends the Property Tax Code. House Bill 1574, amends the Urban Community Conservation Act. House Bill 1575, amends the Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation Law. House Bill 1576, amends the Rivers, Lakes, and Streams Act. House Bill 1577, amends the Real Property Conservation Rights Act. House Bill 1578, amends the Livestock Management Facilities Act. House Bill 1579,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amends the Livestock Management Facilities Act. House Bill 1580, amends the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 1581, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 1582, amends the Illinois Fertilizer Act of 1961. House Bill 1583, amends the Illinois Fertilizer Act of 1961. House Bill 1584, amends the Counties Code. House Bill 1585, amends the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act. House Bill 1586, amends the Surface-Mined Land Conservation and Reclamation Act. House Bill 1587, amends the Illinois Farm Development Act. House Bill 1588, amends the Illinois Farm Development Act. House Bill 1589, amends the Horse Racing Act of 1975. House Bill 1590, amends the Illinois Horse Racing Act of 1975. Bill 1591, amends the Economic Development Project Area Tax Increment Allocation Act of 1995. House Bill 1592, amends the Municipal Waste Water Disposal Zones Act. House Bill amends the Premises Liability Act. House Bill 1594, amends the Soil and Water Conservation Districts Act. House Bill 1595, amends the Open Space Lands Acquisition Development Act. House Bill 1596, amends the Local Land Resource Management Planning Act. House Bill 1597, amends the Illinois Conservation Enhancement Act. House Bill 1598, amends the Illinois Development Finance Authority House Bill 1599, amends the Rural Act. Development Act. House Bill 1600, amends the Recreational Use of Land and Water Areas Act. House Bill 1601, the Forest Preserve Zoological Parks Act. House Bill 1602, amends the Fish and Aquatic Life Code. House Bill 1603, amends the Humane Care for Animals Act. House Bill 1604, amends the Illinois Forestry Development Act. House Bill 1605, amends the Sustainable Agriculture Act. House Bill 1606, amends the State Parks Designation Act. House Bill 1607, amends the Illinois Endangered Species Protection

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 1608, amends the Water Use Act of 1983. House Bill 1609, amends the Illinois Dangerous Animals Act. House Bill 1610, amends the Illinois Exotic Weed Act. House Bill 1611, amends the Conservation District Act. House Bill 1612, amends the Agricultural Areas Conservation and Protection Act. House Bill 1613, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1614, amends the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill 1615, amends the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill 1616, amends the Home Repair Fraud Act. House Bill 1617, amends the Telephone Solicitations Act. House Bill 1618, amends the Carnival and Amusement Rides Safety Act. House Bill 1619, amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. House Bill 1620, amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. House Bill 1621, amends the Secretary of State Act. House Bill 1622, amends State Treasurer Act. House Bill 1623, amends the Attorney General Act. House Bill 1624, amends the Automatic Telephone Dialers Act. House Bill 1625, amends the Consumer Installment Loan Act. House Bill 1626, amends the Consumer Installment Loan Act. House Bill 1627, amends the Bill 1628, amends Fireworks Use Act. House the 1629, amends Agricultural Fair Act. House Bill t.he Agricultural Fair Act. House Bill 1630, amends the Illinois Promotion Act. House Bill 1631, amends t.he Illinois Promotion Act. House Bill 1632, amends the Insect Pest and Plant Disease Act. House Bill 1633, amends the Carrier, Racing, Hobby and Show Pigeon Act of 1993. Bill 1634, amends the Aquaculture Development Act. House Bill 1635, amends the Wildlife Code. House Bill 1636. amends the Wildlife Code. House Bill 1637, amends the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Act. House Bill

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

1638, amends the Illinois Open Land Trust Act. House Bill 1639, amends the Illinois Emergency Management Agency Act. House Bill 1640, amends the Department of Natural Resources House Bill 1641, amends the Department of Natural Resources Act. House Bill 1642, amends the Alternate Fuels House Bill 1643, amends the Alternate Fuels Act. House Bill 1644, amends the Alternate Fuels Act. House Bill 1645, amends the Illinois Pesticide Act. House Bill 1646, amends the Illinois Pesticide Act. House Bill 1647, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House amends the Civil Administrative Code of Bill 1648, Illinois. House Bill 1649, amends the Animal Control Act. House Bill 1650, amends the Animal Control Act. House Bill amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1652, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 1653, amends the Grain Code. House Bill 1654, amends the Grain Code. House Bill 1655 amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1656, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1657, amends the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act. House Bill 1658, amends the Workers' Compensation Act. House Bill 1659, amends the Workers' Compensation Act. House Bill 1660, amends the Workers' Compensation Act. House Bill 1661, amends the Day Labor Services Act. Bill 1662, amends the Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 1663, amends the Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 1664, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1665, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1666, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1667 amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1668, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1669, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1670,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 1671, amends the Sale of Tobacco to Minors Act. House Bill 1672, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1673, the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 1674, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 1675, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 1676, amends the Bingo License and Tax Act. House Bill 1677, amends the Pull Tabs and Jar Games Act. House Bill 1678, amends the Illinois Promotion Act. House Bill 1679, amends the Illinois Historic Preservation Act. House Bill 1680, amends the Museum District Act. House Bill 1681, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1682, amends the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 1683, amends the School Code. House Bill 1684, amends the Abused and Neglected Long Term Care Facility Residents Reporting Act. House Bill 16... House Bill 1745, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1746, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1747, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1748, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 1774, creates the Business Incentives Act. House Bill 1775, creates the Job Training Act. House Bill 1829, amends the Clerks of Courts House Bill 1831, amends the Clerks of Courts Act. House Bill 1832, amends the Clerks of Courts Act. Bill 1839, amends the School Code. House Bill 1840, amends the School Code. House Bill 1841, amends the School Code. House Bill 1888, amends the Public Utilities Act. Bill 1894, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 1949, amends the Residential Mortgage License Act of 1987. House Bill 1950, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 1959, amends the Downstate Forest Preserve

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

District Act. House Bill 2017, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2020, amends the Home Repair Remodeling House Bill 2021, amends the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2077, amends the School House Bill 2085, amends the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 2196, amends the Uniform Partnership Act. House Bill 2206, amends the Hearing Instrument Consumer Protection Act. House Bill 2232, amends the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority Act. House Bill 2238, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2241, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2242, amends the Code of House Bill 2277, amends the Local Civil Procedure. Government Debt Reform Act. House Bill 2354, amends the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Act. House Bill 2357, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2397, amends the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2424, amends the School Code. House Bill 2428, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 2429, amends the Public Funds Investment Act. House Bill 2450, amends the Energy Assistance Act of 1989. House Bill 2481, amends the Use House Bill 2488, creates the Tax Act. Implementation Act. House Bill 2568, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2569, amends the Illinois Vehicle House Bill 2572, amends the Coal and Energy Development Bond Act. House Bill 2573, amends the Water Use Act of 1983. House Bill 2574, amends the Energy Conservation and Coal Development Act. House Bill 2576, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2578, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2579. amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2580, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2581,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2582, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2583, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 2584, creates the Security Guard Regulation Act. House Bill 2585 creates the Electricians Licensing Act. House Bill 2586, amends the Illinois Roofing Industry Licensing Act. House Bill 2587, amends the Nursing and Advanced Practice Nursing Act. House Bill 2588, amends the Medical Practice Act of House Bill 2589, amends the Real Estate License Act of 2000. House Bill 2590, amends the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act of 1993. House Bill 2591, amends the Podiatric Medical Practice Act 1987. House Bill 2592, amends the Illinois Dental Practice Act. House Bill 2593, amends the Optometric Practice Act of 1987. House Bill 2594, amends the Pharmacy Practice Act of 1987. House Bill 2595, amends the Illinois Physical Therapy Act. House Bill 2596, amends the Physician Assistant Practice Act of 1987. House Bill 2597, amends the Illinois Plumbing License Law. House Bill 2598, amends the Professional Boxing and Wrestling Act. House Bill 2599, amends the Water Well and Pump Installation Contractors License Act. House Bill 2600, amends the Interior Design Profession Title Act. Bill 2601, amends the Detection of Deception Examiners Act. House Bill 2602, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2603, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2604, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2605, amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2606, amends the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 2607, amends the Toll Highway Act. House Bill 2608, amends the Railroad Bridge House Bill 2609, amends the Motor Fuel Tax Law. House Bill 2610, amends the Motor Fuel Tax Law. House Bill

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

2611, amends the Illinois Highway Code. House Bill 2612, amends the Soft Drink Industry Fair Dealing Act. Bill 2613, amends the Bingo License and Tax Act. Bill 2614, amends the Horse Racing Act of 1975. House Bill 2615, amends the Riverboat Gambling Act. House Bill 2616, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2618, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 2619, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 2620, amends the Liquor Control Act of 1934. House Bill 2621, amends the Attorney General Act to Add a Section Concerning Indian Claim Litigation. House Bill 2622, amends the Attorney General Act to Add a Section Concerning Indian Claim Litigation. House Bill 2623, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 2624, amends the Adoption Act. Bill 2625, amends the Illinois Marriage and House Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2626, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2627, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2628, amends the Bill of Rights for Children. House Bill 2629, amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. House Bill 2630, amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. House Bill 2631, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2632, amends the Children and Family Services Act. House Bill 2633, amends the Child Care Act of 1969. Bill 2634 amends the Illinois Financial Assistance Act for Non-Public Institutions of Higher Learning. 2635, amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. House Bill 2636, amends the Public Community College Act. House Bill 2637, amends the University of Illinois Trustees House Bill 2638, amends the Legislative Commission Reorganization Act of 1984. House Bill 2639, creates the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Short Title Section Only of the Legislative Commission on Government Contracts Act. House Bill 2640, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2641, amends the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill amends the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill 2643, amends the Illinois Procurement Code. House Bill amends the Freedom of Information Act. House Bill 2645, amends the Freedom of Information Act. House Bill 2646, amends the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. House Bill 2647, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2648, amends the Civil Administrative Code of House Bill 2649, amends the Department of Illinois. Commerce and Community Affairs Law of the Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2650, amends the Illinois Act on the Aging. House Bill 2651, amends the Illinois Act on the Aging. House Bill 2652, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 2653, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 2654, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 2655, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2656, amends the Assistive Technology Evaluation and Training Centers House Bill 2657, amends the Disabled Persons Rehabilitation Act. House Bill 2658, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2659, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2660, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2661, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2662, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2663, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2664, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2665, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2666, amends the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2667, amends Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2668, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2669 amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2670, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2671, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2672, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2673, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2674, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2675, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2676, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2677, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2678, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2680, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2681, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2682, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2683, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2684, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2685 amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2686, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2687, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2688, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2689, amends the Illinois Pension Code. 2690, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2691, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2692, the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2693, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2694, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2695, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2696, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2697, amends the House Bill 2698, amends Illinois Pension Code. the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2699, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2700, amends the House Bill 2701, amends Illinois Pension Code. the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2702, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2703, amends t.he Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2704, amends the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2705, amends the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law of t.he Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2706, creates the Payday Loan Act. House Bill 2707, creates the Illinois Short-Term Loan Act. House Bill 2708, amends the Interest Act. House Bill 2709, amends the Electronic Fund Transfer Act. House Bill 2710, amends the Illinois Credit House Bill 2711, amends the Union Act. Consumer Loan Act. House Bill 2712, amends the Installment Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 2713, amends Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 2714, amends the Minimum Wage Law. House Bill 2715, amends the Minimum Wage Law. House Bill 2716, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2717, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2718, creates the Police Testing Standard for Promotion Act. House Bill 2719, amends the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 2720, amends the Illinois House Bill 2721, amends the Metropolitan Municipal Code. Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 2722, amends the Real Estate License Act of 2000. House Bill 2723, amends the Uniform Act for the Extradition of Persons of Unsound Mind. House Bill 2724, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 2725, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Administrative Act. House Bill 2726, amends the Department of Veteran Affairs Act. House Bill 2727, amends the Township Code. House Bill 2728, amends the Township Code. House Bill 2729, amends the Counties Code. House Bill 2730, amends the Counties Code. House Bill 2731, amends

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 2732, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 2733, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 2734, amends the Election Code. House Bill 2735, amends the Election Code. House Bill 2736, amends the Election Code. House Bill amends the Election Code. House Bill 2738, amends the Election Code. House Bill 2740, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2742, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2743, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2744, amends the Property Tax Code. House Bill 2745, amends the Property Tax Code. House Bill 2746, amends the Mortgage Act. House Bill 2747, amends the Mortgage Act. House Bill 2748, amends the Mechanics Lien Act. House Bill 2749, amends the Mechanics Lien Act. House Bill 2750, creates the Privacy Act. House Bill 2751, creates the Privacy Act. House Bill 2752, House Bill 2753, amends the creates the Privacy Act. Hospital Lien Act. House Bill 2754, amends the Hospital Lien Act. House Bill 2755, amends the Security Deposit House Bill 2756, amends the Security Deposit Return Act. Return Act. House Bill 2757, amends the Condominium 2758, amends the Condominium Property Act. House Bill Property Act. House Bill 2759, amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Bill 2760 amends the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 2761, amends the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 2762, amends the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 2763, amends the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 2764, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 2765, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 2766, creates the Smart Growth House Bill 2767, amends the Illinois Open Land Trust Act. Act. House Bill 2768, amends the Wildlife Code. House

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill 2769, amends the Wildlife Code. House Bill 2770, amends the Grain Code. House Bill 2771, amends the Livestock Management Facilities Act. House Bill 2772, amends the Urban Renewal Consolidation Act of 1961. House Bill 2773, amends the Illinois Community Development Finance Corporation Act. House Bill 2774, amends the Department of Human Services Act. House Bill 2775, the Landlord and Tenant Act. House Bill 2776, amends the Income Withholding for Support Act. House Bill 2777, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2778, amends the Good Samaritan Act. House Bill 2779, amends the Good Samaritan Act. House Bill 2780, amends the Uniform House Bill 2781, amends the Uniform Commercial Code. Commercial Code. House Bill 2782, amends the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 2783, amends the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 2784, amends the Alternative Health Care Delivery Act. House Bill 2785, amends the Health Maintenance Organization Act. House Bill 2786, amends the Illinois Health Finance Reform Act. House Bill 2787, amends the Managed Care Reform and Patient Rights House Bill 2788, amends the Illinois Rural Downstate Health Act. House Bill 2789, amends the Children's Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 2790, amends the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. House Bill 2791, amends the Allied Health Care Professional Assistance Law. House Bill 2792, amends the Health Care Arbitration Act. House Bill 2793, amends the Health Facilities Planning Act. House Bill 2794, amends the Counties Code. House Bill 2795, amends the County and Multi-County Health Department Division of the Counties Code. House Bill 2796, amends the Voluntary Health Services Plans Act. House Bill 2797, amends the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act. House

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill 2798, amends the Alzheimer's Disease Assistance Act. House Bill 2799, amends the Ambulatory Surgical Treatment House Bill 2800, amends the Ambulatory Center Act. Surgical Treatment Center Act. House Bill 2801, amends the Hospital Licensing Act. House Bill 2802, amends the Hospital Licensing Act. House Bill 2803, amends the Nursing Home Care Act. House Bill 2804, amends the Nursing Home Care Act. House Bill 2805, amends the Trust and Trustees Act. House Bill 2806, amends the Trust and Trustees Act. House Bill 2808, amends the Court of Claims House Bill 2809, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. Act. House Bill 2810, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2811, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2812, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2813, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2814, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2815, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2816, amends the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2817, amends the General Not For Profit Corporation Act of 1986. House Bill 2818, amends the General Not For Corporation Act of 1986. House Bill 2819, amends the Business Corporation Act of 1983. House Bill 2820, the Conveyances Act. House Bill 2821, amends the Circuit Courts Act. House Bill 2822, amends the Circuit Courts House Bill 2823, amends the Circuit Courts Act. Act. House Bill 2824, amends the Circuit Courts Act. House Bill 2825, amends the Illinois Act on the Aging. House Bill 2826, amends the Department of Aging Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2827, amends the Assisted Living and Shared Housing Act. House Bill 2828, amends the State Finance Act Concerning the Tobacco Settlement Recovery Fund. House Bill 2829, amends the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

State Finance Act. House Bill 2830, amends the State House Bill 2831, amends the School Code. Finance Act. House Bill 2832, amends the School Code. House Bill 2833. amends the School Construction Law. House Bill 2834, amends the School Code. House Bill 2835, amends the School Code. House Bill 2836, amends the Safe Schools Law in the School Code. House Bill 2837, amends the School Code. House Bill 2838 amends the School Code. House Bill 2839, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2840, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2841, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. House Bill 2842, amends the Firearm Owners Identification Card Act. Bill 2843, amends the Firearm Owners Identification Card Amends the Unified Code of Corrections. amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 2845, amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 2846, 2847, amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 2848, amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 2849, amends the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 2850, amends the Probation and Probation Officers Act. House Bill 2851, amends the Probation and Probation Officers Act. House Bill 2852, amends the Code of Criminal House Bill 2853, amends the Code of Procedure of 1963. Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2854, amends the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2855, amends the Sex Offender Registration Act. House Bill 2856, amends the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act. House Bill 2857, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2858, amends the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2859, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987, the Criminal Code of 1961, and the Code of Criminal Procedure

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

of 1963. House Bill 2862, amends the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. House Bill 2863, amends the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. House Bill 2864, amends the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. House Bill amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2867, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2868, amends Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2869, amends 1961. House Bill 2870, amends the Criminal Code of Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2871, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2872, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2873, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2874, amends t.he Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 2875, amends the Boat Registration and Safety Act. House Bill 2876, amends the County Jail Act. House Bill 2877, amends the County Jail Act. House Bill 2878, amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987, the Criminal Code of 1961, and the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. House Bill 2879 amends the Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. House Bill 2880, amends the Illinois Educational Labor House Bill 2881, amends the Local Act. Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. 2882, amends the Local Governmental and House Bill Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. House Bill 2883, amends the Residential Real Property Disclosure Act to make technical changes in a section concerning completion and delivery of the seller's disclosure statement. House Bill 2884, amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2885, amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2886, amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2887, amends the Illinois Marriage and

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2888, amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2889, amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 2890, amends the Public Utilities House Bill 2891, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2892, amends the Public Utilities Act. Bill 2893, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2894, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2895 amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2896, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2897, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2898, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2899, amends t.he Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2900, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2901, amends t.he House Bill 2902, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 2903, amends the Public Utilities Act. Utilities Act. House Bill 2904, creates the Congressional Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2905, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2906, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2907, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2908, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2909, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2910, creates the Illinois Redistricting Act of House Bill 2911, creates the Metropolitan 2001. Water Reclamation District Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2912, creates the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill creates the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2914, creates the Cook County Circuit Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2915, creates the Cook County Circuit Redistricting Act of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 2916, creates the Cook County Circuit Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2917, creates the Illinois Congressional Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2918, creates the Illinois Congressional Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2919, creates the Illinois Congressional Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill creates the General Assembly Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2921, creates the General Assembly Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2922, creates the General Assembly Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2923, creates the General Assembly Redistricting Act of 2001. House Bill 2924, amends the Cook County Board Of Review Districts Act. House Bill 2925, amends the State Treasurer Act. Bill 2926, amends the State Comptroller Act. House Bill 2928, amends the Attorney General Act. House Bill 2929, amends the Attorney General Act. House Bill 2930 amends the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. House Bill 2931, amends the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. House Bill 2932, amends the Minimum Wage Law. House Bill 2933, amends the Minimum Wage Law. House Bill 2934, creates the Equal House Bill 2935, amends the Unemployment Pay Insurance Act. House Bill 2936, amends the Unemployment House Bill 2937, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. Insurance Act. House Bill 2938, amends the Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 2939, amends the Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 2940, creates the Illinois Labor Act. House Bill 2941, creates the Illinois Labor Act. House Bill 2942, creates the Labor Reform Act. House Bill 2943, amends the Workers Compensation Act. House Bill 2944, amends the Workers Compensation Act. House Bill 2945, creates the Flex Time Act. House Bill 2946, creates the Flex Time Act. House Bill 2947, creates the Living Wage

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act. House Bill 2948, creates the Living Wage Act. Bill 2949, amends the One Day Rest in Seven Act. House Bill 2951, amends the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. House 2952, amends the Service Occupation Tax Act. House Bill 2953, amends the Service Use Tax Act. House Bill amends the Use Tax Act. House Bill 2955, amends the Property Tax Code. House Bill 2956, amends the Income Tax Act. House Bill 2957, amends the Property Tax Code. House Bill 2958, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2959, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2960, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2961, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2962, amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. 2963, amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. House Bill 2964, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 2965, amends the Alcoholism and Other Drug Abuse and Dependency Act. House Bill 2966, amends the Children and Family Services Act. House Bill 2967, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2968, amends the House Bill 2969, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. Public Aid Code. House Bill 2970, amends the Public Aid Code. House Bill 2971, amends the WIC Vendor Management Act. House Bill 2972, amends the Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2973, amends the Department of Human Services Act. House Bill amends the Children's Health Insurance Program Act. House Bill 2975, amends the Department of Human Services Act. House Bill 2976, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2977, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2978, amends the Department of Human Services

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act. House Bill 2979, amends the Department of Human Services Act. House Bill 2980, amends the Children and Family Services Act. House Bill 2981, amends the Children and Family Services Act. House Bill 2982, amends the Early Intervention Services System Act. House Bill 2983, amends the Early Intervention Services System Act. House Bill 2984, amends the Minimum Wage Law. House Bill 2985, amends the Prevailing Wage Act. House Bill 2986, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 2987, amends the Workers' Compensation Act. House Bill 2988, amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. House Bill 2989, amends the House Bill 2990, amends the Property Property Tax Code. Tax Code. House Bill 2991, amends the Illinois Sports Facilities Authority Act. House Bill 2992, amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. House Bill 3018, the State Treasurer Act. House Bill 3031, amends amends the Title Insurance Act. House Bill 3034, amends the Title Insurance Act. House Bill 3111, amends the School Code. House Bill 3114, amends the School Code. House Bill 3117, amends the Elder Abuse and Neglect Act. House Bill amends the State Comptroller Act. House Bill 3173, amends the Probate Act of 1975. House Bill 3195, amends the State Finance Act. House Bill 3234, amends the Cigarette Tax Act to make a technical change concerning tax stamps. 2239, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3252, amends the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 3254, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 3256, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 3308, the Fire Investigation Act. House Bill 3333, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 3337, amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 3338, amends the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 3339, amends the Public

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Utilities Act. House Bill 3360, amends the Election Code. House Bill 3366, amends the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. House Bill 3380, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. House Bill 3393, amends the Early Intervention Services System Act. House Bill 3544, amends the School Code. House Bill 3566, amends the School Code. House Bill 3589, amends the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3590. amends Illinois Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. House Bill 3591, amends the State Treasurer Act. House Bill 3592, amends the Attorney General Act. House Bill 3593, amends the House Bill 3594, amends Attorney General Act. the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law of t.he Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 3595, amends the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 3596, amends the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 3597, amends the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 3598, amends the Illinois Promotion Act. Bill 3599, creates the Airport Property Transaction Act of House Bill 3600, creates the Airport Property Transaction Act of 2001. House Bill 3601, creates the Airport Property Transaction Act of 2001. House Bill 3602, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 3603, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 3604, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill 3605, amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. House Bill amends the Legislative Commission Reorganization Act of 1984. House Bill 3607, amends the Space Needs Act. Bill 3608, amends the Regional Transportation Authority Act. House Bill 3609, amends the Regional Transportation Authority Act. House Bill 3610, amends the Rivers, Lakes

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

and Streams Act. House Bill 3611, amends the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act. House Bill 3612, amends the Illinois Wage, Payment and Collection Act. House Bill 3613, amends the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. House Bill 3614, amends the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. House Bill 3615, amends the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 3616, amends the Department of Commerce and Committee Affairs Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of these House Bills."

Clerk Rossi: "Second Reading of those House Bills to be held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 475, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1083, a Bill for an Act creating the Water Quantity Protection Act of 2001. 2122, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Historic Preservation Agency. House Bill 2125, a Bill for an Act amending the General Obligation Bond Act. House Bill 2137, a Bill for an Act amending the General Obligation Bond Act. House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill Bill for an Act amending the State Aid Formula Provisions of the School Code. House Bill 3184, a Bill for an Act creating the Local Land Development Act. House Bill 3426, a Bill for an Act appropriating one dollar from the General Revenue Fund to the State Universities Civil Service System. House Bill 3439, a Bill for an Act making an House Bill 3440, a Bill for an Act appropriation. appropriating two dollars from the General Revenue Fund to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. House Bill 3463, a Bill for an Act appropriating one dollar from the General Revenue Fund to the Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities. House Bill 3489, a Bill for an

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act amending the Build Illinois Bond Act. House Bill 3490, a Bill for an Act amending the Build Illinois Bond Act. House Bill 3491, a Bill for an Act creating the FY2002 Budget Implementation Act. House Bill 3492, a Bill for an Act creating the Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Implementation Act. House Bill 3493, a Bill for an Act creating the Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Implementation Act. House Bill 3494, a Bill for an Act creating the FY2002 Budget Implementation Act. House Bill 3494, a Bill for an Act creating the FY2002 Budget Implementation Act. House Bill 3495, a Bill for an Act creating the FY2002 Budget Implementation Act. Second Reading of these House Bills to be held on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair. House Bill 286, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Brady, what number is that Bill?"

Brady: "2865."

Speaker Hartke: "2865. We just missed one number. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2865, a Bill for an Act concerning crime victims. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the definitions of 'pecuniary loss', procures 'crime of violence' and 'victim' in the Illinois Crime Victim Compensation Act in order to expand the types of compensation victims can receive to include two additional crimes as compensative crimes. Specifically, these Amendments would allow victims of stalking and aggravated stalking to receive compensation under this Act, allow the individuals who witness violent crimes to receive compensation for counseling benefits and third, allow all victims to be compensated for the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

following: replacement of certain personal properties confiscated as evidence in crime scenes, costs associated with crime scene cleanup, expenses for the travel and transport for survivors of homicide victims to secure bodies of deceased victims from another county or state, and to transport bodies to the appropriate county or state for burial. This is to improve the way that the victims are compensated for the loss by the state and this particular Bill is part of the Crime Victims Compensation Act which is an initiative of Attorney General Jim Ryan. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2865? The Chair recognizes Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Brady. Will this require an appropriation?"

Brady: "No, it would be the money from the General Fund that would be allocated through the Attorney General's Office and would be approved by the court involved in each particular incident."

Novak: "Okay. No, I understand the way the system works now, but it seems to me, maybe I'm wrong, but you're expanding the program to provide for additional compensation under the outlines or under the additional conditions as the analysis suggests. So, if the pot's not gonna get any bigger, where are we gonna get the extra money?"

Brady: "Representative, the fees would be attached by the courts to the individuals found and convicted of particular crimes that would fall under this particular category of compensation to these families that were involved."

Novak: "Okay. So, this is the fee that now is in the current... is it with the Crime Victims Assistance Act? Is that the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

fee that's authorized into that?"

Brady: "That's correct."

Novak: "Okay."

Brady: "What we're doin' is expanding what particular type of crimes that can fall under that jurisdiction."

Novak: "Okay. So..."

Brady: "Or that particular statute."

Novak: "So, that expansion of those crimes or conditions, then the fee will be applicable to that. Is that how you're gonna raise the money then, to pay, to compensate people?"

Brady: "That's correct. That they would be assessed by the courts upon conviction of what these fines would entail."

Novak: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Representative."

Black: "Was this originally a Madigan-Currie-O'Brien Bill?"

Brady: "Yes, it was."

Black: "And the Amendment that becomes the Bill was offered by Representative O'Brien?"

Brady: "That's correct."

Black: "Ah. So, the Bill was, in fact, a Democrat Bill."

Brady: "Well, Sir, it had bipartisan support and that's what the Bill was given to me for."

Black: "All right. I just wanted to make sure Representative Novak knew that. Thank you."

Brady: "Thank you."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for your 'yes' vote on this particular Bill which is designed to improve the way that the victims are compensated for their loss by the state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
Bill 2865?' 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 2865,
there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0
voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Black, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much. Pursuant to Rule 49, I'm joined by 5 Members of my side of the aisle to request a recorded vote on a Motion to Discharge House Bill 8 from further consideration by the House Rules Committee. This Motion has been filed in writing. We ask that this Bill be discharged pursuant to Rule 18(g) and ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Hartke: "...Black, could you do me a favor and take that

Motion out of the record right now? We'll get right back
to it after the next Bill."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. House Bill 1886, Representative Hamos.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1886, a Bill for an Act to create the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Kids Share Endowment Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an innovative program that will set aside a portion of our Tobacco Settlement Funds to create the Kid Share Endowment. This is an endowment, a trust fund, which will not be spent down, ever. So, this is one way that we can create a legacy from the Tobacco Settlement Funds just using the interest from the Kid Share Endowment to provide for local community-based collaborations dealing with children and We would set aside \$50 million for six years and over the life of the Tobacco Settlement that would be at \$300 million. And again, the innovative portion of this is that we would not spend the principal. We would, from the interest, allow communities to develop their own projects to fill gaps for services for children. The program does not begin this year, it begins a year from now. And I'm open and available for questions and I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1886?

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, would you permit Representative Fritchey to comment on this use of the Tobacco Settlement dollars?

I'm just curious as to his feeling on the issue."

Hamos: "Well, Representative Black, I'm sure he can probably..."

Black: "Well, that's why I used his name in..."

Hamos: "I'm sure he can probably..."

Black: "That's why I used his name in debate if he wants to get

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

up."

Hamos: " ... push the button and do it himself. You know, this is a... I very much support the concept of all for health. I think I, like many other people here, was disappointed last year when we didn't spend more of it on health. It was at that time, last summer, that I began working with a group of the children's advocacy groups, the park districts, the municipalities, the education associations, to think about public health as a way to... Sir. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. As a way to create public health initiatives for children."

Black: "So, are you calling this the Smoke 'em For Kids Bill, or what? Surely, not that."

Hamos: "This is a very small set-aside for children Bill."

Black: "Okay. Well, I usually look to Representative Fritchey to give some guidance on whether or not we are overextending the Tobacco Settlement Fund. But I have talked to staff and taken a quick look at the Bill I, quite frankly, certainly can't find anything wrong with the Bill that you're trying to do. But as I said, I generally depend on Representative Fritchey to make sure that we are not overextending the Tobacco Settlement Fund and other than that, I think you have an excellent Bill. And I appreciate you answering the questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Fritchey: "I'm very scared to turn my back on the kind Gentleman from Vermilion, now, 'cause I feel the crosshairs setting in. Very briefly, let me do share my thoughts so somewhat sincerely. House Bill 1886 is a very good Bill in and of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

itself. It purports to do some very good things, not all of which necessarily being health related, but all of which being very laudable. This Bill, unfortunately, because of the pressures that are being put on the Tobacco Settlement dollars by the administration and by some of the other powers that be in this Body probably cannot coexist with the all-for-health proposal which passed out of this Body unanimously a couple of weeks ago. I wish that we would fund both of these programs. I believe that both programs deserve funding. They both cannot be funded. And for that reason, while I strongly support what she's trying to do, I'll be voting 'present' on the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

And I must compliment the Sponsor for all the hard work she put into it, for complimenting the Amendments. It's a good Bill. And it's going to use the tobacco money, it's not going to hinder the General Revenue Fund and I ask that it be passed. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik... Hamos to close."

Hamos: "I think that my cosponsor, Representative Wojcik, and I should get a little credit for dressing as twins today to present this Bill. I do want to point out that I don't know of any organized opposition to this. I think there was a period when the Medical Society was opposed and that may be appearing on your analyses on that side, but they told us in committee they were not opposed because we did think about the future and this Bill does not start until next year. It has a delayed effective date. It is a way to really think about a very small portion set-aside over six years to create this endowment. I think this is an important Bill and I ask for your support."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1886?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? ... all of about a dozen people who have not voted. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1886, there are 100 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 3 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Just to revise and extend my parliamentary remarks and, you know, I'm not gonna delay ya. I pretty much know what your response will be. I've referenced the appropriate rules asking for the record vote on the Motion to Discharge and we'll await your response."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Hartke: "There's been an objection to the rule.

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm shocked and appalled at the objection. Just absolutely shocked and appalled. I had no idea she would do that. But since you have denied our Motions that are in full accordance with House Rules, we respectfully ask for a recorded vote on a Motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair pursuant to House Rule 57(a) and ask for a record vote under the right to do so as embodied in Rule 49."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be overruled?'

'Shall the Chair be sustained?' Excuse me. 'Shall the

Chair be sustained?' Those in favor of sustaining the

Chair will vote 'yes'; those opposed will vote 'no'. The

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

voting is open. The Motion requires 71 'no' votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the Motion, there are 48 Members voting 'yes', 54 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And the Chair is sustained. Mr. Kenner on House Bill 210. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 210, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Kenner."

Kenner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 210 is an initiation (sic-initiative) in response to a new federal accounting rule. It would allow school districts receiving state block grant funding or general state aid to classify the state funds it receives in a fiscal year as funds received in connection with any funding program for which the district is allowed to receive funds. This classification is allowed regardless of the actual source or timing of the receipt of the funds. Very simply, the Bill allows school districts to classify nonreimbursement funds such as block grants or general aid funding as reimbursement funds for accounting purposes only. This Bill came out of committee unanimously and there's no opposition. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 210?

Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House pass House Bill 210?' 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 210, there are 102 Members voting

'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2535, Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2535, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Dental Practice Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation was initiated by the Department of Professional Regulation and given to me by Representative Skip Saviano. It's a response to a shortfall in the Dental Disciplinary Fund. On June 15, 2000 at a meeting, the dental board requested that the Department seek a proposal for an increase on The dentists today pay \$150, would go to 200. Hygienists are paying \$75, it would go to a hundred. And specialists who pay 150 would go to 200. Without these fees, they couldn't... If the fee increase is not approved, the Department will have to reduce their services in the area that investigates the poor dentists and prosecutions that they... comes forth from this. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. We've had a reoccurring problem in the dental licensure fund. It's depleted down to absolutely nothing and as a result, the Department cannot monitor the licensure, which means we don't have the proper amount of investigators on the street investigating bad dentists. We don't have the amount of investigators out there to monitor dental hygienists. And this has become somewhat of a crisis in our state because of the lack of money for the fund. And as you know, the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Department of Professional Regulation, this Body, a few years back, created these dedicated funds so we could keep track of the expenditures on each individual licensure. So, this is very, very important from a standpoint as regulation enforcement by the Department and by our state. So, I would ask for your approval. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm just announcing that I may have a possible conflict of interest, but I will vote with my conscience."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Kelly... Capparelli asks for a..."

Capparelli: "Favor..."

Speaker Hartke: " ... an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2535. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2535, there are 60 Members voting 'yes', 40 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And House Bill 2535, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 383, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 383, a Bill for an Act in relation to interest. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House

Bill 383 was brought to me by the Illinois Collectors

Association. If you remember, last year we passed this

Bill out which increased the interest rate that collectors

could impose on overdue bills from 5%, which was set about

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

80 years ago, to 9%. We passed it out of the House. We passed it out of the Senate. It went to the Governor and we agreed with the Governor that he would AV it down to 7% which came up at a Veto Session. We weren't able to pass it, so we filed this Bill in accordance with the Governor's recommendations and we set it at 7%. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 383?

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

'Shall the House pass House Bill 383?' 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? Have all voted who

wish? Please vote your switches. Have all voted who wish?

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 383, there are

29 Members voting 'yes', 61 Members voting 'no', and 8

Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to

reach the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost.

House Bill 1961, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the

Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1961, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1961 is an effort to try to address the problem that we're having right now in our prison system in regards to women who were entering the system. Right now, while we have a male population that is flatlining somewhat. I emphasize somewhat. The amount of females coming into the prison system has exploded. We have very few, if any, programs right now that are addressing this one head on and what this attempts to do is set up a pilot program in Cook

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

County that would allow the sheriff of Cook County to operate a alternative program for women which would be a program that would be a alternative that would allow for a year program that would be working with women on issues such as mental health issues, drug issues, and the like with an effort to try to break the recidivism rate that we have. The people who will be eligible for this would be individuals who have been charged with... convicted with a nonviolent offense. And I'd appreciate your support."

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

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Tom, who will pay for this program? It's Cook County only, as I understand it."

Dart: "Correct."

Black: "Correct?"

Dart: "Yes."

Black: "Who will pay for the price of the program?"

Dart: "There was an Amendment I put on in committee which was...

made it clear that the county would not, that this would be
have... have to be something that would come out of the
state. I, originally, to be honest with you, Bill, this
was not gonna be one of five ideas that I was allowed
because there was no funding. However, the sheriff has
been in negotiations with the Governor's Office and over
the course of the last three of four days they have come up
with a funding strategy where they believe the money would
be there to do that. And the thing that was interesting
about this which I was trying to explain to them, this was
not going to be talking in reference to new people we'd be

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

bringing into the system per se. These are people already in the system that, but for this, they would be heading over to Dwight or Decatur for a program there. So, it will cost money, but it's money we'd be spending anyways."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative.

According to staff, correct me if I'm wrong, staff indicated that Committee Amendment #1 was attached to the Bill at your request, obviously your Amendment, to turn the Bill into an appropriations Bill and hold it for further discussion. Is that not an accurate portrayal of your Amendment?"

"The Amendment was to, frankly, it was done at the behest Dart: of the Cook County Board because they for so... and I'll be honest with you, I read the Bill and I sorta went toe to toe with 'em on it. Because the way the Bill was written without the Amendment, in my opinion, it's absolutely crystal clear that this has to be funded by the state, 'cause we weren't about to dump this responsibility on the county. These are responsibilities of the state anyways. For some reason they wanted me to make it doubly assured that they weren't gonna have the responsibility, so I put the Amendment on, but frankly, it just repeats what's already in the Bill which basically says it is a state But the one thing I did mention in responsibility. committee was, is that at that time I was trying to be straightforward with the committee. I did not have a revenue source then and at that point I was just gonna move the Bill out to Third Reading to see if something would happen in the meantime. Since that point, as I mentioned, the sheriff and the Governor's Office have had conversations and as of about two days ago, there was the feeling that they were gonna be able to come up with the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

money. Without the money... the way the Bill's written, if the money is not given to the program, the program doesn't happen, so it isn't a mandate on the Department. The Department... The language is all discretionary. The Department does not have to enter into any of these contracts. So, I would suggest that if there is no money from the... comin' from the Governor's Office, this program would not occur."

Black: "All right. And the pilot program must occur in Cook County?"

Dart: "Correct."

Black: "Okay."

Dart: "It was because the sheriff there wanted to do it. If there's other sheriffs who are interested in doing things like this, the people would be very happy to entertain that."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. Representative, I appreciate your honest answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I have no quarrel with what the Sponsor is attempting to do, in fact, I voted for a very similar Bill last year. It didn't have the... maybe the cost factor wasn't clear. And let me explain to you why I can't vote for this Bill. It is nothing against the Sponsor. It's certainly not against the concept of the Bill. I think most of us support the concept. I have two, or excuse me, I have one correctional center in my district. The staff does an excellent job. I'm not criticizing the budget process. I'm certainly not criticizing the Department of Corrections. They've been a very good neighbor to my district for almost 20 years. But I am doing what some correctional officers who work at the Danville Correctional Center have asked me to do and they

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

asked me not to support any legislation that may impact the Department of Corrections' budget until or unless they see some increases in budgets which means which can translate into an increase in staff. The correctional center Danville originally opened to hold about 900 inmates. Tt. now holds almost 2,000 and yet the number of correctional officers has not increased. That's not fair. That's not fair to the correctional officers. It's not fair to the, I might add, although I'm not sure no one's gonna shed a tear, it's not fair to the inmates. It's not fair to the community that was told they would be a good neighbor. And let me emphasize, they have been a very good neighbor. fear is the Department of Corrections' tightening and I can't in good conscience and I will not in good conscience vote for anything that may shift money away from what I think is the top priority other than building new facilities to meet the ever increasing demand and that top priority should be adding staff to those institutions that are already operating, already underway. This is a good idea, a good Sponsor. Under normal conditions I would vote for it, but to the correctional officers that staff the Danville Correctional Center, I have heard you. Your message has come through to me loud and clear. I will not vote for anything until we see our way clear to increase the Department's budget to add correctional officers to the staff of the Department of Corrections so they can do their job, do it well and do it safely. That is the reason I'll vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Durkin: "Representative Dart, who designates which offenders will qualify under this program?"

Dart: "This would be something that'd be an alternative that would be allowed... The State's Attorneys Office would make the designation. It'd go in front of the court. The Department of Correction also has to sign off on this. This is something that Sheriff Sheahan and I believe that I talked to you about this, has been trying to push for a while now as an alternative to deal with the growing female population."

Durkin: "All right. Well, I'm just trying to figure out how this is gonna work. You're gonna have... First of all, who will qualify... what types of offenders would qualify?"

Dart: "Well, I'm..."

Durkin: "What would he have to be convicted of or what can they not be convicted of to qualify?"

Dart: "Who would qualify? I can give you a list right here. The persons who would qualify for this program here would be those individuals who have not been convicted of a violent crime as defined in the statute and I can run down that list, it's a long one there. But in addition to that, people who cannot go into the program, people who are convicted of Class X felonies, first or second degree murder, armed violence, aggravated kidnapping, criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual abuse, or subsequent conviction for criminal sexual abuse, forceable detention or..."

Durkin: "Okay. I... I mean, I think right now isn't there presently a program called TASC, T-A-S-C, which is a treatment alternative for individuals who are, as opposed to being incarcerated, they are sent off to treatment facilities for nonviolent crimes? How does this differ

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

from that program?"

Dart: "This is..."

Durkin: "If you are familiar that, Tom?"

Dart: "Oh, yeah. This is vastly different than that because what this does is this would bring to bear, at one location, almost in a dormitory like setting, a incredibly unique and focused approach to dealing with women as opposed to dealing with men in the prison by providing them with all the different services that..."

Durkin: "Well, TASC is men and women. I don't understand."

Dart: "Yeah. No, but my point is, is that this is not for men and women. This is just for women and this program here brings together all different things that, frankly, they've been talkin' about this around the country and they have not really pulled it together yet. But this is unique in the sense that it's focused on women which, as it turns out, is our number one problem here and it goes beyond anything TASC talks about now. They do a phenomenal job on the things they deal with. This would be a much more holistic approach, dealing with the woman inmate from beginning to the end. Yeah."

Durkin: "That's a big word. All right. Tom, let me just see how this is gonna work. You're gonna have a person who the state's attorney thinks is someone who would qualify. Would this be the sentence... would this be in part of the mittimus or the order from the court at the time of sentencing that this person is to be, ya know, treated and sent into this type of program or is this something which we are gonna leave strictly to the hands of the sheriff or the Department of Corrections to make that decision?"

Dart: "Jim, it'd be absolutely identical to the boot camp program right now. The exact same process that goes on right now

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

for an individual who wants to go into the boot camp, this would be the same process as that. We put it in the same Section so it would somewhat mirror it as far as what... for the very questions you're asking. So, we didn't set this new, very confusing bureaucracy and how it would work, we tried to have it mirror that."

Durkin: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Dart: "Thanks, Jim."

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

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill, as I say, is a very important Bill that could take our first step in dealing with one of the largest problems that we have right now which is our exploding population of women coming into the prison system. And sympathize with one of the previous speaker's remarks about the staffing levels. I have a Bill right now, it's on Second Reading. It wasn't able to make it into my five Bills. It's House Bill 3013 which would mandate staffing levels for the prison system based on the type of prison, the type of people in the prison, and the different needs of it. I've been pushing that because much like it was mentioned earlier I went and visited Danville prison along with about 19 other ones and that was by far the number one complaint and I think it's horrific that some of these individuals are in that situation where they put their life on the line every single day. This, though, what it's attempting to do is try to deflect some of the people who would already be going to prison anyways, but it would just be putting 'em in an area where actually in the end it will save the state money because we'll be doing it at a substantial savings down the road. It's a small pilot

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

It's only targeting a hundred people the first year. It's a very smart investment. As I say, I cannot emphasize enough when the previous speaker talked about the staffing problems, that is the number one problem. people talk about our problems in the prison system right that's it. This would not overwhelm the prison system, this would not magnify that problem in my opinion. However, this would go after the one exploding population segment we have right now and we are not dealing with them. The recidivism rate is horrible and we also have to start talking about their children. When women get involved with the prison system like this, the numbers are showing that they also bring with them a lot of children who are then put in substitute care. This would take women into this unique setting and get them into programs where we will not see them again in our system. They'd be productive members of society and their children as well. So, I think this would be a very smart Bill that we could get moving along now. As I say, it's a very small Bill. I appreciate the previous speaker's remarks, but I think this is something that would make a tremendous difference when we're dealing with women in our system right now and for the entire state. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1961?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1961, there are 95 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 646, Representative

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Lindner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 646, a Bill for an Act with regard to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the School Code and the portion that concerns student discipline policies and the Parent-Teacher Advisory Committee. It was brought to me by a constituent who reported a child that was talking about killing people and writing about that also. He didn't feel there were procedures so that the child could get help or so that other children in the school would remain safe. I've worked with Members of the Education Committee on the language to address their concerns and Amendment #5 becomes the Bill."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, is there any... I'll defer to your legal expertise. Is there any place in the <u>Illinois Revised</u>

<u>Statutes</u> where there's a definition of 'bullying'?"

Lindner: "No."

Black: "So, a school board has to come up with a policy to... let me get the exact language here... if I can find it, there's so many Amendments on this Bill. What's that language? Okay. The school board in consultation with the Parent Advisory Committee, so forth and so on, where is that Amendment? Never can find it when I want to."

Lindner: "I have it here if you'd like to see it."

Black: "Okay. Oh, here it is. The school board in consultation with the Parent-teacher advisory committee and other

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

groups, et cetera, must include provisions in the student discipline policy to address students who have demonstrated behaviors that put them at risk for aggressive behavior including without limitation, bullying as defined in the policy. So, there's no legal definition of bullying, but a school board is gonna have to write a policy to include remedial measures for someone who is bullying. How are they to do that?"

Lindner: "The school board in consultation with the Parent-advisory committee or anyone other community organizations that they'd like to include in that. The Chicago School District now has a policy on that and they define it as, 'the use of coercion, threats, force, or intimidation against another student.' So, they haven't had a hard time defining it and I don't think that other school boards would either. And I'd like to leave that up to the local school boards."

Black: "So, what we might be into here is... there is no definition of 'bullying', but I know it if I see it. Is that gonna be the policy?"

Lindner: "I think people do know it when they see it. I'd like to just read a portion from Bob Green's column here about somebody who witnessed bullying. He said, 'Whenever our teacher had to leave the room, five or six of the biggest and toughest guys would start pounding on their desks with their fists. They would chant, stupid David. They would pound their fists harder and faster on their desks. Suddenly, they would stop. They would all jump up and run over and start punching him. At least, three punches from each of them. Some days they would lift him up along with his desk and drop him about four feet, of course, after punching him. I'm not proud to say this, I witnessed it.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

What did David do? He tried not to cry. He'd duck his head, he'd try to reason with them. He asked them, 'Guys, please stop, please.' Some days he did cry. The rest of us were scared and we just tried to remain invisible. Everyone knew you couldn't tell them because then they would get you after school.' I would call that bullying."

Black: "To me it sounds like a normal day on the floor of the Illinois House of Representatives. I..."

Lindner: "Well, you know, some Representatives have said to me,

'What are we doing here? Are we getting soft? I went

through this when I grew up. What's happening? These

things happen on the playground all the time.' But in

talking with other Representatives like Beth Coulson she

said she witnessed this when she was younger, but there

were two big guys holding a little guy and they were

punching him. The difference is now that people use knives

and guns."

Black: "Well, I can tell by the pitch and tenor of your voice it's gotten a little louder. I think you're bullying me. I..."

Lindner: "I think..."

Black: "Representative, I don't want to make light of what is obviously a serious problem. There isn't any question about it. I taught school for a number of years. We've all gone through the school process. We know how cruel children can be. I guess my only concern is, how in the world is a school going to enforce this policy? I mean, how are they going to be able to do this?"

Lindner: "Well, again that is up to the school board as to what kind of penalties they want to put on it. But as the... I heard the person from the Chicago School Board on the radio this morning and she said students have rights, but they

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

have to know when their conduct runs afoul of the school policy. So, you... I think we all believe in local control here and that the local school board should decide these things."

Black: "Ah hah."

Lindner: "So, that's what the Bill does."

Black: "Ah hah. Now, that's my point. Do we need a State Law discussing this when in fact if any school board thought and it is and can be and probably continues to be a problem, do we need a State Law or isn't this something that any school board who wanted to address this could do so right now?"

Lindner: "They could address it, but there's nowhere in the whole School Code that talks about this and we have all been very concerned with student... school safety lately. We had school safety grants last year, but those are grants that schools have to apply for and there's nothing in the School Code that says schools have to have a policy. And as I said, with my constituent bringing that to me, he was concerned because procedures weren't in place and he felt that the students were in jeopardy."

Black: "All right. But I don't understand..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black, this is on Short Debate. Bring your remarks to a close."

Black: "Well, I know when I've been bullied, Mr. Speaker. You've just bullied me and I'm just gonna sit down. I'm not gonna take it anymore."

Speaker Hartke: "And you're opposed to the Bill. Representative Klingler, do you stand in support of the Bill? Okay. Then we'll go to close."

Klingler: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. I have been a school board member and I

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

remember sitting in disciplinary committees and it was always situations in where there was something very serious that had happened, when there had been injuries that had occurred to a student or to a teacher or to someone at the school. And we've all heard the tragic stories of violence in schools, of people being killed or injured by bullets, by knives and I think, it's important that and I commend the Sponsor for her work on this, that we set up a school board simply responding to a situation once there has been an injury or violent action, that we look at underlying behavior, we look at inappropriate aggressive behavior, we look at inappropriate bullying be, via it on the playground or the classroom or the halls. And if we can find some way to begin counseling with these students, to help these students meet with people that may help them understand their problems, maybe the school may under... discover underlying problems at home that could be addressed with social workers. There are any number of things we can do ahead of time to be proactive in preventing violence in the school. And I do support this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner to close."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank the Members of the Education Committee for their good suggestions that made this a better Bill. And I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 646?' 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 646, there are 90 Members voting 'yes', 10 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 211, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 211, a Bill for Act concerning privacy.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates the Privacy Protection Act. And what it does, it prohibits the constitutional officer or a state agency under a constitutional officer from selling personal information regarding Illinois citizens for commercial solicitation purposes without the written consent of each person whose information will be sold. Presently, the Secretary of State's Office has administrative policy in place that prohibits sharing or disseminating a driver's personal identifying information, however, no statutory mandate exists. The proponents were AARP. We didn't have any opposition in committee and it passed committee unanimously. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield. This Bill is on Short

Debate."

Feigenholtz: "He said, no. Jack, I just have a couple questions for you..."

Franks: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: " ... being your suitemate and all. Do..."

Franks: "And the Sponsor of the Bill, Sara."

Feigenholtz: "Well, I know, but I still have questions. There were some questions I had earlier. There's provisions in this Bill for people to opt in, then there were people

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

opting out. Can you tell me, if I purchase access to a database from another state to access information if I'm a police department, for instance, do I still have information available?"

Franks: "Oh, yeah. This is for commercial purposes."

Feigenholtz: "So, a database company... If I, as the consumer, call in and say, I wanna... I have to affirmatively come forward and say, 'I want off the list.'"

Franks: "Correct. Now, there has been some discussion when this gets to the Senate that they want to amend this to do an opt in and if they did, I wouldn't object."

Feigenholtz: "You would not object to that?"

Franks: "Right. I just want to make it... I just want to let people have the opportunity to keep their private information private."

Feigenholtz: "Potentially, when the Senate gets done with it, we may have to call... if we want to be on a list, we'd have to call in."

Franks: "Correctly... correct."

Feigenholtz: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, I just have one question. It's not to the merits of the Bill at all. We have some notes on our file that you had agreed to hold this Bill on Second Reading until there was an Amendment that was being drafted by an individual that would address some concerns that some committee Members addressed during your presentation of this Bill in committee. Are we mistaken?"

Franks: "No. We talked about that and I held it and we put it

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

back from Third to Second. I talked to the individuals who were interested in it. They've agreed that when it passes the House that they'd talk to the Senate Sponsors and do an opt in provision instead of an opt out and I said that's not a problem."

Black: "All right. So, it's your understanding that you have satisfied and kept your part of the... Okay. That's fine.

Let me ask you a question concerning the Secretary of State who is a... that office, is a large collector of data and insurance companies often must access that data to rate drivers for insurance purposes, et cetera."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black, please bring your remarks to a close."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, how much time was I given?"

Speaker Hartke: "Two minutes."

Black: "Oh, all right. That is often sold commercially. Now, how does this Bill impact that particular practice that has gone on for years and years and years?"

Franks: "Actually, when it's been sold, it's my understanding, that what they've been giving is just the copying charges and whatever it costs for the secretarial and managerial time to put together these lists. This Bill would actually require that a commercial value be put towards it. So actually, I believe, the Secretary of State would get more money out of this issue."

Black: "Okay. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Because of some of the ramifications this Bill may have on the insurance industry which could affect premium rates, I'm joined by the requisite number of people on my side of the aisle to take the Bill off Short Debate. I think there may be one or two Members that simply have some questions.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

It's not a tactic to try and defeat the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Proceed. Do you have more further questions?"

Black: "No. I'll defer to somebody who came down and whispered in my ear. I don't even know who did it."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Osmond: "Representative Franks, that's my only concern about it, is that, you know, we use the statis (sic-statistics)... the motor vehicle reports for tickets and other violations on there and I am concerned what's gonna happen. Will that be prohibited from getting that because it is gathered commercially? Most of the insurance companies subscribe to one or more of the data gathering sections and it's a vital tool for underwriting and pricing. Explain to me again how that would work."

Franks: "You know, Tim, that's a good question and maybe we should address that on the Senate side since they're gonna be changing on the opt in and that's something I'd agree to as well. I think you're making a very valid point."

Osmond: "I don't have any problem..."

Franks: "It's also a question of public safety."

Osmond: "I don't have a problem with it, but I just wondered if you'd addressed it, that's all."

Franks: "No, I hadn't specifically, but I think if we need to, let's do it on the Senate side, 'cause I think you make a good point."

Osmond: "All right. Thank you."

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

Franks: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill 211?' 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 211, there are 99 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2098, Representative Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2098, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2098 is a Bill that was... is an issue that was brought to me by the State Police District 14 in my district regarding Operation Cool. It's a program that is designed to encourage seatbelt usage among high school students. It is a unique program and is the only... it is one of only... is one of the only ones in the nation that is a cooperative agreement or cooperative arrangement between state, county, and municipal enforcement and local private business interests. House Bill 2098, with the Amendment on it, provides for a \$5 surcharge to be imposed on fines for seatbelt violation. That \$5 surcharge would be used to fund a seatbelt compliance program specifically those oriented to high school student programs or programs to encourage high school students to comply with the seatbelt law. I request passage of this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2098?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2098, there are 92 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3098, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3098, a Bill for an Act concerning meetings of public bodies. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Dart."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3098 is an attempt to try to do something that's long overdue. What it is an attempt to do is to put somewhat of more teeth into the Open Meetings Act. What it does is, it would require a verbatim transcript of meetings that are held in closed session, whether they call 'em executive session or whatever it is. This Bill has been precipitated by stories, frankly, from throughout the state. One of 'em was right on the border of my district, frankly, with the Dixmoor Park District which took hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars. It's been estimated at a bottom, with \$600 thousand, it could go much higher. There was money it was supposed to go to a park in the area that never made it there. Instead, people bought squad cars and guns and badges and every other thing. All these meetings that allowed this to occur were done in a closed session, nobody knew about 'em, no one was able to find out what was going on and no one was able try to correct it. There was other instances as well throughout the state. I have a list of other stories as well, one after another. And it brings to light the fact that when people are doing public

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

business in a closed session, we have to make sure they are, in fact, doing what they're supposed to be doing. law's pretty clear on that, but yet it has not been occurring the way it should be. What this Bill would do though, is by having this requirement of transcript, this would encourage people to make sure that they're conducting the business they're supposed to be The way the Bill is written it doing at that stage. requires that the verbatim transcripts kept, does not require that it is divulged. The only time it's looked at is, frankly, if there is a lawsuit pending, it would be inspected in camera by the court which would mean nobody else but the judge would be looking at it. In addition to that, the only way it would be released would either be, pursuant to a court order which would be from the lawsuit an individual public body decided on their own they if wished to release this. The reality of it is between that and Amendment we put on which dealt with the schools 'cause the schools are somewhat concerned about. some confidentiality laws which I, frankly, thought were covered anyways, but to assure them we put an Amendment on to that the confidentiality laws would be insure them maintained at all times. This Bill would insure that the only information that got out would be the ones where they... where there was a violation of the Act. I've had discussions with Representative Kosel, as well, about insuring that there would be the ability for ... if the public body wished to divulge some information, whatever the reason may be, they'd be able to do it in an edited fashion so that they could somewhat edit out remarks that they did not wish to make public. I have been working with a lot of different groups on this. I feel confident

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

that we have a Bill that is a very good piece of legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "This Bill's on Short Debate. We will hear one person in response and one person in favor. The Chair recognizes Representative Franks. Are you in support of the Bill?"

Franks: "Yeah. Representative... I don't spend enough..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "I don't spend enough time with ya. I wanted to ask these questions. What is the cost of keeping a verbatim record of the closed public meeting?"

Dart: "The cost would be minimal if that's... It would merely come down to the purchase of a hand-held tape recorder. So it would be next to nothing and the storage requirements would be also next to nothing."

Franks: "You could use a video tape or a court reporter if you chose to do so?"

Dart: "Correct. Correct."

Franks: "Okay. Now, would these closed session minutes, would they remain in the possession of the public body?"

Dart: "Yeah. The public body would maintain control of them at all times so that there would be no ability for them to be leaked out under any situation. As I say, other... the only time they would come out would be if either the public body themselves decided to do it or if it was pursuant to a suit that was brought and they were found to be in violation of the Act."

Franks: "So, they would not be available for public inspection?"

Dart: "No, they would not."

Franks: "Now, if anyone was to review these tapes, under what circumstance would that occur?"

Dart: "That would be pursuant to the public body deciding in

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

their biannual requirement to review tapes if whether or not they wish to release any information. It would be up to them whether or not they wanted to and frankly, at that point, what they wanted to release, as well. So, that'd be the primary way in which that would be given out."

Franks: "And it would be viewed only by a judge in chambers, I presume?"

Dart: "That would be the other option. There'd be two of 'em: one at the public body wanted out and the other would be if there was this lawsuit pending and in that situation, just as you mentioned, it would be an in camera inspection by the court and only the court at that point in time."

Franks: "Now, would this Bill... would that supersede the privacy or confidentiality provisions of any other State or Federal Law?"

Dart: "No. No, as a matter of fact we made it crystal clear...

Oh, don't we... We would... That's why we put the Amendment on there to insure that this was crystal clear that the confidentiality laws that were in existence would not be superseded."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Dart. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Franks: "I think this is a Bill whose time has come. The public deserves to know what goes on in these meetings if it's necessary and plus, there's absolute safeguards here that are built in and we need to do this to protect our communities and also the public bodies themselves. So, I encourage everyone to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hartke: "There are six people seeking recognition. I will recognize one in opposition to the Bill.

Representative Kosel, do you stand in opposition?"

Kosel: "Mr. Speaker, I would like some more information about it.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

We spoke with the Sponsor and I think there are some points that need clarification."

Speaker Hartke: "Does anyone else stand in opposition to the Bill? Representative Wirsing, Turner, or Mitchell. Representative Kosel, I will allow you to address the Bill."

Kosel: "We spoke before. This does not change the reviewing
 requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Is that correct,
 Representative?"

Dart: "Could you repeat the question, please?"

Kosel: "This particular piece of legislation does not change any of the reviewing procedures that are already in place with the Open Meetings Act?"

Dart: "No, those stay exactly as they are now."

Kosel: "All right. So, closed meetings set minutes would still
 have to be reviewed periodically for release?"

Dart: "Absolutely."

Kosel: "I think you've gone a long way to try and make this very economical. My concern was which I spoke to you about before was that as someone goes to review their minutes and wants to release them, I think that we have to let them know since there were no rules involved with this particular piece of legislation that they can do that in an anecdotal form as opposed to a actual verbatim form. And what I would suggest is that you amend that language onto the Bill when it gets to the Senate and would request that you do that."

Dart: "Yeah. The point you brought up was very well-taken earlier and we talked at length about that, that there does seem to be some degree of ambiguity where, frankly, a lawyer on either side could say, it does require this or it doesn't require that. And I'd be happy to amend that in

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the Senate to insure that, because you and I, when we spoke about this, we were both in agreement. Ultimately, what we want to have happen we are on the same page. So if we need to clarify that, I'm very much for that."

Kosel: "Yeah and I think that that will do it because I think it will save lots of money in legal fees for the very small library boards or school boards, so that they understand that they can do that and I think it's possible. And I'd be glad to work with you to do that. Thank you."

Dart: "Definitely. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Dart to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Dart: House. Т appreciate the questions and comments on this Bill. There has been a lot of work done on this. As I say, the net effect of this you might not be able to see or read about on a daily basis, but what this will do is it'll that when public bodies are discussing public affairs that it is done in an open fashion. And for those limited exceptions where there is closed sessions that are allowed and warranted, that they're discussing just that and only that. This is not meant to be something for lawyers. is meant so that the bodies know that when they're discussing matters of the public they'll be out in public doing that. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3098?' 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 3098, there are 91 Members voting 'yes', 10 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

passed. For what reason does Mr. Turner seek recognition?"

Turner, J.: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on to speak

in the last Bill and I forgot to turn it off."

Speaker Hartke: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 4, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 403, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1710, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1926, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2523, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3184, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3194, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3292."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary request."

Speaker Hartke: "State your parliamentary inquiry."

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much. Pursuant to Rule 49, I'm joined by five Members of my side of the aisle to request a recorded vote on a Motion to Discharge House Bill 57 from further consideration by the House Rules Committee. By the way, when they meet, is that an open meeting otherwise, I'm gonna request a tape recorded... Oh, we... I am sorry. We forgot to put the General Assembly in that Bill. Doggone it, I'm sorry. This Motion has been filed in writing and is on the House Calendar... no, it is not on the House Calendar, but it's filed in writing. I would ask that this Bill be discharged pursuant to Rule 18(g) and again ask for a recorded vote on our Motion pursuant to the House Rules."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm shocked."

Speaker Hartke: "And the Motion is denied."

Black: "I... Since the Majority Leader has denied our request for justice, truth, and the American way and it's the Motion that is in full accordance with House Rules, we respectfully ask for a recorded vote on a Motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair and to, pursuant to Rule 57(a), and ask for a recorded vote under the rights embodied in Rule 49. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that eliminates the state sales tax..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is..."

Black: " ... on gasoline. I..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the..."

Black: "Well, just remember when it hits \$3 a gallon this summer."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?

All those in favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 48 Members voting 'yes', 52 Members voting 'no'. And the Chair is sustained. House Bill 843, Representative Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 843, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill addresses compliance with the federal Act that goes into effect on August of 2001. Currently, municipalities tax wireless phones on the basis of three different alternatives. In response to that, the Federal Government is trying to bring uniformity to that system.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

They have passed that Act at the federal level. This Bill will bring us into compliance with that federal Act. It will establish one location where all wireless phones are to be taxed and that would be at the place of origin. So, it would bring uniformity to the system. There is no opposition. And I would answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Hartke: "This Bill's on Short Debate. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Kurt, do you have any more Bills tonight?"

Granberg: "I hope not."

Bost: "Me, too. You're not gonna... keep that voice."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, this is a Bill to bring us in compliance with a relatively new Federal Law, you said that. Does it have anything to do with the recent court decision that municipalities were extending the... oh, the memory. You know, they can collect a right-of-way tax on hard wire and I think some were extending that to cellular towers and I don't know whether it was the State Supreme Court or a Federal Supreme Court, but it was a recent ruling that municipalities cannot do that and it's gonna cost some cities money. And I noticed that the federal Act has to do with how sales and use taxes are handled on wireless communication. The question is, does it give cities or

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

states any new taxing authority on wireless communication?"

Granberg: "No, there would be uniformity. Some might win it on a marginal basis, some might lose, but it would make the system applicable unit to be uniform all across the state. So, there'd be no new taxing authority."

Black: "And so, if he gives no new taxing authority to states or to any local government on the wireless industry?"

Granberg: "No."

Black: "All right."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Black: "So, fine. Thank you very much."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Black."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 843?' 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 843, there were 95 Members voting 'yes', 5 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1921, Representative Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Okay. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Yes. I would have voted... my speaker malfunctioned. I would have voted 'yes' on that Bill."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1921, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1921 is a Bill that I think improves a piece of legislation that Representative Mautino passed last year in which it allowed nonhome rule

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

municipalities to impose a sales tax after a referendum of the residents in the municipality. This particular Bill allows that sales tax to be increased in quarter percent increments rather than the full one half percent that was authorized within the legislation and it also allows that sales tax increase to be used for property tax relief. That means that it, the original Bill, had that it was to be used for infrastructure improvement and now the Bill can be used to devote some of that money to property tax relief. This is an important issue in a community within my district that in the event that they take an issue like this to the voters and the voters do approve an increase in their sales tax and I emphasize that it has to be an incre... or has to be approved by the voters by referendum. This community does have one of the highest tax rates in the State of Illinois. This will allow that community to offset some of that tax rate and reduce the levy in that community by virtue of this possible use of the sales tax. I would be glad to answer any questions."

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

Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mautino: "Sponsor, this... I'm sorry. Mr. Myers, this simply reduces the amount that can be gone for in referendum from half percent down to a quarter of a percent, so it's actually a tax reduction?"

Myers: "It could..."

Mautino: "From the sales tax."

Myers: "Yes. It could be a tax reduction."

Mautino: "Okay."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Myers: "I think your initial legislation authorized a maximum of a half a percent and it could be... it had to be taken at a half a percent."

Mautino: "Correct. And this will also allow it to be used for property tax relief as well. These are some of the things that we wanted to do originally with the Bill and I just thank you for bringing it forward. I support that legislation and would simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Myers: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Myers asks the approval of House Bill 1921. All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 59 Members voting 'yes', 40 Members voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. And Mr. Myers, what is your wish?"

Myers: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman requests Postponed Consideration.

What is the status of House Bill 2437? Representative

Brosnahan."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2437 has been read a second time, previously. There's been a Motion filed to table Amendment #2 by Representative Brosnahan."

Speaker Hartke: "Motion to Table has been heard. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of tabling House Amendment #2 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 103 Members to table House Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Brosnahan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1
  was a Committee Amendment, it became the Bill. Amendment
  #3 adds some clarifying language. It also changes two
  dates. This language in Amendment #3 was requested by the
  Department of Human Services. This is an Agreed Bill. And
  I'll be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2437?' 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 2527. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2527, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental protection. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee... Committee Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 1969. Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 2110. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2110, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education student assistance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 632, Representative Coulson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 632, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson. Representative Coulson.

Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a hyphenated cosponsor on the Bill.

With leave of the Body could I present the Amendment for Representative Coulson?"

Speaker Hartke: "You may present the Amendment."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your kindness. Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. language encompasses Amendment 1 and makes additional It changes the definition of 'newborn infant', a changes. 'newborn infant' is a child a licensed physician reasonably believes is 72 hours old or less at the time The original Bill defined a 'newborn relinguishment. infant' as one 30 days old or less. It changes Section 15 by deleting language allowing a person who is not the newborn infant's parent or legal guardian, but relinquished the infant with the knowledge and permission of a parent. There is a presumption that only a newborn infant's biological parent may relinquish. It further goes on and adds to Section 20 by requiring a fire station or emergency medical facility to inform the parent of the name and location of the hospital to which the infant transported if the parent of a newborn infant returns to reclaim the child within 72 hours after relinquishing the infant. There are several other changes of a technical nature that the Amendment adds. I'll be glad to answer any questions that you might have."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Flowers: "Representative Black, would you read that again, please, a little slower?"

Black: "Sure. What do you want me to read?"

Flowers: "Okay. Tell me how do I relinquish a child. Tell me what the age of a newborn is again. Just start all over again, please."

Black: "All right. Representative, with your permission, can I defer to Representative Coulson, who has worked on the Bill, now that she's out of her meeting?"

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was there a question asked or..."

Flowers: "Yes, Representative."

Coulson: "Okay."

Flowers: "You and I discussed this Amendment last night..."

Coulson: "Yes."

Flowers: "...and part of the discussion was... I'm trying to pull up the Amendment, so please... Part... I'm... I'll shoot from the top of my head. Part of the discussion was, if you have a baby in the hospital and walk away and leave that child that's one thing, and if you have a baby in the back in the corner in the dark in the alley and have... and leave it at the door of a hospital that's another thing. My question to you, as you and I discussed last night, that woman that had the baby in the safety of a hospital will be charged with a crime, but the woman who had the baby in the dark in a corner in the alley and dropped the baby off at the hospital door will not be charged with a crime. Is

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

that still in your Bill?"

Coulson: "It's not in the Bill that the baby who is delivered in the hospital and the mother would be charged with a crime.

That is a possibility by current law. What my legislation does is provide for a baby to be safely delivered to a hospital or a fire station so that we can save that baby's life."

Flowers: "Representative, I understand what the intent of your legislation is. I refer to your legislation as the 'Baby Moses' legislation because Moses' mother loved her child so that she was willing to give it up in order to save that child's life, but she knew exactly where she was sending the baby to. My question to you is, if I have my baby in the hospital and get up, put on my clothes, and walk out the door. I don't want to tell you anything. I don't want to tell you that I'm walking away. I'm not going to tell you that I want to give the baby up for adoption. I want to leave the baby and walk away. You're telling me that I will be charged with a crime. There's a possibility. But you and I both know, from discussion last night, that I will be charged with baby abandonment. But..."

Coulson: "Let me just clarify that."

Flowers: "I can be the same woman, have a different baby, at a different time, at a different location, not in the safety of the hospital, and as I told you last night, you did not support my midwifery Bill. But I can have my baby at home without the protection of a doctor, without the protection or the safety of the environment and deliver my baby to a cold doorstep, and then that child... I won't be charged with a crime. Because your concern is the safety of the child. It's not your concern, the safety of the child of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the woman who left her baby in the hospital. Why is there a difference?"

Coulson: "In this Bill we are concerned with the safety of the child. I am happy to work on that issue, as I mentioned to you in committee, in another Bill, in another time."

Flowers: "We are making criminals."

Coulson: "As far as the mother being... I am happy to work on that with you, Mary. I'm very happy to work on... It doesn't belong in this Bill."

Flowers: "If you pass... No. If you pass this Bill, Representative, we are making criminals out of women who want to do the same thing that that woman did when she left her baby at the doorstep of the hospital, at the doorstep of the police station. And so, I was hoping that you would either amend your Bill to not make criminals out of the women who want to walk away from their babies in the hospital. Is that the intent of your legislation?"

Coulson: "We are not making criminals out of anyone."

Flowers: "It is..."

Coulson: "We are not changing that..."

Flowers: "...part of the law. So, it is... So, that means...

So, the women who leave their babies in the hospital, they will be made criminals, but the women who leave their babies at the doorstep, they will not?"

Coulson: "Mary, we are not making anyone criminals. We are saving babies."

Flowers: "The women that leave... Let me ask you this question.

The women that leave their babies at the doorstep of the hospitals will not be made criminals, but the women who walk away and leave their babies in the hospitals, they will be charged with a crime?"

Coulson: "No, Mary, I cannot agree with you on that, and I will

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

not concede that point."

Flowers: "Well, what the does the law says on that?"

Coulson: "As I said before, the law states that if a mother who has her baby in a hospital is not covered by this Bill. It is covered by current law."

Flowers: "So therefore, you have created that the women who have their babies in the hospital is not covered by this Bill.

So, that's what your legislation does."

Coulson: "They are not covered by this Bill."

Flowers: "So, you carved those women out."

Coulson: "They are not covered by this Bill, and I'm happy to...

I am happy to work on that issue with you, in another Bill.

Those women do not belong in this Bill. We're talking about saving babies."

Flowers: "Why not? So, the women who leave their babies in the hospital their babies are not worthy of being saved?"

Coulson: "Their babies are already safe."

Flowers: "They have walked away and left their babies in the hospital. Why are you going after these women and want to charge them with a crime? Why did you carve them out?"

Coulson: "Mary, I am not going to go after them, and I don't believe the State's Attorneys Office would go after them.

And I've had conversations with the State's Attorneys Office, and they say that it would be dependent on the case. Ninety percent of the time, they would not go after that woman who left her baby safely at the hospital. The issue here is to save the babies."

Flowers: "So, it's up to the state's attorney to use their discretion on those women, but more specifically, once again the women that leave their babies at the doorstep, by the fire department, they can just drop their babies off and walk away scot-free. Are there any counseling for

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

these women? Is there any counseling for these women who will have the liberty of just leaving their babies at the doorstep?"

Coulson: "Yes."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Coulson, you and I have worked a long time on this Bill. Sure seems that way, doesn't it? I have a... Based on some of the comments of the previous speaker, I have a couple of questions for you that we spoke I understand what in committee last night. Representative Flowers is getting at. I understand what Representative Flowers is getting at. I think that we tried to remedy a problem, and masterfully, we're able to separate these two groups of babies. One, the larger subset are a group of women who have always been going into a hospital, delivering a baby, and their identity is known. And in this Bill nothing stipulates any change for those women they still are under the burden of an affirmative defense. Correct?"

Coulson: "Correct."

Feigenholtz: "So, what you're trying to do in this Bill is create a subset of those women, women who do not feel comfortable going into a hospital, for whatever reason, because they don't want to give up their identity, a smaller group of those women. Am I correct?"

Coulson: "Yes, that's right."

Feigenholtz: "Because they won't deliver in a hospital because they don't want their identity known."

Coulson: "For whatever reason."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Feigenholtz: "Okay. So, the previous speaker has a legitimate, on some level, a legitimate point is... The women in the larger group are actually divulging their identity, but they have a greater burden falling upon them than the subset."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson to close."
- Coulson: "I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment. The purpose here is to save babies' lives. That is all we're trying to do here. The other issues are superfluous. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor
  Amendment #2 to House Bill 632?' All those in favor
  signify by saying 'yes'; 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 1969, Representative Giles. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1969, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 403, Representative Jones. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative John Jones, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jones."
- Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3, amended by replacing Subsection (d)."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Amendment #2, Mr. Jones. Amendment #2."

Jones, J.: "Table Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative John Jones."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 amends the House Bill 403, as amended, by replacing Subsection (d), of Section 24-3.1, of Section 105, with the following: A unit of local government, including a home rule unit, may not regulate the acquisition, possession, transportation, storage, purchase, sale, or any other dealing, in rifles and shotguns and may not regulate ammunition, components, and accessories, for rifles and shotguns in a manner inconsistent with Subsection (a). This Section is a limitation under Subsection (i), of Section 6, of Article VII, of the Illinois' Constitution on the concurrent exercised by home rule units of powers and functions, exercised by the state."

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

Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Dart: "Representative, what would be the net affect of this change? Why are we doing that?"

Jones, J.: "We're changing the subsection... limitation under Subsection (i), of Section 6, of the Article VII, of the Illinois' Constitution."

Dart: "And why are we doing that?"

Jones, J.: "This preempts home rule. And that's our purpose for doing it."

Dart: "The Bill as it originally existed did not preempt home

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

rule. Is that correct?"

Jones, J.: "No."

Dart: "Okay. So, it did not before? With this Amendment, it will preempt home rule?"

Jones, J.: "Right."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 403?' 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: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Jones, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is just a technical Amendment by inserting, after dealer, the following: who is not licensed under this Act."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 403?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3015, Representative... Third Reading. Third Reading. House Bill 3015, Representative Rutherford. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3015, a Bill for an Act concerning radiation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rutherford, has been approved for

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "I'd like to withdraw it."

Speaker Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 497, Representative Hamos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 497, a Bill for an Act concerning family leave. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos. You have an Amendment that's been approved for consideration."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This creates a Family
  Leave Act. My intention is not to call this on Third
  Reading. I would just like to move it from Second to
  Third. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #... Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intent to put that Amendment on?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Yes. And I asked if there was any discussion, and no one sought recognition. But you stopped me, so would you like to ask some questions about the Amendment?"
- Parke: "The question is, does she plan on putting that Amendment on?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos, do you plan on adopting the Amendment?"

Hamos: "Yes, I'm asking for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay. That is her intent."

Parke: "Well, I'm not sure. She said, that she wanted to move it

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

to Third. But I needed to know..."

Speaker Hartke: "What does the Amendment do? Explain the Amendment, please."

Hamos: "It creates a paid family leave policy. It's a new approach to talking about family leave. My intention is not to call this Bill on Third Reading. And I'm simply asking for it to be moved, from Second to Third."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "I'm in that 51st state you talked about in Transportation a few weeks ago. I'm in a state of confusion. If I understand the Lady, the Representative, she got up and said, withdraw the Amendment, put the Bill back on Third. Is she adopting the Amendment, or moving the Bill back to Third?"

Speaker Hartke: "Well, that was not her intention."

Black: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Hartke: "She indicated that she wanted to place the Amendment on the Bill. She explained the Amendment."

Black: "She did? I don't think she did, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're confused."

Speaker Hartke: "Then you may ask her a question about the Amendment. It's open for discussion. Representative Hamos, would you explain your Amendment, again?"

Hamos: "Mr. Black, I called this Amendment in committee last week. It was adopted by the committee. And all I'm trying to do is to have it adopted, so I can move it to Third. But my intention is not to call this Bill on Third Reading. My intention is only to move it from Second to Third."

Black: "I'm still confused. You said this has already been adopted by the committee?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Hamos: "It was recommended for adoption by the committee, approved for consideration."

Black: "Okay. So, it's your intent, then, to ask the Body to now approve the Amendment?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Black: "All right. And you further stated, that your intent, if the Bill moves to Third Reading, it will stay on Third Reading..."

Hamos: "Yes."

Black: "You have no intention of calling the Bill?"

Hamos: "No intention to call the Bill?"

Black: "Okay. Would you briefly explain to me, what Floor
Amendment #1 does?"

Hamos: "Amendment #1 creates a new approach to providing paid family leave. It is a voluntary program that businesses could decide to opt into with a cost-shared model for providing family leave. But again, this is part of a national movement to look at possible family-friendly policies. And my intention is not to call this Bill. The only reason I'm moving it from Second to Third is so it could be in our computer, and people could read it during the summer and fall months."

Black: "Representative, I can understand why you would not want to call this Bill. I'm looking at the fiscal note as filed by the Department of Employment Security. I don't want to get into this. I would much prefer, if you have no plans to call the Bill, just let it sit. If you want to add the Amendment I have no choice but to ask for a record vote on the Amendment, simply because of the underlying cost of the Amendment. And I don't want any Member on my side of the aisle to come back to me in a week say, why did you let me be recorded as voting 'yes' for that Amendment? I mean,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

it's your Bill and you, obviously, have the right to do with what you want, but if you want to adopt the Amendment, I will ask the Chair for a record vote on the Amendment."

Hamos: "I will leave it on Second Reading."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 2358, Representative Winters. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2358, a Bill for an Act to create the Local Legacy Act. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Winters, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Please table Amendment 1."

Speaker Hartke: "Table Amendment #1. Withdraw Amendment #1.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Winters, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

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

Amendment 2, basically, shrinks the Bill slightly. It takes it from allowing acquisition money, within this Bill, to be used for acquisition for natural areas, farmland, and historic properties, to simply a planning and inventorying Bill. It does remove the opposition of the realtors. And I would move its adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition... Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, you said this Amendment removes the objection..."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Winters: "Correct."

Parke: "... from the realtors and home builders?"

Winters: "Correct."

Parke: "So, you want to put this Amendment on and then call it on Third, later?"

Winters: "Yes. And they're fine with the Bill, as far as I know."

Parke: "Do you know if anybody else is opposed to this Amendment?"

Winters: "No. I'm not aware of any other opposition. There was significant opposition with it in its original form.

That's what the Amendment is to do."

Parke: "Okay. And you're going to put this Amendment on, and move it to Third, and then we'll discuss it later?"

Winters: "Correct."

Parke: "Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2358?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2228, Representative Johnson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act concerning evidence. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Johnson, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Any others? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes. Amendment #2, basically, shells the Bill, so that we can move it over to the Senate, and continue to work on

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

this. This is a cleanup piece of legislation, recommended by the Governor, concerning a Bill on the possession of evidence in a criminal case that we passed last year. And we need to do cleanup work on this, and so, it's still not ready to go, but we'd like to shell it, put it in my Leader's name, and send it to the Senate. It'll only be worked on over there, as it relates to this particular Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2228?' 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 2204, Representative Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2204, a Bill for an Act relating to certification of school personnel. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mitchell, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is simply technical cleanup language. We had some duplicative language. And LRB has asked us to take that language out, and that's all Amendment #1 does."

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

Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "I apologize. I couldn't hear you."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Mitchell, J.: "Jay, it's a technical cleanup from duplicative language, in Section 21 (b), regarding the subject of endorsements on certificates. It was included twice, in the original draft. LRB notified me of this, and asked if I would eliminate the second of the duplicative sections, and that's what Floor Amendment #1 does."

Hoffman: "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 2204?' 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: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Jerry

  Mitchell, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is a minor change that was an agreed change between the School Management Alliance and the sponsors of the Bill, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, and the Illinois Education Association. And it simply provides that three, rather than two, members of the board, shall be school administrators employed by the..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

  Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this Amendment, is there anybody in opposition to your Bill, now?"
- Mitchell, J.: "The opposition stays the same, Representative Parke. The State Board of Education is opposed and it is the only opponent."

Parke: "Are they against the Bill or against your Amendment?"

Mitchell, J.: "They're against the Bill. They never filed

- 40th Legislative Day

  April 4, 2001

  anything, on the Amendment."
- Mitchell, J.: "Does the Amendment make it better or does the Amendment just stay sort of neutral on any...?"
- Mitchell, J.: "In those school associations that had concerns, it makes it a better... The School Management Alliance is now, at least, neutral on the Bill. I'm not really sure, whether they're in favor. But, they are not opposed any longer."
- Parke: "So, you think the State Board's feeling is neutral on your Amendment, or would they be opposed to your Amendment?"
- Mitchell, J.: "No. I believe the State Board would be neutral on this Amendment, but it will not change their opposition to the Bill, itself."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, you're deleting... your underlying Bill had two members of this new certification board would be parents... a private-sector member, or a parent of a student. You're rolling that back to one member, probably, because you're adding another member from school administration?"

Mitchell, J.: "That's correct."

- Black: "How many members, on the certification board... Well, I'm sorry, that's not in your Amendment. We'll debate it on Third. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2204?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the 'ayes' have it. 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. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Committee Amendment #1, and Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading."

Clerk Rossi: "No."

Speaker Hartke: "There have been notes requested on the Bill.

The Bill will remain on Second Reading. House Bill 241,

Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk... Clerk, the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 241..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers in the chamber? Take that Bill out of the... House Bill 280, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 280. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 would simply... One moment, please... would simply add an effective date, a very minor, technical change. And I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 475, Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 475, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. 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, would you like to present your Amendment? Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. House Bill 546, Representative Mitchell, Bill Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 546, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell."

- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This adds to the Bill.

  This removes the concerns expressed, by the Illinois Bar

  Association, with respect to the causal connection between

  the finding of trace amounts of a controlled substance, and

  satisfying the elements of the finding of involuntary

  manslaughter, and reckless homicide."
- 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 546?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 850, Representative Stroger. Todd Stroger. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 850, a Bill for an Act concerning public labor relations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Stroger, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1, actually, changes the number from 5 to 10. As the committee was told, there was a mistake. They thought the Amendment was already on and it was 10 when they passed it. And we would like to correct that mistake, with this Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Amendment #1 simply increases the minimum number of employees in order to provide or participate in collective bargaining. Excuse me. The underlying Bill had five... it's my understanding, your Amendment goes to 10... takes it up to 10?"

Stroger: "Yes. When I presented the Bill, we thought that the Bill had actually said 10, and I told the Members of the committee that it was 10. And that's what they thought they had passed."

Black: "All right. Okay. You increased it to 10 so it would cover the City of Chicago, I'm sure. Right?"

Stroger: "It will cover the 10 people in my household, yes."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 850?' 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 but several notes have been requested on the Bill that have not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading. House Bill 1722, Representative Davis. Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1722 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment merely changes who will do the reporting to the General Assembly. The original legislation asked that each university, individually, would report to the General Assembly if their enrollment declined 10% or more. But this Bill asks... this was requested by the Board of Higher Ed, that they be the party, or the group that reports to us. So, I just urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Discussion on the Amendment? Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, did the colleges come to you and ask you to put this Amendment on this Bill?"

Davis, M.: "Yes, they did."

Parke: "So, there'd be no opposition to it, then?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

Parke: "Thank you."

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

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1722?' 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 1814, Representative Wait. Ron Wait. Out of the record. House Bill 1975, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1975, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Novak, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Novak: "Has Floor Amendment #2, or Amendment #2 been withdrawn?"

Speaker Hartke: "Approved for consideration."

Novak: "No. Amendment #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Amendment #2 is in Rules."

Novak: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, Floor Amendment #3 becomes the Bill. This is an endeavor for the Secretary of State, Jesse White's special task force, that we convened last year, on mobile home taxation and enforcement. And is simply, as a matter of experience in what occurred during the meetings, they were made up of county treasurers from around the state. They were made up of people that are involved with the industry with respect to the manufacturers, people that own the mobile home

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

parks, and as well as, mobile home owners themselves. And what we found, through our deliberations in our public meetings around the state was that there is an enforcement problem with trying to collect the mobile home privilege taxes on mobile homes when the taxes become delinquent. Currently, the law does not provide for any sale of mobile home privilege taxes in the State of Illinois. You know, if you own a home and you don't pay your property taxes, your taxes are subject to a tax sale pursuant to the statutes, and it's administered by the local county treasurer's office. What this Bill does, simply, is take all the language that's under the Real Estate Tax Code for property tax sales, puts it... transfers it to the Mobile Home Privilege Tax Act in the State of Illinois and allows delinquent mobile home privilege taxes to be sold at a tax sale similar to taxes that are sold on real estate. was the conclusion of all the parties and this is a consensus Bill. And I would be more than happy to entertain and answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Discussions on the Amendment? Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, I have some rather large mobile home associations in my district by O'Hare Airport. And a lady named Terri has been very active in working on this. Has she been in agreement... Do you know if she might be in agreement with this legislation?"

Novak: "Well, Mr. Parke, we have another piece of legislation, that we're working on, about licensing mobile home installations. I believe you're referring to Terri Nelson?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Parke: "Yes."

Novak: "And Terri Nelson lives in Cook County, correct?"

Parke: "Say that again."

Novak: "Most of the mobile homes, in your district, are in Cook County?"

Parke: "They're all in Cook County."

Novak: "They do not pay any mobile home privilege tax."

Parke: "So, this is... Are you saying this does..."

Novak: "This exempts Cook County. Mobile home taxes are not collected on any mobile homes in Cook County."

Parke: "All right. But are the Mobile Home Association of Illinois opposed to this?"

Novak: "No, they're not."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, you and I have discussed this whole issue on occasion, and I don't... I'm not envious of you carrying this Bill. The only question I need to ask you, in the underlying Bill you were creating certain fees, so that these homes were going to be treated somewhat like real estate, when certain transactions were carried out."

Novak: "Right."

Black: "It was my understanding, that because of these fees the American Association of Retired Persons had expressed opposition to the Bill. I don't see anything in Amendment 3 that would mitigate their opposition. Do you?"

Novak: "Mr Black, AARP may have had a problem with the other Bill that I passed out, but I haven't talked to any member of AARP with respect to this Bill. And the fees that you

40th Legislative Day

referred to, are paid by the tax buyers. They are not paid
by the mobile home owner. They are paid by the tax
buyers."

Black: "Well. All right. I'll ask you that again, on Third Reading, because maybe I'm just not reading this correctly, Representative. But it appears that there were some new fees and fee increases. And when we get to Third Reading, maybe we can clarify how those fees are to be paid, but that's not embodied in Amendment #3. I won't bother you with those questions, now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Novak: "Okay. 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 1975?' 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 1814. Representative Wait. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1814 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Wait, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wait."

Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. House Amendment #2 is just a technical Amendment to this Bill. This deals with Crime Victim Compensation Act, establishing emergency fund."

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

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- (sic-Bill) 1814?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Wait, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wait, Amendment #3."
- Wait: "Yes. Amendment #3 is just another technical Amendment, also."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #3?

  Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

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

  1814?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2138, Mr. Hassert.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2138, a Bill for an Act concerning underground utilities facilities damage prevention. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hassert, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hassert."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of General Assembly.

  This amends the Underground Utility Facility Damage

  Prevention Act. It provides a different use of penalties,

  adds some different language, basically, rewrites the Act.

  This is agreed to upon Amendment by all parties. Be happy

  to try and answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2138? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 3128 (sic-2138)?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2139, Representative Osterman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2139 has been read a second time, previously."

Speaker Hartke: "38."

Clerk Rossi: "No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Osterman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, I think it's House Bill 2139.

Representative Osterman, is that the correct Bill?"

Osterman: "2139 is the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "2139. Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment #1 tries to address some of the issues that came up on Third Reading, dealing with employees let... employers letting employees take off on election day. Amendment #1 would exclude businesses, 25 employees or less, and limit businesses from 25 to 100, allowing 2 people off on election day. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, wasn't this a Bill that you put on Postponed Consideration?"

Osterman: "Yes, it was."

Parke: "And this simply just lowers it from what, 50 now... no,

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

from no limit to 25?"

Osterman: "It excludes companies 25 employees or less, and businesses from 25 to 100, would be limited... or could only let 2 people off on election day, if people wanted to, required to."

Parke: "How is a business going to keep track of all of this?

You've got all these stipulations. Are you... Do you have something in there where they're going to have to send mailers out? Are we, in the state, going to send mailers out, so that the businesses know that only one or two can be off, at a time? And it doesn't apply unless it's groups of 25 or more. How are you going to let these employers know?"

Osterman: "I would let the employees... the employers make that decision on their own, if there were two people in a business from 25 to 100, if they wanted to, let them make that decision on their own."

Parke: "Does this Amendment become the bill?"

Osterman: "Yes, it does."

Parke: "Do you have any other Amendments?"

Osterman: "No other Amendments."

Parke: "Okay. I will deal with this when it's on Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your parliamentary inquiry."

Black: "Our file indicates, this Bill lost on Third Reading. The Sponsor put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. I'm not aware of any rule that lets you take a Bill on Postponed Consideration, after a Third Reading defeat, roll a Bill back to Second Reading, and amend the Bill that was

#### 40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

defeated. I mean, I've been here awhile, Mr. Speaker. I don't ever remember this happening. And if you can quote the appropriate rule, I'll stand corrected. But I don't think you can take a Third Reading Bill, that was defeated, put on Postponed, roll it back to Second, and amend the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "The parliamentarian will answer your inquiry."

Black: "Okay."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker, in response to your inquiry, it has been the custom and the practice of the House to allow Bills to be moved from the Order of Postponed Consideration back to Second Reading for an Amendment, and then upon the adoption of the Amendment, or in the case the Amendment is not adopted, the Bill then would next go to the Order of Postponed Consideration for consideration."

Black: "Can you give me an applicable rule? I'm not questioning your interpretation. In my knowledge, and it's certainly... I'm very forgetful, I don't recall this ever happening since I've been here. And if there is a rule that allows it, sobeit. But I... Now, if you could just cite a rule or a case."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Black, in this case what I would cite is the custom and the practice of the House, is something that we've done on many occasions over the past several years."

Black: "Well, I don't remember any such practice, but I'm not in the position... One thing I've learned as I get older, that the parliamentarian always does a good job, and you can always rely on the rule of 60. So, okay, and I... I think many people would join me. I don't remember this ever happening in the years I've been here, but whatever. I

- 40th Legislative Day

  accept your ruling. There isn't anything I can do about it."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black, are you concluded? Representative Black, have you concluded?

  Mr. Black, are you finished with your inquiry?"
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, once again for the third time this week, I apologize. My error is that the Bill was not declared defeated. Had you declared the Bill lost, I might have won one, but you did not. Before you declared it, he asked for Postponed Consideration, so the Bill is still alive. I stand corrected. I should know better by now, than to argue with one, the Speaker, two, the parliamentarian. I apologize. I was incorrect."
- Speaker Hartke: "Your apology is accepted. Further 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 2139?' 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: "The Bill will be returned to Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2148, Representative Ryan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano on the Amendment."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #5 to House

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Bill 2148 is a culmination of negotiations with the Plumbers' Union and the Plumbing Contractors. And this Amendment makes the Bill an Agreed Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 2148?' 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 2298, Representative Lyons. Eileen Lyons. 2298."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2298 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lyons."
- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Repre... Amendment #2 to House Bill 2298 is not substantive, it is merely clarifying language to the previous Amendment."
- 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

  2298?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed

  'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' it. And the

  Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2438, Representative Coulson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2438 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,

- 40th Legislative Day

  April 4, 2001

  offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 changes the..., from calendar year to fiscal year, the circuit breaker program. And I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

  No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2438?' 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 3037, Representative Kurtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3037 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kurtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Connor on Amendment #1."
- O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3037 provides for a state grant of up to 10% of amounts levied by so-called 708 and 377 boards. This Amendment merely includes certain public health boards that were not included as part of the original legislation."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition... Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment, yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Hoffman: "I just want to clarify it. This was my Bill, previously. This would include certain public health boards that do mental health services only?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

O'Connor: "That is correct. Mental health and developmental disabilities."

Hoffman: "Okay. So, if they don't do any mental health services, or service developmentally disabled individuals, then they would not be included in this Bill?"

O'Connor: "That's correct. That's my understanding. Yes."

Hoffman: "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 3037?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3157, Representative Collins. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning public employees. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Collins, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "I'm going to move it to Third."

Speaker Hartke: "Explain your Amendment, please."

Collins: "The Amendment says, that if you're an employee for the State of Illinois, that you can, before you're fired for a job, that they have to offer you another position, so that they just don't fire you."

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

Black: "All right, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I'm confused. I thought she said, move the Bill to Third?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "She did, and then I asked her to explain the Amendment, and she did."

Black: "Oh. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Amendment 3 becomes the Bill. Right, Representative?"

Collins: "Yes."

Black: "And the Amendment has..."

Collins: "Amendment 2 becomes the Bill."

Black: "I'm sorry, you're right. I think maybe it's time for me just to give up. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. All right. You adequately define public employee. It has to do with people who are running for public office, who are, public employees. Is that the intent of the Bill?"

Collins: "Yes."

Black: "All right. With this headache, I'll wait 'til Third Reading. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3157?' 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 3241, Representative Ryan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3241, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ryan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryan."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

What this Amendment does, it was, basically, a consensus with DCCA and some of the opponents regarding this piece of TIF legislation. Basically, what this Amendment does is, it adds a member of the school system as part of the task force. It also deletes any of the reporting changes that were required in the initial piece of legislation. And I ask for your passage."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, does this Amendment become the Bill?"

Ryan: "Yes, it does."

Parke: "Who asked you to do this?"

Ryan: "Who asked me to do what?"

Parke: "To put the Amendment on the Bill?"

Ryan: "Like I said earlier, Representative, this was a consensus.

There were some opponents. DCCA was an opponent to the first piece. And this will work out with them."

Parke: "My understanding is, DCCA is still opposed to this?"

Ryan: "No, they're not."

Parke: "Did DCCA ask you... DCCA said this was okay to transfer this?"

Ryan: "Yes, it is. Yes, they did."

Parke: "You planning on calling this Bill, tonight?"

Ryan: "No, Sir."

Parke: "Can't? Okay. Very good. We'll wait for DCCA to respond to us."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "I apologize, Representative, I just got the Amendment.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Does this have anything to do with nurses?"

Ryan: "No, Sir. I don't believe so."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3241?' All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3377, Representative Lawfer. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3377, a Bill for an Act concerning industrial hemp. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lawfer, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Floor Amendment #1 is tabled."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, there's a question about Amendment #1?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1 remains in the Rules Committee."

Lawfer: "Oh, okay. Okay. Floor Amendment 2 adds to the Bill,
answers the concerns that were made in committee and
provides that the research on industrial hemp shall include
finding high producing, high quality varieties, with a zero
THC. And it makes other technical changes, expands the
research on law enforcement by including Western Illinois
University, and also stipulates that state funding will not
be used for the study. I think that this answers the
concerns that the State Police have. With this Amendment,
the State Police are neutral. And answers the concerns of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the Governor, that he had in the veto of the previous Bill in the last General Assembly. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

3377?' 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. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 241?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 241 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to Second Reading, for the purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3..."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please move House Bill 241 back to Third, for the purpose of an Amendment? I mean, back to Second?"

Speaker Hartke: "No. We've got it on Second. We have it there."

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Hartke: "It's there."

Flowers: "Okay. It's on Second. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers, please present your Amendment."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 241, I removed the contraceptive portion of the

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Amendment. So, the only thing that's left on the Bill now, is dealing with the epidural, as well as the insurance coverage for nutritional medicine."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, she will."

Parke: "Representative, just help me work through this. What did you remove with your Amendment?"

Flowers: "The contraceptive portion, where is it, that..."

Parke: "All right..."

Flowers: "...insurance company have to provide contraceptive services."

Parke: "All right. Our evaluation says, 'delete requirements of mandate of birth control..."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Parke: "...if policy provides Viagra.'"

Flowers: "Contraceptives. I removed the Section dealing with contraceptives, Sir..."

Parke: "Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Ma'am."

Flowers: "...and Viagra. That's gone."

Parke: "So, what's left?"

Flowers: "What's left is the Insurance Code to provide coverage for the reimbursement of medically-appropriate prescription nutrition and also, the coverage of epidural."

Parke: "Now, does this have to be requested by a doctor?"

Flowers: "Of course."

Parke: "Okay. So, the doctor says, I believe that this is necessary for my patient, for nutrition, therefore, the insurance policy must cover it?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Parke: "Do you know if that's removed the opposition of any of the business groups?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Flowers: "I was not aware of any opposition of the business groups from... I was not aware..."

Parke: "I believe I mentioned..."

Flowers: "...for that particular..."

Parke: "...that to you before."

Flowers: "Well, there was three portions of the Bill, and I knew there was opposition in regards to the contraceptive coverage."

Parke: "And then... If this Amendment goes on, does it go back to Postponed Consideration? So, right now, all that's left...

And this... Does this Amendment become the Bill?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Parke: "It's just mandated, what a physician mandates for nutrition for his patient, as a supplement, and that's about all?"

Flowers: "And the coverage of epidural, yes."

Parke: "And the epidermal (sic-epidural)? Well, I certainly think this is a much better Bill than you presented to the Body before. Of course, that's my opinion. But... And I think, that you've worked on it. I might be able to support this on Third..."

Flowers: "Well, Rep... Well, Representative. I would be thrilled if you would join me, as a Sponsor, with this great piece of legislation. Because,..."

Parke: "Talk..."

Flowers: "...it's been a long time since we've been able to share some good legislation."

Parke: "Well, I'll tell you what. We'll talk about that, for sure. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 241?' 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: "Place that Bill on Postponed Consideration.

  House Bill 1710, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1710, a Bill for an Act concerning hospital districts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for consideration."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1710, Amendment #2, narrows the situations which directors of hospital districts have leased real property in their hospital district. I incorporated some of the suggestions of the committee, and currently, all directors now under this Amendment that are eligible, will have to vote to approve the contract. And it also addresses situations when someone is reappointed to a hospital board."
- 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

  1710?' 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 1926, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1926 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001 consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

- Reitz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 1926 deals with the road districts allowing them to... the road districts, that are under property tax extension laws, allows them to accumulate money that they may not be able to, currently."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

  Since no one's seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1926?'

  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 Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I have another

Amendment here that I'm trying to figure out. I don't have

Floor Amendment 2 on me. Mark, do you have that?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black."

- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to help Representative... Floor

  Amendment #2 is technical in nature. It adds to the Bill.

  It changes a Section number in Floor Amendment #1, that was drafted in error."
- Reitz: "Thank you. I appreciate Representative Black helping me out on that one. And that is exactly what it does. It adds a one, and it is one of the best Amendments, that I've seen today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1926?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3184. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3184, a Bill for an Act concerning land development. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Slone, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Slone on Amendment #1 to House Bill 3184. Representative Slone, are you ready to present that Amendment?"

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment would shell out this Bill. The Bill is an effort to update the state's planning, enabling statutes. And it's a long way from ready, so this would shell it out to allow us to continue to work on it. I would appreciate favorable consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment?

Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess, if she's shelling it, then she's just going to leave it on Third, and not call it. Is that correct?"

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion?"

Parke: "No. Wait. I'm asking a question, Mr..."

Speaker Hartke: "I thought that was a comment."

Parke: "I'm asking a question, if she's planning on shelling it and leave it on Third. Is that..."

Speaker Hartke: "That's a question?"

Parke: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Slone, would you like to answer that question?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Slone: "We hope to move it to the Senate to continue working on it, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "I thought we had an agreement, we weren't sending shell Bills over to the Senate?"

Slone: "Is that addressed to me, or to the Speaker, Mr. Parke?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Do we no longer have that agreement? I was inquiring of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Parke: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I thought we had an agreement that we were not moving shell Bills to the Senate. Has that been changed?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke, you're going to get a direct answer.

Mr. Parke."

Parke: "I guess, we're going to work on this on Friday, so we'll have some kind of agreement at that point. So, I no longer have a problem with this. Yes. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative Slone, this is strictly going to shell the Bill? It has no substance to it?"

Slone: "It has until we adopt the Amendment, Mr. Parke. After that, it will have only a title. Yes."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. The Amendment does not... is not yet on the system.

Could the Lady just simply take the Amendment out of the record until we can get it on the system?"

Speaker Hartke: "It is on the system."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Black: "We can't call it up. I'll try again."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you care to check out, our system? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment... Mr. Black."

Black: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair. We have, at least, seen the paper copy. Can I just make an inquiry of the Chair? I want to make sure..."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Okay. I have a shell Bill, in Leader Daniels' name. The shell Bill is important to me because it involves negotiations going on between a large corporation, and some of their dealers. Now, I have asked that this shell Bill be put on any Agreed List, because it's imperative... You know how the system works, if the Bill dies, Friday, negotiations will stop. Is it the intent of the Chair, that in cases like this, where it would be in Leader Daniels' name, that some of these shell Bills will, in fact, go to the Senate if we work it out between the two staffs?"

Speaker Hartke: "The answer is yes."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you. That's fair."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3184?' 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 Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2523, Representative Delgado. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2523, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Delgado, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Delgado."

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

Amendment #2 was actually Speaker Madigan's. It will replace everything of 2523, an enacting clause with a technical change of school year. And that's, basically, what the Amendment will do."

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

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since the Gentleman, and this Amendment is on the system... he's shelling the Bill, it's my understanding then that 2523, the Chief Sponsor will become Speaker Madigan. Correct? All right. Has the paperwork been done? I just want to make sure."

Speaker Hartke: "You're guaranteed."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #... Mr. Cross."

Cross: "After this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "...Floor Amendment #2?' 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. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 49, I'm joined by at least 5 Members of my side of the aisle, to request a record vote on the Motion to Discharge House Bill 6. As you know, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 6 deals with property tax

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

relief, specifically, property tax relief for the senior citizens of the State of Illinois. This Motion has been filed in writing, is on the House Calendar. We ask that this Bill be discharged pursuant to Rule 18 (g), and again, ask for a record vote on this Motion to Discharge for the seniors for property tax relief for the people of the State of Illinois. Yes. Yes. Yes. It's up to you, Mr. Speaker. It's up to you to take care of the seniors for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Cross: "No. No. It's now up to her, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "The Lady's objected to the Motion."

Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since you've denied our Motions, and actually those of all the seniors in this state, that are in full accordance with House Rules, we respectfully ask for a record vote on a Motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair pursuant to House Rule 57 (a), and ask for a record vote on the right to do so, as embodied in Rule 49."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?'

All those in favor of sustaining the Chair vote 'yes';

those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

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

the record. On this Motion, there are 59 Members voting

'yes', 54 Members voting 'no', and 3 Members voting

'present'. And your Motion fails, and the Chair is

sustained. House Bill 3292, Representative Pankau. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3292, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Pankau, has been approved for consideration."

40th Legislative Day April 4, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Pankau."

- Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. It's a property tax Amendment, being proposed by the Department of Revenue. It does two basic things. It sets the number of appraisers that the Department itself will have in the Office of Appraisers. And it also changes the Section reference as to the valuation of farmland. And I ask for its approval."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

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

  'Shall the House adopt the Amendment on House... Floor

  Amendment #2 on House Bill 3292?' 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 1825, Representative Hassert. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act in relation to the cremation of animals. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hassert, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hassert."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Amendment #2 just simply adds some definitions to the underlying Bill. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

  No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the

  House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1825?' All

  those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

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

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 2419, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2419, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Osmond, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill.

This Bill addresses the use of credit scoring by insurance companies in their underwriting decisions. There's, basically, three things that the Bill addresses: One, is disclosure, when an adverse decision is reached; second of all, it outlaws the use of credit scoring, as the sole determinate, for the issuing of a policy, or nonrenewal of a policy; and third, it empowers the Department of Insurance to make sure, that the use of credit scoring, does not discriminate against any group of individuals based on race, religion, gender, or income. And I ask that we adopt the Amendment."

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

Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Inquiry of the Sponsor. This... Would Amendment #2 become the Bill?"

Osmond: "Yes, it will."

Hoffman: "And how does it defer from the original Bill you introduced?"

Osmond: "Well, we address the issue of whether or not credit scoring can be used as the sole deterrent, or sole

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

determinate for issuing, and renewing of policies. It also addresses the language of the disclosure information, that'd be required in the event that an adverse decision is made."

Hoffman: "Explain the last portion of that."

Osmond: "Currently, Representative, if you had a personal automobile policy, for instance, and you received nonrenewal notice, that stated for credit purposes, you've been nonrenewed. Under the current law, the companies are sending out credit reports, and it might be from Equifax, or Transunion. But the credit reports did not really address the issue of credit scoring. Credit scoring is based off of information from the credit reports. So it's my opinion, that if you received the credit report, you're really not getting anything that you can understand that can relate back to why you were nonrenewed. And what this will do will be to allow the department to check with the companies to make sure that those disclosures are understandable, and addresses the process of credit scoring, not just a credit report, which are two different things."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2419?' 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 475, Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 475, a Bill for an Act in relation to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Capparelli, has been approved for consideration."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 475 is an attempt to personalize and professionalize the booting industry. It passed out of committee overwhelmingly, but they did ask for an Amendment. And the Amendment says, 'Requires that a posted employee, who'll personally inform each person who leaves a vehicle on the premises that the vehicle can be booted if the terms of the use of property are violated.'"

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

Hoffman: "Yes. I just... for clarification. I believe we want to be doing Amendment #2, that's going to become the Bill, and takes care... So, I think, we probably want to withdraw Amendment #1, and go to Amendment #2? No?"

Capparelli: "There's an added one, that's all. That's the way it is."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to withdraw Amendment #1?"

Capparelli: "No."

Speaker Hartke: "No?"

Hoffman: "No, he wants to do Amendment #1. He's going to come back to..."

Capparelli: "I just added Amendment #2 because the committee asked me to do that."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion on Amendment #1? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 475?' 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?"

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Capparelli, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Amendment #2 is the one that the committee asked me to adopt and that requires that a posted employee to personally inform each person who leaves a vehicle on the premises, that the vehicle can be booted if the terms of the use of property are violated."

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

Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "So now, this becomes the Bill. Right? Okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 475?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; and 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. The Chair recognizes
Representative Burke for a Motion. Representative Burke
now moves the House suspend the House Rules to allow House
Bill 705 to be heard in committee, this evening. Is there
any objection to the Motion? Hearing none, the Motion is
adopted. Representative Cross. He declines recognition.
Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2575?
Representative Novak."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2575 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 236, Representative Flowers."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 236 is on the Order of House Bills-Third

- 40th Legislative Day Reading."
- April 4, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading
  - for the purpose of an Amendment. House Bill 279, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 279 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 2390, Mays(sic-May)."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2390 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment, at the request of Sponsor. House Bill 1904, Saviano. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Bolin: "House Bill 1904 is on the Order of House Clerk Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment, at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 2382, Soto. Mr. Clerk."
- Bill 2382 is on the Order of House Clerk Bolin: "House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Reading for the purpose of an Amendment, at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 403, Jones. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 403 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 2565, Mr. Berns."
- Bill 2565 is on the Order of House Clerk Bolin: "House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Order of Second Reading,

40th Legislative Day

- April 4, 2001
- for the purpose of an Amendment, at the request of the Sponsor. Is Representative Davis, Monique Davis, in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2141?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2141 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, at the request of the Sponsor, for the purpose of an Amendment. The Chair recognizes Representative Howard, for a posting notice suspension request. Representative Howard now moves that the posting requirements for House Resolution 187 be suspended so that the Resolution can be heard this evening in committee. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection the House suspends the Rules that allow House Resolution 187 to be heard this evening in committee. Clerk... House Bill 1722, Representative Davis.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1722, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, for the purpose of an Amendment, at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Yes. This Bill has already been amended, and the Amendment was adopted, so we should be on Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "You'd like to call the Bill on Third?"
- Davis, M.: "Yes."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on Third Reading.

  House Bill 1722, Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1722, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Davis."

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1722 merely requires universities whose enrollment dropped 10% or below, they have to report it to the Board of Higher Education, and the Board of Higher Education will report to the General Assembly. And we think it's important that we know if a university's enrollment is declining to that degree."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1722?

  Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

  'Shall the House pass House Bill 1722?' 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 1722, there are 111 Members voting

  'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And

  this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

  hereby declared passed. House Bill 1789, Mendoza. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1094?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1094. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Giles, what is your pleasure?"
- Giles: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Floor Amendment
  #1."
- Speaker Hartke: "You'd like to table Committee Amendment #1? Mr. Giles, you'll have to file a written Motion. Take that

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Bill out of the record. House Bill 827, Representative McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Supplemental Calendar #2."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 827, a Bill for an Act concerning empowerment zones. Second Reding of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McGuire, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Mr. Speaker, I have agreed to hold that Bill on Second.

So, I would appreciate if you'd just hold it on Second."

Speaker Hartke: "Let that Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 859, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 859, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 859 is the... is an Amendment which is in response in getting ready for the Governor's Task Force on Patient Safety. Our respective staffs got together with myself. We put together this Amendment. It came out of committee tomorrow, recommended for consideration 18 to 0. And what our goal is to put this Amendment on, await the Governor's Task Force report and, hopefully, use this Bill as the vehicle for the Governor's language. I would ask for your favorable vote."

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

859?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

'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 893, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 893, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano, Amendment #1."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 simply continues the sunset. And that's all it does. It renews it. And we're gonna hold it until the department gets back to us with their audit results. I would ask for your favorable vote."

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

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is... Representative Cross."

Cross: "Just an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Cross: "Are you gonna give us an idea how much longer we're gonna be here tonight? We're just getting to be a little disorganized and we've been back now for a couple hours. You'd said we'd have two more hours of work. And there doesn't seem to be any end in sight. Can you give us an idea?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sit down. Two minutes."

Cross: "Two minutes."

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

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

893?' 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. Mr. Clerk, committee schedule."

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately after Session; the Executive Committee will meet in Room C-1, the Financial Institutions Committee will meet in Room D-1, the Judiciary I-Civil Law Committee will meet in Room 122-B, the Judiciary II-Criminal Law Committee will meet in Room 114, the Public Utilities Committee will meet in Room 115, and the Transportation & Motor Vehicles Committee will meet in Room 118. The following committees will meet 30 minutes after Session; the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will meet in Room 118, the Registration & Regulation Committee will meet in Room 114, the Revenue Committee will meet in Room 115, and the State Government Administration Committee will meet in Room D-1. The following committees will meet Thursday morning at 9:00; the Elections & Campaign Reform Committee will meet in Room 114, the Environment & Energy Committee will meet in Room D-1, the Higher Education Committee will meet in Room C-1, and the Human Services Committee will meet in Room 115. At tomorrow morning; the Constitutional Officers 10:00 Committee will meet in Room C-1, and the Personnel & Pensions Committee will meet in Room 118."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Holbrook for an announcement."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. The Tourism Committee will meet tomorrow at 8:30 at our regularly posted time. A meeting at 8:30 a.m. in Room 122-B. This has been on the House Calendar for the last week. So, if you're a Member of Tourism, we're gonna be going over DCCA's tourism budget

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

tomorrow. So, we are meeting, even though it isn't on the handout of schedules. We're meeting at 8:30."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Davis."

- Davis, M.: "I want to announce there is no Human Service

  Appropriation Committee tomorrow morning. There is no

  Human Service Appropriation 8:00 committee. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further announcements by any Member? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, until the hour of 11:00 a.m. tomorrow April 5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. House Bills on Second Reading that will be read on Second Reading and held on that order. House Bill 47, a Bill for an Act amending the Residential Mortgage License Act of 1987. House Bill 63, a Bill for an Act in relation to coal. House Bill 86, a Bill for an Act concerning State collection of debt. House Bill 128, a Bill for an Act in relation to balancing budgets. House Bill 157, a Bill for an Act concerning liens. House Bill 172, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 175, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of dry cleaners. House Bill 220, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 221, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 246, a Bill for an Act in relation to medical practice. House Bill 256, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 268, a Bill for an Act respecting schools. House Bill 280, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 375, a Bill for an Act to create the Uniform Athlete Agents Act. House Bill 377, a Bill for an

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act to create the Corporate Practice of Medicine Act. House Bill 389, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. House Bill a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. House Bill 401, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. House Bill a Bill for an Act concerning natural gas costs. House Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning reckless corporate conduct. House Bill 475, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 482, a Bill for an Act concerning the local regulation of firearms. House Bill 487, a Bill for an Act concerning redevelopment. House Bill 497, a Bill for an Act concerning family leave. House Bill 546, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 548, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. House Bill 570, a Bill for an Act regarding telemarketing. House Bill 573, a Bill for an Act in relation to contracts. House Bill 579, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 580, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 582, a Bill for an Act amending the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. House Bill 618, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 623, a Bill for an Act amending the School Code. House Bill 671, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 711, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 742, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 762, a Bill for an Act relation to the expungement and sealing of arrest and court records. House Bill 849, a Bill for an Act relating to public labor relations. House Bill 852, a Bill for an Act in relation to public works projects. House Bill 868, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. House Bill 902, Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. House Bill 911, a Bill for an Act in relation to tort immunity.

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

House Bill 914, a Bill for an Act concerning local governments. House Bill 919, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 975, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. House Bill 1015, a Bill for an in relation to criminal law. House Bill 1091, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1092, a Bill an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1093, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 1689, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire protection. House Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act in relation to human services. House Bill 1704, a Bill for an Act concerning campaign finance. House Bill 1714, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act concerning State holidays. House 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Bill House Bill 1779, a Bill for an Act in relation to domestic battery. House Bill 1790, a Bill for an Act concerning municipal planning. House Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act in relation to campaign finance. House Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act in relation to home inspectors. House Bill Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act concerning park districts. House Bill 1855, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain grant and loan programs. House Bill 1867, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1869, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 1887, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental protection. House Bill 1819 (sic-1919), a Bill for an Act concerning fiscal reports. House Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 1935, a Bill for an Act relating to

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

heirloom marriage certificates. House Bill 1967, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1999, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 2016, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2064, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act. Senate (sic-House) Bill 2115, a Bill for an Act concerning health care service contracts. House Bill 2117, a Bill an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2119, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2122, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2125, a Bill for an Act concerning general obligation bonds. House Bill a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2133, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 2134, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 2135, a Bill for an Act in relation State government. House Bill 2136, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 2137, a Bill for an Act concerning general obligation bonds. House Bill 2146, a Bill for an Act concerning lending practices. House Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. House Bill 2162, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2193, a Bill for an Act concerning public labor relations. House Bill 2201, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. House Bill 2207, a Bill for an Act concerning mortgages. House Bill 2208, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 2215, a Bill for an Act regarding education. House Bill 2220, a Bill for an Act concerning rights and remedies. House Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. House Bill 2224, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. House Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act concerning mortgages. House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

2259, a Bill for an Act in relation to motor carriers. Bill 2271, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. House Bill 2281, a Bill for an Act concerning currency exchanges. House Bill 2282, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. House Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act in relation to cemeteries. House Bill Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 2333, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 2374, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone calls. House Bill 2387, a Bill for an Act in relation to families. House Bill 2400, a Bill for an Act relating to the licensure of nurses. House Bill 2411, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Soft Drink Industry Fair Dealing Act. House Bill 2426, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone services. House Bill 2435, a Bill for an Act concerning food donations. House Bill 2439, a Bill for an Act to create the Home Loan Collateral Fund Act. House Bill 2467, a Bill for an Act relating to education. House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act concerning medicine. House Bill 2493, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil immunities. House Bill 2536, Bill for an Act concerning private security. House Bill 2538, a Bill for an Act concerning certain financial institutions. House Bill 2555, a Bill for an Act concerning disclosure of certain information relating to insurance companies. House Bill 2993, a Bill for an Act concerning surplus line insurance. House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act concerning human services. House Bill 3003, a Bill for an Act regarding abused and neglected residents of long term care facilities. House Bill 3019, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental matters. House Bill 3029, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3032, a Bill

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

for an Act in relation to criminal law, which may be referred to as the Robb Family Law. House Bill 3052, a Bill for an Act in relation to health care. House Bill 3060, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. House Bill 3069, a Bill for an Act concerning local governments. Bill 3070, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation of professions. House Bill 3071, a Bill for Act concerning health facilities. House Bill 3072, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act in relation to aircraft. House Bill 3082, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3083, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 3084, a Bill for an Act regarding vehicles. House Bill 3087, a Bill for an Act concerning pollution. House Bill 3090, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 3091, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 3092, a Bill for an Act in relation to gambling. House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act in relation to aeronautics. House Bill 3097, a Bill for an Act concerning contact lenses. House Bill 3123, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education. House Bill 3124, a Bill for an Act amending the Election Code. House Bill 3127, a Bill for an Act in relation to the use of social security numbers. House Bill 3131, a Bill for an Act relation to human services. House Bill 3146, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 3155, a Bill for an Act concerning domestic violence. House Bill 3211, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 3213, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. House Bill 3224, a Bill for an Act concerning legal advocacy services. House Bill 3231, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. House Bill 3238, a Bill for an Act concerning farm products. House Bill 3261, a Bill for an

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

Act concerning financing. House Bill 3266, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil immunities. House Bill 3279, a Bill for an Act in relation to gender violence. House Bill 3283, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. House Bill 3286, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 3288, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. House Bill 3289, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 3299, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. House Bill 3202 (sic-3302), a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3320, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3321, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. House Bill 3324, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 3341, a Bill for an Act concerning campaign finance. House Bill 3373, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental matters. House Bill 3375, a Bill for an Act concerning state facilities. House Bill 3426, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3439, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3440, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3441, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3463, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3489, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 3490, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 3491, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 3492, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 3493, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 3494, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 3495, a Bill for an Act in relation to State government. House Bill 3505, a Bill for Act making appropriations. House Bill 3521, a Bill for an Act concerning school construction. House Bill 3533, a Bill for an Act in relation to worker safety. House Bill

40th Legislative Day

April 4, 2001

3535, a Bill for an Act relating to ticket scalping. House Bill 3540, a Bill for an Act concerning long-term care facility residents. House Bill 3564, a Bill for an Act concerning State subsidies. House Bill 3567, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3572, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Exxon Overcharge Fund Act. House Bill 3577, a Bill for an Act in relation to support. House Bill 3578, a Bill for an Act in relation to campaign contributions. House Bill 3579, a Bill for an Act in relation to campaign expenditures. House Bill 3580, a Bill for an Act in relation to contributions to candidates, political committees, and public officials. House Bill 3581, a Bill for an Act concerning campaign contributions. House Bill 3582, a Bill for an Act in relation to campaign finance. House Bill 3583, a Bill for an Act in relation to legislative printing. Second Reading of these House Bills to be held on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading. There being no further business, House Perfunctory Session now stands adjourned."