42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs... Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "We lift our hearts. Most Sovereign Master, Author, and the Finisher of our faith, we ask, Dear God, that You would create in us a clean heart, renew in us a right spirit. For we're reminded of Your word, that said if My people which are called by My name would humble themselves and pray, seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, said then would You hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins, and heal their land. You said, Your eyes shall be opened, and Your ears shall be a tent unto every prayer that they pray. So, I pray, Father, that You would hear us as we ask You for guidance this day. ask You for wisdom. We ask You for understanding. We ask You for compassion and love. So, this we do kindly pray. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Howard."
- Howard et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Monique Davis is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Tom Ryder, and Stephens are excused today."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Rossi: "Committee Clerk Reports. Representative Saviano, from the Committee Chairperson on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1805. Representative Erwin, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2588, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2634. Representative Crotty, Chairperson from the Committee on Children & Youth, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 236. Representative Novak, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be Floor Amendment adopted' #1 to House Bill 1776. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Conservation & Land Use, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3060. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2115. Representative Bugielski, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 5, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2538. Introduction - First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 188, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act with regard to education. Senate Bill 434, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. Senate Bill 1098, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. First Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli, do you wish to call House Bill 2376? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act relating to banking. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2376, a banking Bill, requires any interest on investments from the monies in the Bank and Trust Company Fund, that is held in the Office of Banks and Real Estate, to be deposited back into The Fund is made up of state bank exam fees, that Fund. quarterly call fees, electronic data processing fees. Currently, the State Treasurer invests the money in the Bank and Trust Fund that are not needed can be current administrative expenses. All the interest for this Fund is deposited in the General Fund. The Bill simply would require that the interest earned of the Fund balance would go back to the Bank and Trust Company Fund. There's no one objecting to this. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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'. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Please record yourself. Mr. Clerk, 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. Representative Kurtz, did you wish to call House Bill 811. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 811, a Bill for an Act in relation to contracts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kurtz."

Kurtz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This 811 makes unenforceable provisions in the Building and Construction Contract Act, provisions that make the contract subject to the laws of another state. House Bill 811 makes contracts that require litigation, arbitration, or dispute resolution to take place in another state. The Amendment addresses the concerns of the Retail Association. The Bill does not apply to them, and their people who sell tangible, personal property. And the Amendment specifies the Act does not apply to federal contracts, or to contracts of other states. I'd welcome 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 voted who wish? Dale Righter voting? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reitz, did you wish to call House Bill 2259? Dan Reitz. Bugielski, did you wish to call House Bill 2207? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2207, a Bill for an Act concerning mortgages. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2207 deals with the release of paid mortgages by title insurers. The title insurance industry in Illinois and the rest of the country, has been experiencing a good news and a bad news situation right now because of the... the good news is because of the interest rates there's a lot of buying of homes and a lot of financing. news is that the volume of this activity has overwhelmed the capacity of many lenders and their services to issue releases of mortgages. In the past, in order to keep up with this large influx of the titles, title companies have hold harmless letters to other title been issuing companies, when the next financing comes in to close, and the public record reveals one or more outstanding mortgages of record. These letters are relied on by the current title company to insure over the unreleased liens. Issuing these letters, which is being done into the thousands was a very big expense and contemplated (sic-complicated) the cost of closing on issuing titles. The Illinois Land Title Association has decided to address this issue through the introduction of a Bill giving title companies a procedure whereby, they would issue certificate of releases when they paid off the mortgage pursuant... the procedure as drafted would only apply to mortgages to one-to four-family residential properties. They've been working on this for the last two months. All of the financial industry people

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

have agreed to this Bill. And I ask for its passage."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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 voted who wish? Mr. Parke and Mr. John Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 97 'ayes', 18 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pankau, did you wish to call House Bill 3373? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3373, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental matters. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. This is the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency Bill. Basically, it does three things: it puts the Illinois requirements in line with all the USEPA requirements, that's number one; it adds a provision for large, new, and used tire sites, and this was never in the law before, this is the new part of the law; and this is also an Agreed Bill between the chemical industry and the Illinois EPA. And I ask for your favorable approval."

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... For what purpose does Representative Hamos seek recognition?"

Hamos: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Hamos: "Representative Pankau, does this have a fee in it? Will this require an annual fee?"

Pankau: "No."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Hamos: "No?"

Pankau: "The only fees that are in here are the fees that put it in line with the USEPA fees and fines should there be an accidental spill. But that is nothing new. It is already there. And in the new part, the tire Section, there are no fees, whatsoever."

Hamos: "Okay. 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reitz, Mr. Dan Reitz? Mike Smith. Mr. Smith, did you wish to call House Bill 1011? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act concerning zoning. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an initiative of the Illinois Municipal League at the request of the City of Peoria and Peoria County. It would permit municipalities and counties that have adopted zoning ordinances to enter into a intergovernmental agreement, whereby the city would be able to exercise zoning powers beyond their municipal limits. This would only extend into their planning jurisdiction which is a mile and a half but it would allow them to control the zoning. This has been used in the City of Peoria and Peoria County very successfully. They have been told, however, that they need the statutory authority to continue doing it. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

- Righter: "Representative Smith, I was not in committee where this Bill went through. I'm not sure I understand exactly what the function of this Bill is. Can you explain it to me again, please?"
- Smith: "Sure. This would just allow municipalities and counties to enter into intergovernmental agreements, whereby the city could control the zoning beyond their jurisdiction within the mile-and-a-half zone that they currently have for planning purposes."
- Righter: "You said this is in use in your county? Or this is for your county?"
- Smith: "Yes. The City of Peoria and Peoria County have used this very successfully, however, they've been advised that they need to have language in the statutes to allow them to continue this."
- Righter: "What kind of ordinances or is the City of Peoria wanting to enforce beyond that one mile border that this would allow them to do?"
- Smith: "It would be all of their zoning ordinances, Representative."
- Righter: "Well, how would this intergovernmental agreement...

  would this require just a vote of the county board and a

  vote of the city council?"

Smith: "That's right."

Righter: "Is there any... There's no referendum required?"

Smith: "No, there isn't."

Righter: "Okay. This would... Is it fair to say, that if the city council and the county board agree, both vote to enter

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

into this intergovernmental agreement, then you have in effect then, is county zoning according to the zoning ordinances of the city. Is that fair to say?"

Smith: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?"

- Righter: "If the city council and the county board decide to enter into this intergovernmental agreement, then what that is going to allow is, basically, county zoning according to the city's zoning ordinances. Is that fair to say?"
- Smith: "That is correct. Within the mile-and-a-half zone."
- Righter: "Just with... Just a mile and a half outside the city's..."
- Smith: "That's right. As you know cities have, you know, the authority for planning purposes within a mile and a half."
- Righter: "Okay. Then, this just adds an enforcement provision within that mile and a half."
- Smith: "Right. This is just about cities and counties working together to control growth."
- Righter: "Okay. Thank you, Representative Smith. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Smith 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? McGuire voted? Mr. Ryan, has Mr. McGuire voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 people voting 'yes', 14 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Osmond, did you wish to call House Bill 2426? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2426, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osmond."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is legislation that Representative Brunsvold has brought forth and I'd ask that he answer any questions and perhaps, explain the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill... the Amendment was adopted last night. Amendment #2 sets down a definition. Well, that definition clears up an ambiguity in the law. We have two 911 Acts. One is a wire line. And one is a wireless Act. And these two Acts deal with those two types of phone, a land line, and then a wireless phone. The new technology has created a situation where you have a land-line phone within a certain station in a business, and when you reach outside of 30 feet from that station, it becomes a true wireless phone. So, there is an uncertainty on definitions there and this Bill clears up that uncertainty on the definition. And I would ask for passage of the Bill, and answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osmond 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. Dan Reitz in the chamber? Mr. Reitz, did you wish to call House Bill 2259? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2259, a Bill for an Act in relation to motor carriers. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2259 is a rewrite of Chapter 15 of the Illinois Vehicle Code. The intent was to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

simplify and streamline the Illinois Vehicle Code. We've worked with a number of state and local agencies. This is an Agreed Bill. And IDOT, State Police, the Highway User Association have all signed off on this. And as it moves to the Senate, they've assured me they've taken out all of the substantive changes. So, if there is anything in here I'm sure they'll catch it in the Senate as they review this, and straighten that out."

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? Have all 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. Mr. Persico, did you wish to call House Bill 774? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 774, a Bill for an Act in relation to trusts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 774 amends the Trust and Trustees Act. It allows the trustee to invest for total return, provides for an adjustment between income and principal, so that capital gains can be shared between the principal and the income beneficiaries. The Corporate Fiduciaries of Illinois and the Illinois Bar Association support this Bill. And I would be willing to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. And there appears to be 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? The Clerk shall take

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner."

- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that on House Bill 1011, I meant to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Scully. Mr. Scully, do you wish to call House Bill 3216? Could you adjust your time, Mr. Scully? You're on the Internet. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present House Bill 3216 which is an initiative that Lou Lang has been working on for several years. It establishes the CHOICES Program to order and prevent... or avoid institutionalization of individuals with mental illness, or a nonrecurring disorder of mental illness, or substance abuse. This legislation was written in direct response to the problems created by the Olmstead decision of the United States Supreme Court which mandates that mental illness is a form of disability and imposes upon all the states a duty to provide persons with the least restrictive environment. And I'd ask for your support for this proposal. And I'd be willing to answer your questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill which, up 'til yesterday, was my Bill. I thank Mr. Scully for taking it over. The Olmstead decision requires the state to do many things, and this is a beginning to make that happen. The program, in

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

this Bill is one that will over a period of years save the state a significant amount of money and provide better treatment to those with mental illness. And I would urge your support."

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

Two people have spoken in favor of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Lindner: "I have a question. This is subject to appropriation.

Is that correct?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scully."

Scully: "That's correct. That is correct."

Lindner: "All right. And is there anything in the Bill that directs whether or not these are going to be grants, or whether this... if there is an appropriation, if the money is going to be equally distributed? Does the Bill address that?"

Scully: "I understand that that issue has to be worked out, and hopefully, it will be a grant, but it is also subject to appropriation."

Lindner: "Okay. So, there's nothing in the Bill that says what the distribution would be?"

Scully: "No, it does not."

Lindner: "Okay. Thank you. I rise in support of the Bill."

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

Two have spoken in support of the Bill. One person has stood in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Johnson: "I think I want to support this, but I have a couple of questions because I'm not sure exactly what this does. On

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- the... Does this... When you say this Bill really moves to codify the Olmstead decision, does this Bill specifically prohibit the development of larger units such as Kiley, those sorts of facilities?"
- Scully: "It doesn't address that, Representative Johnson. And it does not really codify the Olmstead decision, so much as it is enacted in response to the Olmstead decision which created these very substantive rights for people with mental illness."
- Johnson: "Right, which I agree with. But, ya know, does your Bill go to the issue of, obviously, the least restrictive environment and so on? But this would not prohibit places like Kiley, where there is a necessity for those. Because Olmstead does not really prohibit those either."
- Scully: "It does not prohibit those."
- Johnson: "Okay. All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

  Two have stood in support of the Bill, two have stood in response. The Chair recognizes Representative Eileen Lyons."
- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have questions regarding the Bill. Representative, can you tell me the estimated cost of this proposal?"
- Scully: "There has not been an estimate by the department, yet.

  And there's the intention to phase it in over four years."
- Lyons, E.: "To phase it in over four years?"
- Scully: "That's correct."
- Lyons, E.: "And it mentions in the Bill that this would allow treatment for 1 thousand persons. Can you tell me how that number was arrived at?"
- Scully: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat your question?"
- Lyons, E.: "Could you tell me how 1 thousand persons was arrived

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

at?"

- Scully: "That is an estimate of the first phase-in."
- Lyons, E.: "And then, if there's 1 thousand people, then there would be a waiting list for those who would not be included in the first phase-in? I mean, are we going to determine that there's going to be a waiting list is what I'm asking."
- Scully: "The establishment of a waiting list is a goal. This legislation does not establish a waiting list."
- Lyons, E.: "But the goal would be to make sure that everyone has the choice of integrated community setting. Is that true?"
- Scully: "Everyone has a choice of an integrated setting, as well as finding the most appropriate facility for their needs."
- Lyons, E.: "And that would be determined by whom?"
- Scully: "That would be determined by the client in conjunction with the department."
- Lyons, E.: "So, the client would work with the department, and the department would be determining the best environment for that patient?"
- Scully: "The client doesn't have the ultimate say. I believe...

  No. Excuse me. The department doesn't have the ultimate say. And based upon the Olmstead decision, a court would have the ultimate say in the event that the client and the department cannot reach an agreement on the most appropriate setting."
- Lyons, E.: "I guess what I'm asking, is the thrust of this to give the patient the choice? A choice..."
- Scully: "The thrust is to give the patient, the client, the choice but they do not have absolute right to demand a specific treatment. The goal is that that would be worked out between the department and the individual client. And if it cannot be worked out voluntarily, then a person would

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- have the right to seek recourse through the courts, based upon the Olmstead decision. But hopefully, those will be very few and far between. And hopefully, there will be an agreement between the department and a client on what is the most appropriate setting for their treatment."
- Lyons, E.: "So, if we treat 1 thousand patients in the first phase the goal is, over four years, to include everyone?"
- Scully: "As resources are available. And of course, with the lack of a waiting list, we don't know how many people everybody is."
- Lyons, E.: "And I can understand why you cannot estimate, not knowing those numbers, what the costs will be. But I don't understand why we can't have an estimation based on, at least, the first phase-in the thousand persons."
- Scully: "We're estimating about a \$9 million savings based upon phase one."
- Lyons, E.: "Nine-million dollar savings of what amount?"
- Scully: "Compared to what it would cost to institutionalize these same clients."
- Lyons, E.: "Which would be about what amount?"
- Scully: "Representative, right now, the estimates are that we are spending about \$75 thousand per student, per child. And we would hope to reduce that to \$16 thousand per child through the least restrictive means, thereby, saving up... and these are estimates, \$59 thousand per child."
- Lyons, E.: "Is this just for children?"
- Scully: "Per person. I'm sorry, Representative. Representative,

  I couldn't hear your last question."
- Speaker Madigan: "Could the Members please give their attention to Representative Lyons. Could we reduce the noise level.

  Ladies and Gentlemen, please."
- Lyons, E.: "Representative, you were giving me numbers of what it

- 42nd Legislative Day

  would cost for institutionalized care for, and I assume,
  not just children. You're just talking about mentally
  disabled?"
- Scully: "Children who have mental disabilities. And the estimates that we have been given are based on estimates we received from the Community Behavioral Health Care Association. Again, because of the lack of a waiting list and specific statistics on how many people there are who have these needs, it's difficult to make these estimates."
- Lyons, E.: "Just to clarify. You mentioned children again. Is this just for children, or is this for ..."
- Scully: "No. No. I used children, as an example, because that is the one source of estimates that we have."
- Lyons, E.: "Okay. Now, is it just for community setting, or is it for treatment within the community? Is it for medication in the community? What does this provide other than giving them a choice of where they are?"
- Scully: "The placement could be residential setting. It could be institutional. The goal is to structure the least restrictive means for providing these people with the services they need."
- Lyons, E.: "I understand that. I guess what I'm asking is, aside from placing them, what other services are going to be provided with this legislation?"
- Scully: "General enrichment of all of their support services, depending upon the individual needs of each individual client."
- Lyons, E.: "So that would include case management? That would include medication?"
- Scully: "Yes. In fact, case management would be a critical component of determining what is the most... least restrictive means."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Lyons, E.: "And it's all included in that legislation?"

Scully: "Yes."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scully has moved 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? Representative Mendoza voted? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Biggins, House Bill 2299. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2299, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Bill 2299, which was presented in committee by Representative Jim Meyer, and it is here before us today. It amends the Criminal Code to add to the list of offenses for which a vehicle can be seized and delivered to the sheriff. These offenses, now added, will include concealing or aiding a fugitive, escaping from a prison, which can be a felony or a misdemeanor, and also, escaping from a police officer, escaping while armed, and anyone aiding... using a vehicle aiding an escapee. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having receive a Constitutional

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2439, Mr.

  Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2439. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment #1? Burke, the Clerk advises that Amendment #1 is assigned to the Rules Committee. The Clerk now advises that Amendment #1 was assigned to a committee. Mr. Clerk, which committee was it assigned to? Executive Committee. Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke."
- Burke: "It's my intention to withdraw that Amendment. That's why
  I did not seek its adoption at committee last evening.
  So,..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. All right. Now,... So, Mr. Clerk,

  Amendment #1 is assigned to the Executive Committee. Is

  there an Amendment #2?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "So, the Bill should be placed on the Order of Third Reading."
- Burke: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2439, a Bill for an Act to create the Home Loan Collateral Fund Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke, can we take this out of the record for just a couple of minutes?"
- Burke: "Yes, Sir"
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Murphy, did you wish to call House Bill 2052? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act in relation to East St. Louis area economic development. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to defer this to Representative Younge, please."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2052 reenacts the provisions of the East St. Louis Development Authority Act. Amendment #1 eliminates all the language having to do with a demonstration enterprise zone. The affect, monetarily, of this, would be \$160 thousand annual budget for the Authority. DCCA is neutral. The Department of Commerce & Community Affairs and the Department of Revenue is neutral. And I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, there's noise on the floor, so I just couldn't hear what this Bill does."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke has raised a valid point. The noise level is too high, people cannot hear each other in debate or discussion. Mr. Parke, could you state your question, Sir?"

Parke: "Yes. I'm not sure what my position is, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Question, state your question."

Parke: "The question is, could you tell us, again, what this does?"

Younge: "Yes. The Bill reinstates the East St. Louis Development

Authority which was repealed, inadvertently. There was an

understanding that with the creation of the Southwest

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Development Authority, the East St. Louis Development Authority would continue to be an Authority that would help in the development process of the East St. Louis area. I have a letter which I have shared with Representative ???????, indicating that James Riley was the Chief of Staff, if he remembers if that that was the agreement. And so the Development Authority would be responsible for building houses, and streets, and the development process in the East St. Louis area. I have talked with the Director of the Southwest Development Authority and he had said that he will cooperate with ... should it become law. Again, he would cooperate with the new Authority."

Parke: "I'm just... I don't know. Is it that her microphone's not loud enough or... 'cause I can hear myself well, but I have problems hearing her. All right. Representative, let's do it a little easier. Representative, if you'd look at me. There were questions in committee. Does this Amendment address all the concerns that were brought up in committee?"

Younge: "Yes. It eliminates, totally, the demonstration zone part of the Bill and addresses that whole question. I have... Also, there was a question as to whether or not this Authority would cooperate with the Southwest Development Authority. And I have eliminated that as a question."

Parke: "Now, you presented this last night? This Amendment. Was it last night, or did you present it..."

Younge: "No. The Amendment has gone through the committee process."

Parke: "Okay. Did anybody object when you had the Amendment in committee?"

Younge: "No."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Parke: "Then I don't have any more problems."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Because of potential conflict of interest, I'll be
 voting 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. To this Bill. I know of no support through our Development Authority which currently covers Madison and St. Clair County, SWIDA, Southwest Illinois Development Authority, the Director has contacted me, and he has asked us... me not to support this Bill. He said if it does pass he will have to work with it, because it will be the law of the land. I know of, at this time, no practical purpose for this to take place, even though that I hope that I could support Representative Younge in many of her other issues, as we help represent our Metro-East Area. But, I do not stand in support of this Bill, and neither does the Development Authority that currently covers this area. Thank you. I request a 'no' vote."

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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 80 'ayes', 31 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hassert. Mr. Brady, House Bill 3003.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3003 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3003..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady, excuse me. The Clerk advises that the Bill is still on the Order of Second Reading. And Mr. Clerk, are there any pending Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No pending Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

And has the Bill been read a second time?"

Clerk Rossi: "The Bill has been read a second time, previously."

Speaker Madigan: "On what day? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3003, a Bill for an Act regarding abused and neglected residents of long-term care facilities.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3003 addresses two Sections of law that pertains to the Office of Inspector General. It would first remove the sunset provision in the statute to the operation of the Office of Inspector General, and secondly, it provides recipients' records and communications that they shall be disclosed to the Office Inspector General the Department of Human Services within 10 business days of the request of the Inspector In the course of an investigation authorized by General. the Abused and Neglect Long-Term Care Act, it provides that the request shall be in writing and signed by the Inspector General on his... with his or her designee. It provides that the request shall state the purpose for which the disclosure is sought. Also provides, any person knowingly and willfully refusing to comply with such request may be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. There are no known

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  opponents to this particular House Bill and I'd be more
  than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Burke, House Bill 2439. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2439 has been read a second time, prior to today. The Bill is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2439, a Bill for an Act to create the Home Loan Collateral Fund Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2439 is an initiative that is fully supported by our State Treasurer. And it would create a Home Loan Collateral Fund that would be accessed by individuals seeking credit who have for some reason not perfect credit. It would afford these applicants the opportunity to arrange for credit at a fair rate, at a prime rate, as opposed to a subprime rate. There is no opposition to this legislation. And for the Members who were here in the last Session, you might recall that this matter passed unanimously out of the House, and unfortunately, was not heard at the Senate. And I'd be

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. rise in strong support of House Bill 2439. As you know, this is an initiative, and I want to commend the This was brought to us by men from the banking industry that came to my office and pointed out, that it in many... in my district area and other parts of the city where we service, many, many families are being foreclosed on properties that have equity of over a hundred thousand dollars in it, but yet, might be delinquent 3 or \$4 thousand because they might have had a back disc, was in the hospital, and out of work for nine months. However, they've got junior who needs braces. They need to go out and take care of their daughter's wedding, and they're unable to do so because their credit rating is so poor because of this problem. And they brought up a very wonderful idea, by suggesting that we can assist them through a state fund charging an interest, and assist these homeowners who are qualified, who have so much equity in their home, to be able to, at least move that delinquency line out of there, put it back in the principal and then allow their credit rating to appear, which it should be, in very good standing. This loan would be paid back through their mortgage payment, and it's something that will save us as we continue to have a downward spiral in our economy. House Bill 2439 is something that our taxpayers, the people who have put us here in Springfield to do their work. This is a wonderful Bill and I would ask all my colleagues to strongly support this. And we can all go home knowing that we have done the people's work, and today have capped it with something so important to the homeowners of Illinois."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Just one question for the Sponsor if he would yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Or I don't know who to ask, Representative Burke, but there was an Amendment out there, Amendment 1, that we had understood was going to be added to the Bill. Can you tell us why, or what happened to that Amendment?"

Burke: "The Amendment was a little distant from the original intent of this legislation. It would have addressed itself to the definition of predatory lending, and that's something that we were not going to get into, in this particular piece of legislation. I might... I stand corrected, too, as a matter of fact, with respect to this Bill having received unanimous support in the last Session. It did not receive unanimous support but it did receive an overwhelming vote. It was in the hundreds. So, there were a few."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Is Mr. John Jones voting? Mr. Clerk, 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. Mr. Hassert on House Bill 3196. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3196, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 3196 simply amends the School Code to require criminal background checks for student teachers.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

I'll be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all 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. Mr. Berns. Is Mr. Berns in the chamber? Mr. Berns on House Bill 1356. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1356, a Bill for an Act concerning speech. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Berns."

- Berns: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I've been asked to advance this on behalf of Representative Righter who will answer any particular 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 Representative yield? Is it Representative Righter?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dale Righter will answer your questions."
- Black: "Representative, good morning. I haven't had time to look at this. Bring me up to speed if you would. An area of...

  The most critical shortage area in most downstate schools is speech and pathology. Does your Amendment help this situation or simply tighten requirements to the point where it'll make it worse?"
- Righter: "Well, I hope it'll help the situation, Representative.

  The Amendment and the Bill, now 1356, is the compilation of a lot of hard word by the Illinois Community College Board, the Community College Trustees, the Illinois Speech Language Hearing Association, and other groups to try to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

create a licensure for Illinois speech language pathology assistants. The purpose of that is to try to address the very shortage that you're referring to, Representative Black, with regards to the ability of local school districts, especially downstate, to provide speech language pathology services. This simply creates licensure, in both the School Code and the other parts of the Illinois Law, that is required. What we're hoping is to move this over into the Senate, where it will, hopefully, clear there, also. There are three community college programs right now that have graduated, or are in the process of graduating speech language pathology assistants, and this simply, quite frankly, creates a certification for them to go to work in our schools."

Black: "Would these assistants be able to work in a public K-12 system?"

Righter: "In a public school system?"

Black: "Yes."

Righter: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. Once again, the Community Colleges of Illinois are trying to be proactive and help alleviate what critical shortage, my guess is, probably not in just downstate schools but throughout Illinois. And that is teachers who have the necessary training to do speech and pathology work. And we should do everything, I think, in our power not only to help school districts find these employees, but certainly, to put teachers or teacher's assistants in classrooms with people who need this assistance. I commend the Sponsor for getting this worked out. And, particularly, thank the community colleges for,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

once again, showing how quickly they can react to vital needs... so community college systems so adequately serves the people of Illinois. This is a great idea. Good Bill. And I hope you'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "To the Bill. This piece of legislation is absolutely needed. Currently, there are three junior colleges who are directly affected: that would be the College of DuPage, Parkland College, or Park College in Champaign, and Lakeland College in my legislative district. And a couple of years from now, this legislation is absolutely going to be needed. There's a shortage of language speech pathologists now. And I stand in support of this Bill."

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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Stroger, House Bill 3069. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3069 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the Bill that would allow the governmental agencies to collect wages. We debated it yesterday. And I'd ask for an 'aye' 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? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  question, there are 77 'ayes', 38 'noes'. This Bill,

  having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

  declared passed. Representative Kosel, House Bill 1904.

  Kosel, 1904. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1904, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The purpose of this Bill is to allow subcontractors to earn interest on their retainages as general contractors do. It is an Agreed Bill with the two Amendments. And I would ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

  The Chair recognizes Mr. Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. I want to thank the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Illinois Road Builders, for their cooperation in working out this agreement. And I would like to thank Representative Kosel for handling this Bill. And I would ask for your approval."
- 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Winters, House Bill 2263. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2263, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2263 will form the Transportation

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Resources for Innovative Projects. It is a cooperative council headed by the Lieutenant Governor, with input from the Department of Human Services, the Department of Transportation. We'd like to move this Bill over to the Senate for further negotiations. And I would urge its adoption, answer any questions if asked."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wojcik, House Bill 3015. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3015, a Bill for an Act concerning radiation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is an agency Bill. And this proposed legislation would insure that persons who install and provide service for radiation machines are registered with the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety. Reporting will be required for machine installations, and servicing of machines at unregistered The Department would authorize to adopt installations. implementing rules and to collect fees to support the This proposal is an Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety initiative. This legislation proposal will assist the Department in insuring that all radiation installations are registered with the Department, and all radiation machines, mainly x-ray machines, are inspected by Department inspectors to protect the public health and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

safety. I ask for its favorable passage."

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

The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'.

Have all voted who wish? Has Mr.

Granberg voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hultgren, House Bill 1630.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Tom Johnson, House Bill 389. Do you wish to call the Bill? You do not wish to call the Bill? Johnson."

Johnson: "No. I believe there's an Amendment, that I spoke to you about, that I'd like to have discharged from Rules, on this. This is the recodification of the School Code. And that's not been discharged. And I've not heard that Amendment. But I would sure love for that Amendment to be heard. Now, if you want to do that as a Floor Amendment, we'll be more than willing to accommodate you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, a brief inquiry of the Chair during the lull. I don't have a donut factory in my district, so I couldn't bring any donuts. We did have a Spudnut shop years ago, but it closed. Didn't anyone bring any treats in today from a factory, or a shop in their district?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well, speaking of treats. You brought yourself, right?"

Black: "Yes. Thank you. You're very kind, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Right. Sure. Okay."

Clerk Bolin: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lawfer, did you wish to call House Bill 3377? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3377, a Bill for an Act concerning industrial hemp. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3377 authorizes the University of Illinois to study industrial hemp. This has been somewhat similar to a Bill that went through the last General Assembly. There were some concerns about that by the Governor's Office. We believe that this Bill does address those concerns that he had in regards to developing varieties of zero THC. That is addressed, as well as, the funding and the concerns that the Illinois State Police have. The Illinois State Police were involved in these negotiations, wrote the language that's in the Bill and are now neutral on that Bill. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

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

Winkel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanted to express my appreciation for all the hard work that Representative Lawfer has put into this legislation. He has addressed the concerns that we have brought to him. He has made the focus of the research toward a zero THC level hemp plant, and has also worked with law enforcement. And I understand that Western Illinois University will be doing some research to look at the law enforcement problems with this sort of research on the hemp plant. And I stand in support of Mr. Lawfer and his efforts."

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

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  Two people have spoken for the Bill. The Chair recognizes

  Mr. Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Will the Sponsor yield? Mr. Lawfer, you said, you said, research on developing zero THC cannabis plants. You tell me how you do that?"
- Lawfer: "Well, all things are possible with genetic engineering.

  And only by proper breeding and so on that a zero THC variety can be produced. There are zero THC varieties of industrial hemp. They may not be the most productive, and that's where the study would be involved as to developing productive economic varieties that would have zero THC."
- Novak: "Well, don't you have to start with a cannabis grown...

  growing a cannabis plant, or cultivating seeds with THC,

  before you can start doing research to reduce the THC to a

  zero level?"
- Lawfer: "I believe with the modern technology that gene, that THC gene, can be removed from an industrial hemp plant."
- Novak: "So, this research that's going to be done at the U of I, aren't there going to be some plants with THC in them?"
- Lawfer: "The Bill says that the researched goals will be to develop zero THC. Correct."
- Novak: "I know the resear... I know you said that the research goal would be to develop a cannabis plant with zero THC. The question I asked is, won't plants be grown at the University of Illinois with THC in them, because you have to use that basis for your research analysis to reduce... to go for the objective to reduce it to zero THC. Isn't that true?"
- Lawfer: "I think that the primary seed and so on, that needs to be imported may have some THC. The Bill also identifies and defines industrial hemp as having a THC of .03% or less."

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Novak: "What kind of security will be provided by the University?"

Lawfer: "The security will be utilizing some existing facilities that they have used for other crop production that needed to be in a secure area. Those will be utilized. The basis, or the criteria for the security, will be determined by the Federal Government, the DEA, when they issue... and as the University seeks permits for the production."

Novak: "I mean, will there be like... give me an example. Will there be like barbedwire fences around the plots where you're growing the cannabis?"

Lawfer: "Yes. It appears that..."

Novak: "Armed guards?"

Lawfer: "Probably, regular patrols, as well as cameras."

Novak: "Regular patrols?"

Lawfer: "Yes."

Novak: "Black helicopters going over, you know, so to make sure there's no airborne invasions?"

Lawfer: "It depends on whether they're available or not."

Novak: "Okay. Thanks."

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

Two people have spoken for the Bill. One person has stood in response. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could, just a couple of comments to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Righter. Excuse me. Mr. Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you. I, too, want to compliment Representative Lawfer who has truly recognized the need to dig in and see whether this can be evolved into a viable plant that can be used for an alternative resource of income for agriculture. That's the whole basis of doing the research is to establish a plant that can meet today's criteria, socially,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

and from a physical standpoint, to truly see whether this product can be used, can be grown here in Illinois, and be a profitable alternative for agriculture here in Illinois. And I think that that's the base here, and that's why Representative Lawfer has come back. And, I guess, to clarify where the Illinois State Police...I need to ask Representative Lawfer, what is the Illinois State Police position, at this point, on this Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lawfer."

Lawfer: "The Illinois State Police were the ones that sought the cooperation of Western Illinois University Law Enforcement to do the study and how law enforcement could be affected if commercial industrial hemp was produced. So, that study was... the issues were addressed by the Illinois State Police... actually wrote the language that was put into the Bill, and now are neutral on that. There's been... I want to thank the Illinois State Police for their cooperation, and at the meetings that they've attended, and their cooperation has been very helpful."

Wirsing: "Well, thank you, Representative. And I applaud you in your efforts. And will be supporting the Bill."

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

Three people have already spoken in support of the Bill.

One person has stood in response. Mr. Moffitt, you're seeking recognition. In response? Mr. Moffitt?"

Moffitt: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "In response. Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, you indicated that the State Police now are neutral. On your first Bill they were an opponent. Is that correct?"

Lawfer: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "Are there any other opponents who have changed from

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

being an opponent to being either neutral or proponents?"

Lawfer: "I'm not aware that there's been any other changes in that regard."

Moffitt: "And this is a different Bill than last time, is that correct? I mean, it's because you've put in the provisions that satisfied the concern of the State Police?"

Lawfer: "Right, as well as the funding, and also the goal to produce zero THC varieties."

Moffitt: "And those are all changes from the first Bill?"

Lawfer: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "I thank you. I just wanted that clarification. And I appreciate all the hard work you've done."

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 72 'ayes', and 43 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reitz. Mr. Dan Reitz. Representative Mendoza, did you wish to call House Bill 3103? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3103, a Bill for an Act concerning reverse mortgage loans. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3103 is the senior citizen protection Bill. It amends five financial institution regulation Acts. Currently, seniors who have contracted for reverse mortgage have, by that contractual transaction, rendered themselves ineligible for a senior citizen real estate tax deferral, under the Senior Citizens Real Estate Tax Deferral Act. There are many seniors who do not know that

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

they are ineligible for both the reverse mortgage and the senior tax deferral. And, naturally, they try to get both. Upon learning the truth, seniors understandably, get upset and many face undue hardship, since they have already contracted a reverse mortgage and cannot reverse it. Bill protects seniors from this type of scenario, and would require the lender to brok... or the broker, to inform the prospective mortgager of their ineligibility to obtain both benefits. The information must be provided t.he prospective mortgager by a separate document. And the senior must sign the disclosure document as part of the reverse mortgage transaction. Basically, this Bill is simple. It provides for an honest and upfront reverse mortgage transaction for seniors, and it would protect them from undue financial hardship. And being that that's what we're here to do, protect our seniors, I would ask for an And I would refer any questions to the 'aye' vote. original Sponsor, Representative Mulligan, since my voice is not doing so hot today. Thank you."

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill came to me from senior citizens in my district, particularly, two women who called me in tears over the fact that after receiving a reverse mortgage they realized they were no longer eligible for the senior citizens' property tax deferral. I think that they should have known that upfront rather than later. The bankers are neutral on this. And I think it's a very good idea. They can still get the reverse mortgage, but they ought to know because having to pay the property taxes out of pocket rather than having them deferred is a hardship, and most people that go for the reverse mortgages

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

it allows them to stay in their home and still receive some funding. So we appreciate an 'aye' vote on this."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill, vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eileen Lyons, did you wish to call House Bill 2271? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2271, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2271 is legislation that Representative Coulson has been working on for over two years now. And what it does is creates Massage Licensing Act providing for definition, licensing requirements, and grandfathering provisions, so there are uniform standards for the profession throughout the state. There was an Amendment on the Bill to address the concerns of the opposition, and now there is no longer opponents to the Bill. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Coulson. Coulson."

- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise to just make some comments. Many areas of the state need to have standardized massage therapists, and this Bill has been worked on, and there's no opposition. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Madigan: "This Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

  Two people have spoken in support of the Bill. The

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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 111 people voting 'yes', 3 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Shirley Jones, House Bill 3224. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3224, a Bill for an Act concerning legal advocacy services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones."

- Jones, S.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 3224 amends the Guardianship and Advocacy Act except the case of willful and misconduct provided attorneys and paralegals employed by or working on behalf of the Guardianship. And this Bill I would turn over if any questions I would like for you to turn it over to Mary Flowers. Thank you."
- 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? Has Mr. Granberg voted? Has Representative Kurt Granberg voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. McAuliffe in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1954."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1954, a Bill for an Act amending the Health Care Professional Credentials Data Collection Act.

  Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1954 amends the Health Care Credentials Professional Credential Data Collection Act. This is some cleanup language and some language to extend the date. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1954 is a cleanup Bill for the credentialing Bill we passed a couple of years ago. It addresses some of the concerns of the insurance companies and the hospitals. And it is an Agreed Bill now. And I appreciate your vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote '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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lou Jones. Is Representative Lou Jones in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2847. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2847, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones."
- Jones, L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  This Bill simply takes out the juvenile part of... to pay
  the \$2 co-pay for a nonemergency medical. This was at the
  suggestion of the Department of Corrections. Where now,
  every inmate pays the \$2 co-pay, and this just takes the
  juvenile out... out of the Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Meyer. Mr. Meyer on House Bill 3231. Jim Meyer. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3231, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 3231 was before the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee. It passed out with a vote It provides that state reimbursement for school transportation costs to transport students, in grades K-3, that live within 1 1/2 miles of the school. It requires, that the districts who wish to receive reimbursement for such transportation certify the onset of such transportation by September 1, to the State Board of Education. And the effective date of this would be July 1, 2002. This was brought to me by my local school board. live in changing times. Our children transfers between their homes and school quite often through winding streets and streets that... where there are traffic problems on And this would allow our most vulnerable of our children, our K-3, to have that transportation to school. I would be happy to answer any questions."

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

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Giles: "Representative Meyer, I know in committee you were trying to correct a wrong to make it right. I believe you added so that the actual school year would start and I believe... is that October?"

Meyer: "September 1st."

Giles: "What month was that?"

Meyer: "September 1st."

Giles: "Yeah. Okay. I just stand in support of the legislation.

I made a mistake on your Amendment yesterday. I thought it
was something else. And I just stand to fully support this
Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scott."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Scott: "Representative Meyer, do we have a... the analysis that we've got shows a fiscal impact of multiple millions of dollars. Is that 25 million in Chicago and 6.4 million in Elgin, for example? In the two largest districts? I assume that my district being a very large one would also have a strong fiscal impact. Is there some kind of mechanism to try to pay for this that's inside the legislation?"

Meyer: "Yes. As a matter of fact, that's why we worked out the language with the State Board of Education. That, in order to qualify, you must declare by September 1st of this year, and then would be reimbursed after the next year's budget. It is effective in 2002. That gives the budgeting process time to work. That was discussed very much in depth in committee, and that was a mechanism that will work."

Scott: "Okay, and is there any... is there any feeling with respect to trying to decide if there's any more dangerous situations than others, or is it just... if you... every

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  child K-3 gets transported regardless of how close they

  live to the school?"
- Meyer: "Well, K-3 obviously, the person living next door isn't going to take a bus, but K-3, that's up to... that would be up to the school district to decide where that cut off would be. This just allows them to do it. Some of them may not even choose to do it."
- Scott: "So... I'm sorry, would they... would they then submit a plan to the State Board of Education for reimbursement then as to what their plan is and how many children they have and what it's expected to cost, and then they would get reimbursement from the State Board?"
- Meyer: "Yes, they would submit the plan and that's why the cutoff of September the 1st... they have to submit the plan and it's a permissive Bill, it does not require."
- Scott: "Great. Thank you very much for your answers, Jim."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate.

  The Chair recognizes Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Sponsor yield? Representative Meyer, on the... have you computed what the costs would be on this?

  I'm sorry if Representative Scott had asked that and I didn't hear the answer. What would be the impact?"
- Meyer: "Okay. The way this works, Representative, is that by September 1st of the year, the school would have to apply for this transf... would have to apply for this transportation. The way it will work is that the... the way that'll it'll work is that at that point, then they'll be able to determine what that actual cost is and build it into the budget because of the year delay that we've built into the program."

Mautino: "Do we have an idea of what this could range?"

Meyer: "Well, I think that the Board of Education is \$50,000,000

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

possibly or more. Now, there's some factors that need to be considered, that each individual case would have to be resolved as it's applied for. You may have a school that is already providing busing into a certain area, but the bus may be only partially full. The extra students would, basically, cost the school district nothing in that case."

Mautino: "Okay. I have some concerns with your Bill in that we're going to be taking the dollars and possibly general state aid to put into picking up kids who may be within an area we're currently not doing the transporting. could be down the block, they could be within range. Му concern is, we'll be giving... taking the dollars out of the classroom and giving them to bus drivers to... I mean, these are... that's a \$50,000,000 hit. If you look at the overall budget, the increase for general state aid, is going to be \$135,000,000. And even with that, we'll have school districts that are losing money. So, I understand what you're trying to do, but I have serious concerns that by doing this, the utilization is going to be much more in the larger cities, larger... larger districts, and it's going to take dollars that could best be used in the classroom itself. So, that's my main concern and that's why I would be rising in opposition to your Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. I've been somewhat distracted, so I... my recollection is that there's been one person in support and three in response or opposition, which means that there shall be no more in response or opposition. There could be two more in support. So, Representative Crotty, do you rise in support? Representative Crotty."

Crotty: "I have a question..."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, you'd be in response."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Crotty: "...of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "You would be in response. And my recollection is that we have run through all of those in response."

Crotty: "Well, I won't know until I get the answer to this question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Davis. Mr. Steve Davis. You rise in support or in response? In response, Mr. Davis. No, excuse me. We've used up all of those in response. So we'll go to Mr. Meyer to close."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The important thing to keep in mind... to remember House. with this Bill, is that it builds in the time for budget to... to be made for this expenditure. Again, one of the previous speakers had referred to the current year. This does not take effect during this year. I didn't plan for it to, and it's not intended to, and it doesn't do But what it does, is allow for a school district where they feel that there is a necessity to bus these children who are amongst the most vulnerable of our citizens in this state. To apply for this, permissive, it does not require. It doesn't take money out of the school... out of the classroom. It makes sure that the safety of our children is there so that when they go back and forth to school, many times among winding streets, many times along thoroughfares that have traffic problems, that they are safe. It passed out of committee 21-0. D'T like to continue to move this over to the Senate to keep this discussion going. I think its time has come, and I would ask for a favorable 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?

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Fowler voted? Representative Barbara Currie. Has Representative Barbara Currie voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 55 'ayes' and 52 'noes'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative Collins, on House Bill 2834. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2834, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and chamber Members. House Amendment #3

deletes all and becomes the Bill. This Amendment is

identical to House Amendment 2 which did not pass in

committee. It would allow parents or community residents

to chair local school councils. So, what it simply does,

it takes away the parents only as being members... I mean,

being the chairman of the local school council and it lets

the parent or the community person chair the local school

council."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Our file is confused on this Bill, and part of that is my fault and I apologized to the Sponsor last night. Would the Chair inform the Body, how many Floor Amendments are on the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3 is the only Amendment that's

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

been adopted to the Bill."

Black: "All right. And Floor Amendment #3 becomes the Bill, is that correct, Representative?"

Collins: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Now, at one time, the Chicago Board of Education, the City of Chicago, the Illinois Federation of Teachers, and the Chicago Teachers Union opposed something that was in Floor Amendment... oh, I'm looking at the wrong Bill. Representative, I'm going to have to buy you lunch before we get done with this Bill. I apologize. I was looking at the analysis of the wrong Bill."

Collins: "Okay."

Black: "Floor Amendment #3 simply says that a parent or community resident member must be, correct, must be selected chairperson of a local school council?"

Collins: "That's correct. They still have to go through the voting process, so the..."

Black: "Okay."

Collins: "...council can elect either the council... can elect the committee member... I mean the chairman of the council can be a local parent or a community person. It is not mandatory, it's just they still have to go through the election process."

Black: "All right. And the City of Chicago and the Board of
Education of the City of Chicago has no opposition to this
Bill, whatsoever, correct?"

Collins: "They're neutral on the Bill."

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

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 take the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hultgren, House Bill 1630. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1630, a Bill for an Act concerning promotion. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a simple Bill. A couple of years ago, the Illinois Development Finance Authority was increased from 15 members to 17 members. All the numbers were changed in that except the number that stated how many it would take to pass something out of of the Finance Authority. It was left at 8 which is obviously a minority vote out of 17 members. So, what we're simply doing is changing that amount to 9, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Burke, House Bill 2046. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2046, has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would provide

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

that automated external defibrillators may be moved for use and still enjoy the exemption from liability. This would be in cases where a high school may have a defibrillator on the premises, and there were an emergency on a ball field. This legislation would entitle the operator of the device to take the device from the school building to the field and use it and still enjoy the exemption in the Good Samaritan Statute. And I would ask... be available for any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting... it stands corrected. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, how many times have you read this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "This Bill has been read on two occasions."

Speaker Madigan: "Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2046 would provide that the automated external defibrillators, that whole subject... to the Director of Public Health to establish guidelines for placing automatic external defibrillators in state buildings and to recommend the appropriate placement on the basis of the guidelines. Placement must include when appropriate, state buildings in which more than 200 persons may be present at any given time, and also requires the Director to establish

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

guidelines for placing AEDs in all public and private schools and other school facilities, including appropriate placements in the training of personnel for use at school-sponsored athletic activities and events by March 1st. And the Director must recommend a program of assistance in training to enable schools' compliance with the guidelines. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Bill Mitchell, House Bill 3123. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3123, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill.'

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Thirty-one twenty-three is an attempt to alleviate the problem of recruitment and retention that have plagued rural fire protection districts in Illinois. Fire fighters in rural areas would be awarded an exemption from tuition and fees and public universities and community colleges for With the Amendment that was not more than four years. adopted yesterday, it would limit the scholarships to two per department per year. And, if I might add, just yesterday or the day before yesterday, I had a volunteer fire fighter from Niantic Fire Protection District, who was severely injured. His name was Tim Wood, and he was I'd be glad to protecting someone on Interstate 72.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

entertain any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Osmond."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Bill, this is the first time I've seen this Bill. I think it's a terrific Bill, but in the event it passes out of here which I hope it does, would you be amicable to amending this to include volunteer paramedics who also serve communities that may not be volunteer fire fighters? I know up in our county, there's at least two separate organizations that provide emergency medical services that are not affiliated with fire departments. And they have every bit the same problem and maybe even more with training, the continuing ed hours and the hours necessary to become certified are actually quite a bit higher than the fire fighters. So, I'd like to support the Bill and like to ask you to see if that could be amended in the Senate to pick up that class."

Mitchell: "Representative Osmond, I would have no problem with that right now. There are about 28,000 volunteer paid on-call firemen. That is not an unusual request, and I would have no opposition to that to be added on in the Senate."

Osmond: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Andrea Moore."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Moore, A.: "Representative, this is a worthwhile idea, but I do have some concerns about where it might go. When I first read the analysis, I thought well, this obviously would be good for fire fighters. But down here, usually we do the fire fighters on one hand and then the next year we have

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

the police and then pretty soon it expands. Couldn't you see that being a potential problem with this Bill?"

Mitchell: "Well, I think Representative, I appreciate your concern. I've thought of that, and that's why we pretty narrowly drafted this into communities or excuse me, protection districts of less than 5,000 people. worked with the professional fire departments on this Bill. So, you know, we've limited it to two scholarships per year, per department. So, I mean, I tried to be as fiscally responsible as possible on this thing, but you also have to recognize there's an extreme need, Representative, in the State of Illinois that these folks, the vast majority of them get no compensation whatsoever, and they put their life and limb on the line every day. Not only to the fire fighter that I had injured on Wednesday, but last year, I had a volunteer that was killed, Don Wilson in Herrick, Illinois. He was a volunteer. He got no compensation. And his family, when he passed away, got no insurance. So, this is just a recognition, I think a minimal recognition, quite frankly, that we as the state owe a lot to these people who do protect us. I might add that the National Guard have very similar benefits and that the State of New York just passed a far more generous version than this... this Bill for their volunteer fire fighters."

Moore, A.: "Sounds like you've made your case, Representative."

Mitchell: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. There has been one in support, two in response. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just need to let the Body know that I'll be voting 'present' for conflict of interest."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

- Speaker Madigan: "Again, two in support... excuse me, one in support, two in response. Mr. Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Also, to join Representative

  Bost, due to conflict of interest, I also will be voting
  'present'."
- 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? Ladies and Gentlemen, hold down the noise level. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wyvetter Younge voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes, 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Dan Reitz. House Bill 2575. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2575, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2575 deals with the LUST Fund and with the Amendments. It simply extends the date on this for... when this Act is over, from January 1, 2003 until January 1, 2013. It repeals the Article addressing the environmental impact fee. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? Representative Hamos voted? Mr. Wait voted? Mr. Ron Wait, has he voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 89 'ayes', 24 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  hereby declared passed. Mr. Jerry Mitchell, House Bill

  3204. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3204, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring you 3204. It amends the Architecture Practice Act. It makes a technical change in a Section concerning certifying a record. If you have any questions, I would ask my good friend and colleague, Mike Bost, and he would be happy to answer your questions. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes, 0 voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative May, House Bill 2390. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2390, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May."

May: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Bill 2390 amends the School Code to allow a tax equivalent grant to school districts with military bases within their district's boundaries. These schools are in crisis because there are hundreds of acres that they get no property tax for. It affects districts in the southern part of the state and in the northern part of the state, throughout the state. This will give them just a little bit to right this

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

huge inequity. We heard testimony in committee from a Dr. Patricia Pickles of North Chicago. This district loses \$5.8 million a year. She testified in committee that it takes her two or three years to get the little bit that she gets from the Federal Government. This is a long standing problem. For all of these school districts, this Bill is supported by ED-RED, Lake County, and the Large Unit District Association. This Bill... similar Bill, passed out of the Senate 51-0, and I ask for an 'aye' vote for the kids."

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

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

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in reluctant opposition to the Bill. The way this Bill works, if I understand correctly from my conversations with the Sponsor, is that the money to reimburse these districts for their losses from land that is held by the Federal Government, first of all, there are federal payments to make up for what these districts lose. And the pot of money from which the funds would come to pay what this Bill would have everybody pay, is the same pot of money that all the other school districts rely on. It's the money that our downstate and other school districts need, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The matter is on the Order of Standard Debate.

There have been one proponent, one opponent. The Chair recognizes Mr. John Turner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Turner, J.: "Representative, this establishes a Grant Program of some sort for one particular school district? Is that

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

correct?"

May: "No, there are ten districts. As I stated, there are ten districts in this state, and it does... it uses the idea of a tax equivalent grant which is already done in Joliet for, I believe, it's the prison, so, the precedent has been established. It is one-half of one percent. Does not nearly cover what it costs to educate these students."

Turner, J.: "One-half of one percent of what?"

May: "Half of a percent of the equalized assessed valuation."

Turner, J.: "Who supplies the grant funding?"

May: "It would come from the General Revenue's Funds from the...

the State Comptroller would set it aside. And just to
follow up on the question, there was a House... there was a

Floor Amendment passed yesterday to state that this would
be a line item just to address the question about taking
any money out of the pot."

Turner, J.: "Well, if... if it comes from the General Revenue Fund or any line item, it's coming from the state. How would you respond to the argument that if it's coming from state, if it's state funding that is, and it only goes to ten different school districts, that it works against all other school districts because they don't share in this money which is not equally distributed?"

May: "We fund our schools through the property tax in this state.

That's why, in its wisdom, the... this Body, years ago, set up this Chaney-Monge Fund because the Joliet area has a huge tract of land that provides no fund, no property tax.

We fund our schools through the property taxes in this state, and there are hundreds of acres and hundreds of students to be educated. It's just a small token to right the inequity."

Turner, J.: "Okay, you lost me on that. I understand that

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

education is mostly funded through property taxes, but I thought your answer to my question was, as per this particular grant mentioned in this particular Bill, that it was funded from the General Revenue Fund."

May: "That's correct."

Turner, J.: "Well, that's not property taxes, that's taxes in the State General Revenue Fund raised by income taxes or sales taxes, correct?"

May: "That is correct."

Turner, J.: "All right, to the Bill. Representative, I certainly understand you're trying to do something beneficial for your district, and I can appreciate that. Obviously, I'm here to try and represent my district in the best way I possibly can, as well. Nevertheless, I have to stand in opposition to your Bill. While it does help your district, seems to me that as a legitimate argument that it hinders or hurts other school districts in this state, particularly those in downstate. And if you don't happen to have... if your district doesn't happen to contain one of the school districts, one of the ten that you mentioned, then it strikes me as a pretty good argument that, indeed, we are taking money from the state to fund particular school districts, and if your school districts don't share it would be a bad vote for your district. And therefore, I would think for the overwhelming number of us here in this chamber, it should be a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The matter is on the Order of Standard Debate.

There has been one proponent, two people in opposition.

There will be one more in opposition. Mr. Righter. Mr. Righter."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Righter will be the last person in

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

opposition. Mr. Righter."

Righter: "First, Mr. Speaker, I request a verification on the Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, Sir. Granted."

Righter: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Righter: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Righter: "Representative May, I wonder if you could help me understand a little bit about the operation of your Bill.

What you're trying to accomplish here, as I understand, is for those school districts that may have a military installation there, since that property is exempt from local property taxes, you're going to try to help make up for them by expending money out of the State's General Revenue Fund. Is that fair to say?"

May: "It's... yes, it's to give a tax equivalent grant."

Righter: "Okay, but, the point of your Bill is to try to make up for the loss of the revenue that the school district may suffer because that property is not subject to taxation by the local government. Is that right?"

May: "Yes, that is correct. This is a unique circumstance that puts these districts... you know, if these districts go under, North Chicago, the state will have to bail it out."

Righter: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure I understood what you're trying accomplish. Now, Representative, what is the triggering mechanism for your Bill in terms if a military installation closes? I mean, if the United States Government continues to hold onto the property after the base may close, will your legislation still apply and still give that particular school district the benefit?"

May: "No, there must be students in the district. That's...

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

these Amendments we put in, address these questions. There must be students in the district."

Righter: "Right, I understand there'd be stud..."

May: "And every year there are six criteria that the... the board... the superintendent sends in."

Righter: "When you say students in the district, Representative May, I guess... that's not quite the answer I guess I'm looking for. What I'm asking you is, is if the military base has closed down, and there are no more United States military personnel at the base, will your legislation apply to that school district?"

May: "There must be military students living on the base."

Righter: "Okay, military students."

May: "Uh huh."

Righter: "Students. Okay, I understand. So, even if there are no students from the military base on there, but the property is still held by the Untied States Government, your Bill will no longer help those districts. Is that right?"

May: "That is correct. They will not get the tax equivalent grant."

Righter: "Okay. Is there a reason... can you tell me why you are selecting out individual... the military bases as opposed to other entities that may not be subject to property taxes in school districts? Are there others that you can think of that may not be in this legislation?"

May: "I am not aware of that. I've selected the military bases because, as I've stated, the large tracts of land that produce no property tax, and do produce a large number of students."

Righter: "What's the name of the school district that you represent, Representative May?"

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

May: "I don't represent any school district. I represent the 60th District."

Righter: "Okay. Okay. What school district brought this to your attention, Representative May?"

May: "This is an initiative of ED-RED, and that is a consortium of school districts in the collar counties."

Righter: "How many school districts in this state,

Representative, are impacted by the fact that there is a

military base somewhere within their school district

property?"

May: "There are ten districts."

Righter: "Ten?"

May: "Yes."

Righter: "Ten out of what, 895?"

May: "There are ten districts and there are... they are in the northern part of the state. I think North Chicago and Ron Stephens... North Chicago is in Susan Garrett's district and then the Air Force Base in Southern Illinois is in Ron Stephens... Scott Air Force Base is in Ron Stephens' District."

Turner, J.: "Okay. What is the estimated fiscal impact for your Bill?"

May: "Yes, we have it filed, \$600 thousand."

Turner, J.: "Okay. And, that money, I think I heard you say in response to an earlier question, is suppose to come out of the General Revenue Fund?"

May: "That is correct."

Turner, J.: "Okay. And, you say the Comptroller is supposed to set aside that money?"

May: "There... we've asked for a separate line item, yes."

Turner, J.: "A separate line item?"

May: "That's correct."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Turner, J.: "Okay. Are there any provisions in your Bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Righter, could you bring your remarks to a close."

Righter: "I will. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are there any provisions in your Bill, Representative May, that would ensure that whether it's coming from the Common School Fund or the General Revenue Fund, that money that would otherwise go into the state aid formula categoricals or whatever other mechanism we're using now, that this will not subtract from that? Is there anything in the law to guarantee that?"

May: "Yes. The Amendment we did, says clearly that it's to be appropriated to the district from a separate line item. So the intent of this Amendment was to say that it'd be a separate line item and be funded. It would require a continuing appropriation to this line item."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Righter, could we do one more question?

One more question. Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I would yield my time to Representative Righter, please."

Speaker Madigan: "I'm just trying to move this along. I think everybody understands what the Bill is. Mr. Righter."

Black: "I understand."

Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But there is going to be a transfer, is there not, Representative May, into this line item and that money could otherwise go to the schools? Is that fair to say?"

May: "You know, everything we do in this chamber affects funding of schools and funding of all of our budgetary items."

Righter: "Thank you Rep..."

May: "No more than anything else we do."

Righter: "Thank you, Representative May. To the Bill. Mr.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker, I appreciate Representative May's intent here in looking out for, obviously, what is a school district legislative district. somewhere in her But. as Representative May just said in answers to some of t.he questions, there are ten school districts out of 895 that will benefit from her legislation. Ten out of 895. for the other 885 school districts, this is not good legislation. And for the overwhelming majority of Members in this chamber, this is not good legislation, and I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. We have now heard from all of the opponents. There could be two more supporters.

Representative Coulson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make mention that while this only helps ten districts, there are several districts in downstate Illinois, as well as upstate Illinois, that do have military students. Whether we have a base or not, my base, in Glenview Naval Air Station was closed. But I have over 500 students that are from the Great Lakes Naval Base that live in my district and go to school in the schools in my district. I think it's very important that the Federal Government address this issue, but meanwhile, the districts in my area have had to have two referendums in order to try to increase their taxes to pay for these students. And I think it's only right that we can try to help. It's a \$600 thousand fiscal It is not a lot of money to the state budget, but it will greatly help those school districts which are both upstate and downstate, and I would encourage you to support this to make sure that those students who are children of our military are receiving the best education they can and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

fairly funded. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The last person to speak in support of the Bill, Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of General Assembly. I stand in strong support of this Bill. As a freshman Legislator, I came here working as hard as I could to provide the best educational opportunities for all the children throughout this state. And we have several school districts now that are underfunded because there are military dependents who do not pay property taxes. This is not the fault of the school districts. The school districts are doing everything they possibly can to cover It is up to us, as Members of the General these costs. Assembly, to reach out and provide a \$600 appropriation to help these school districts from the northern part of the state to the southern part of the state. Ensure that these students have an equal opportunity in the school houses. This Bill has passed the Senate unanimously and now it's in our hands, and I ask every single one of you whether it affects your school districts directly, to think long and hard about how important this legislation is for the school children throughout this state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kurtz. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes' and 58 noes'. The Chair recognizes Representative May."

May: "I'd like to request postponement, but..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall be..."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

May: "Mr. Speaker, may I point out... just... I really didn't get a chance to answer a couple of points that were brought up."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May, just one second. You've made a request for Postponed Consideration. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you declared the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "No, I didn't."

Black: "Are you sure?"

Speaker Madigan: "We'll get the transcript."

Black: "All right. Okay. No, I'm not going to check the transcript. If you say you didn't, obviously you didn't.

You were very close."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, I was."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Madigan: "Like you and I are real close. Right? The Bill shall be put on the Order of Postponed Consideration.

The next Bill will be by Mr. O'Connor. House Bill 579.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 579, has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connor. Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 579, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connor."

O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 579 would establish a pilot program conducted by the Illinois Commerce Commission to test automated audible warning devices at railroad crossings in Cook, DuPage, Lake and Will counties. The project is intended to contribute data to the existing federal...

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Federal Railroad Administration horn-blowing, rule making process. As drafted, the Federal Rule could mandate whistle blowing in communities in Illinois which now have so called 'quiet zones'. We're asking the ICC to determine whether the stationary horns which are a more inexpensive alternative to the currently mandated technological changes be explored. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition to the Bill."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mathias. Ladies and Gentlemen, let us keep the noise level down. Mr. Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong support of this Bill. My town has a major freight line that goes through it. The noise at times can be unbearable, especially through the middle of the night. Something must be done. The Federal Railroad Administration has been working with the local municipalities. I think this is a good way, a good test of a program rather than having the trains run with their sir... their horns throughout the... for a mile in front of a intersection or a railroad crossing. I think this is a great idea that we've been pushing to have an audible sound at the crossing. So, I strongly urge my fellow Representatives to support this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "We have now had two people speak in support of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for Mr. Mathias.

  Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman yields."
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Mathias, or perhaps Mr. O'Connor, you can answer this question. The previous Bill, your side declined to put votes on a Bill that would help ten school districts in

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Illinois. Four of those school districts belong to Mr. Stephens. One of those school districts belonged to Ms. Coulson, but it was felt that we should not provide any special dispensation for Ms. May. So, what's the argument for our side of the aisle putting votes on this measure, separate and apart from the merits?"

O'Connor: "It's a railroad safety Bill. What we're attempting to do is put in place in Illinois, a system which will ultimately benefit downstate areas by making money from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund available to eliminate crossbuck, so called crossbuck grades crossings downstate.

Our hope is, is that we can minimize the impact of the federal rule up north so that money will be available for grade crossing safety in the southern part of the state. I think that this is a Bill which will help every region in the state. And that's a reason to vote for it."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've now had two people in support of this Bill and we've had one person in response. And we have four people seeking recognition. Now again, two in support, one in response, the Chair recognizes Mr... Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "I would speak in favor of it."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Proceed."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to my colleague and my friend on the other side of the aisle for the last comments, Illinois is the middle of the country and I think we understandably have more railroads crossing back and forth through our districts than most states do. This law, particularly since the railroad crossings pass through heavily populated districts that abut homeowners the whistle blowing is just terribly offensive. All you have to do is be down here in your apartment at night, late at

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

night, to hear how the whistles blow as they come through, and in the middle of the night, you can hear them. And I think that in order to try and stem what's happening at the federal level, we should support this Bill because I think it's a benefit to everyone in this state. Particularly, since we are such a crossroads, and we have many, many areas that have unique and unusual train crossings. In many of our districts, particularly in the upper half, not only do we have commuter, but we have... we're competing with freight and other rails that cross. I think this is a good idea and I think we ought to support it."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we can keep the noise level down. We have now had three people speak in support of this Bill. There shall be two in response. Those seeking recognition are O'Brien and Davis. So, Representative O'Brien, only for response."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

- O'Brien: "Representative O'Connor, what is the estimated cost to come from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund for these pilot programs?"
- O'Connor: "There's been... the source of the funding for the pilot program has not been determined. It is estimated that the cost of one grade crossing, fixed horn, is \$50,000. But there's no intention to necessarily take this from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund."
- O'Brien: "But..."
- O'Connor: "It is subject to appropriation. From the... possibly from the General Revenue Fund. That'll be a function, obviously, of the will of this Body."
- O'Brien: "But this would authorize that money to come from that fund. Is that correct?"

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- O'Connor: "It's my understanding that it's subject to appropriation, so, it could come from any funding available."
- O'Brien: "I guess that's not really my question. There is money already in the Grade Crossing Protection Fund."
- O'Connor: "There's now money in the Grade Crossing Protection Fund. It's 20... I believe last year it was \$29 million. That money appropriately is going mostly to counties outside of the... south of I80 for reconstruction of so-called crossbuck crossings. And we certainly would support that continuing effort by the ICC."
- O'Brien: "My question to you, however, is if this Bill authorizes money to be taken from the Crossing Protection Fund for this pilot project, you don't have to have additional funds put in there through the appropriation project... process.

  Correct?"
- O'Connor: "My understanding is, is that this is substantive legislation. It's my understanding of the Illinois Constitution that substantive legislation cannot authorize the expenditure of funds. Therefore, my answer is, is that at the time of appropriation we will make that determination as of the source of the funding."
- O'Brien: "It's my understanding that you have made an agreement that you won't seek to use Grade Crossing Protection Fund moneys unless you have an agreement with the railroad industry and with others. Is that correct?"
- O'Connor: "That's absolutely correct. Yes."
- O'Brien: "Because the money in that Grade Crossing Protection Fund is already there. So, this enables you to dip into it. You don't need any further appropriation. There's already \$29 million in that fund."
- O'Connor: "Well, it's certainly not the intention to use any

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

funding in this fiscal year, and you certainly have my commitment that I would support approval of the interested parties in the use of the funding from the Grade Crossing Protection Fund."

O'Brien: "I appreciate your answers, Representative O'Connor. the Bill. I guess I can understand how aggravating railroad whistles could be. I lived 50 feet from one of the tracks for four and a half years. It's loud, you can't talk on the phone. But you know what, it's an inconvenience. In my district, I've had people killed because we have Amtrak going through and we don't even have arms that come down. There's not enough money. I have one community that needs them, but their local share exceeds five years of their operating budget. Five years, just for their local share. They can't afford it. I see this as a potential drain on that fund because there's money there. You've made a commitment, but there's nothing to say that those test pilots, that money could not come out of that fund right now because there's already money there and you're saying that this money could come from there if this legislation is enacted. So, I have a real concern and I just simply can't support it because although I understand that noise levels are an inconvenience. When you move next to a railroad track you figure you're gonna hear bells and whistles and noise, and trains are going to use the track, and so to say, 'Gee, you know, I think we ought to spend all of this money so that my comfort level isn't destroyed in my home.' It's kind of crazy. And I just don't understand it. I would support you if we had crossbars and we had arms coming down across every railroad crossing in Then, I think it would be the State of Illinois. appropriate to do this. But, you know, I'm sorry for the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

inconvenience for people who don't like to hear the train whistles, but I don't like the inconvenience when I have to go to wakes and funerals of people that I know that get killed at least once a quarter in railroad tracks in my district, so, I'm sorry I have to oppose your legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "The last person in response will be Representative Steve Davis. Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Davis, S.: "Yes, Representative, was there any discussion about taking any money out of the High Speed Rail Fund to fund your project?"

O'Connor: "No."

Davis, S.: "Well, let me ask you this. How many railroad lines are there in Lake and Will County? Do you know?"

O'Connor: "How many railroad lines?"

Davis, S.: "What is the proliferation of rail lines?"

O'Connor: "Lines? I don't know."

Davis, S.: Was there any reason..."

O'Connor: "I know that there are approximately... in the area that this covers, the pilot project that was covered, there's approximately 1700 grade crossings."

Davis, S.: "Okay. I'm just curious as why you didn't put any downstate counties into your Bill, because I can tell you being from the Metro-East, we have nothing but rail lines coming through our counties, and it seems to me like you would have... somebody would have taken a study to find out where the most proliferation of railroads and railroad lines come through, and I can guarantee you that the Metro-East is at the top of the list on that. So, I'm... for one thing, disappointed that you did not include any downstate counties and that you did not include Madison,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

St. Clair, in particular. My other point is, and I agree with Representative O'Brien, if we're going to take money out of the Grade Crossing Fund, it should be used for safety purposes and not for purposes of conveniencing people who live next to railroads. My other question is, I don't see him on the floor, but I was wondering why you didn't include Calhoun County as one of your test areas in the State of Illinois?"

O'Connor: "Is that a question? Wha... Oh..."

Davis, S.: "Yes. Wha... I was just curious why you wouldn't include Calhoun County in the Bill?"

O'Connor: "The... I just wanted to rem... it's a pilot program.

I'm happy to include... if it goes... if this Bill passes,
to include... and work with you on including some downstate
counties. The idea was, is to find some counties where
there's dense population for the purposes of working with
the Federal Railroad Administration. But, I'm perf... I'm
open to considering other counties."

Davis, S.: "Well, there's no railroads in Calhoun County, but if you would put Calhoun County in the Bill, maybe we could support it, but as the Bill stands now, we can't. Thank you."

O'Connor: "Thank you Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. O'Connor, if you could close briefly, we'll do the Roll..."

O'Connor: "I would've apprec..."

Speaker Madigan: "We'll do the Roll Call and then we'll recognize

Mr. Mathias. So, are you prepared for Roll Call, Mr.

O'Connor?"

O'Connor: "Yes I am."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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 93 'ayes' and 21 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mathias seeks recognition because his name was used in debate. And if you don't use anybody else's name in your debate, then you'll be the last one to speak on this matter. Mr. Mathias."

- Mathias: "Thank you. One of the previous speakers, after me, stated... wanted to know why we did not support Representative May's Bill. I just wanted to let that speaker know that I and several of the Members on my side of the aisle did support that Bill, and I think it was a Bill... a good Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg. Is Mr. Granberg in the building?

  Mr. Granberg. Has anyone seen Mr. Granberg? Mr. Meyer,

  House Bill 2538. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2538 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1, 2, and 3 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Jim Meyer, has been approved for consideration."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 was requested by the Illinois Bankers' Association. It authorizes the disclosure of customer financial records as necessary to enforce a transaction requested or authorized by the customer in connection with the servicing of financial products and services requested or authorized by that customer. Also, with the maintaining of servicing of a customer's account with the bank and also with the proposed or actual

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

securitization or secondary market sale related to transaction of a customer. Nothing in this exception authorizes sale of the financial records or information of a customer without the consent of the customer. I'd appreciate passage."

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?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I... Put my mind at ease on just one question. Whenever I see that we're relaxing the right of any entity to relax its rules on my private information, my financial data, which certainly wouldn't interest anybody, but it's mine. Why do we want to do that? Why is it necessary to relax restrictions on release of my private financial data?"

Meyer: "Well, first of all, Representative, this is only by the request of the customer and it brings us into line with Federal Law. This is the purpose of it."

Black: "Well, this is the same Federal Government that requires our Social Security number on everything we do and the same Federal Government that then goes on 60 Minutes and says, protect your Social Security number because of identity theft. I mean, that's the common sense that they use, and I just get nervous when I see any Amendment that says you're relaxing restrictions on making my private financial history more available to people at other banks or other savings and loans. Why is that necessary?"

Meyer: "Well, it does help to prevent financial fraud, and again, it is with the authorization of the customer. You have to authorize that in order for it to happen."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Black: "Is there specific language in your Amendment that says I would have to authorize the release that opens the window to my personal financial information under the following circumstances? For example, if the bank is up for sale, part of a due diligence accompanying the sale, part of the ordinary course of servicing my account. Is there... Can you have staff show me the specific language that says I would have to agree to that?"

Meyer: "Yes, Representative, on page 5, line 22, it says, 'nothing in this item, however, authorizes the sale of the financial records or information of a customer without the consent of the customer.'"

Black: "Without consent of the customer meaning..."

Meyer: "You."

Black: "... me."

Meyer: "Yeah."

Black: "All right. Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2538, a Bill for an Act concerning certain financial institutions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2538 is an ominous... excuse me, omnibus banking Bill that was suggested by the Office of Banks and Real Estate. It, as amended, contains language authorizing the Office of Banks and Real Estate to issue legal opinions

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

and interpretations whenever necessary to enforce the parity of state banks with national banks. It contains language equalizing certain powers to do business granted to state chartered thrifts such as savings and loans and savings banks with the powers granted by the state... with the powers granted to state chartered banks. minor fee language and amendatory provisions amending the Foreign Bank Representative Office Act. These fees affect only banks that are headquartered in some place other than Illinois, which has an office open in Illinois. No Illinois headquartered banks or corporations would be affected by these fee hikes, nor would any consumers be directly affected. It clarifies its thrifts, such as savings banks and savings and loans can charge any rate of interest and are not affected by the remaining interest rate ceilings contained in the State Interest Act. this provision gives thrifts the same market-based freedom to set interest rates as the banks have had for many years. And it also adds several new exceptions to the overall State Law that says that consumer information must be kept confidential by the financial institution that holds it. The exceptions benefit state chartered banks, savings and loans, savings banks and credit unions. The exceptions say that these financial institutions can divulge information in due diligence situations when the financial institution any of its assets are up for sale. In the course of servicing a customer's account or responding customer's request, and it's necessary to protect the bank, savings and loan, savings bank or credit union from fraud or other liability. And of course, that is with the customer's consent as we indicated in the Amendment. This Bill has been negotiated between all the parties

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

interested. I know of no one that is in opposition to it. It is an agency Bill. It updates the banking laws of Illinois to conform to Federal Law. Both staffs have taken a great deal of time to go through it and understand it and there are no concerns at this time with any of the language in the Bill. I would ask for a favorable vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you. I have a question. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Soto: "My question is, who's opposed to this Bill?"

Meyer: "I know of no one in opposition to the Bill. The Bill passed out of the banking committee with no dissenting votes. All Amendments have passed with no consenting (sic-dissenting) votes. I simply do not know of anybody that's in opposition to it."

Soto: "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? ... shall take the record. On this question, there are 98 'ayes', 10 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Granberg, House Bill 3538. Mr. Granberg."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3538, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3538 addresses the critical condition that our long-term health care facilities are facing in this state. Our families, our friends, our grandparents are in these long-term health care facilities, and these

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

facilities are literally going bankrupt all throughout the State of Illinois. We imposed a one-year freeze on their reimbursement rates in 1992. That freeze is still in existence. Since that time, these nursing homes have been underfunded to the tune, on their costs of \$80 million. This Bill addresses that issue. Half of those funds will be available from the Federal Government. If these nursing homes aren't properly funded, they close. What do we do to those people, those members of our society, who are purely vulnerable. What do we do with our family, our friends, when our nursing homes can no longer operate? I would ask your support and I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

Mr. Granberg has spoken in support of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I, last night, questioned the Representative about the amount of money involved in this Bill, and it is significant. But I did ask, and I think he nodded and agreed that he would try to work to see if we could find money to fund this, because we're talking tens of millions of dollars. frankly, the Bill is a good one, because we need to force the issue of paying for nursing homes rather than having homes subsidize our elderly, which is the nursing responsibility of the state taxpayers as well as individual people. So, I will support the Legislator's Bill and hope that this opens a dialogue or continues to put the pressure on the four Leaders and the Governor, to find a workable solution to this crisis that the Legislator's Bill addresses."

Speaker Madigan: "Yeah, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. We've had one for, one in response. The Chair

42nd Legislative Day recognizes Mr. Reitz."

April 6, 2001

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support Representative Granberg, and as we have a tremendous problem with nursing homes and the amount of money that we have available to them. Fixing the reimbursement rate or these enhancements will help tremendously. So, I rise in support of this Bill. And I would also... I know Representative Granberg's having a problems with his voice today. I would... I've spoken with Representative Bob Ryan and he'd be happy to translate anythings that needs translated."

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

Two have spoken for, one has spoken in response. The Chair recognizes Representative Hamos."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. with regret against this Bill. This Bill costs a \$100 million. It gives one industry, the nursing home industry, a huge rate increase along with annual rate increases guaranteed in the Bill. Now, I've been told that this Bill is kind of greased. That the Leaders have all agreed that we need to do this. But I'm urging you at this time to vote 'present', because if you've been working this year for example, on Early Intervention Programs that to cut off thousands of little children because the state can't afford it. If you've been working to try to provide few million dollars into AIDS Outreach to a African-American communities. If you've been working to try to give your schools some additional funding, but you've been told the state can't afford it. If you've wanted to maintain funding for hospitals, tertiary hospitals, or try to, in fact, develop a new family care program, but have been told the state can't afford it. Then, you know, this is a Bill that costs a \$100 million, and if you're

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

wondering how you're going to be able to go home this spring break and tell every single human service provider in your district why only one industry is getting a increase and every other human service provider is getting a zero COLA. I think that this is the time we need to send a message that we need to learn more about the budget. can't we afford anything else in the budget? that we need to not have a sensible discussion about our priorities? And our priorities should include more than one industry, the nursing home industry. This Bill gives a \$100 million blank check to nursing home owners with no guarantee that the money will even trickle down to the hard working workers in these nursing homes. So, I'm asking you to vote 'present' at this time, so that we can continue to have a discussion about all the priorities in our state; education, health care, and human services. Please vote 'present'."

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

Two have spoken for the Bill, two have spoken in response, and there are four people seeking recognition in the following order. There are four seeking recognition.

There'll only be two more recognized: Boland, Morrow, Hoffman, Black. Now, Mr. Boland, are you for or against?"

Boland: "For."

Speaker Madigan: "Boland is a proponent. He'll be the last proponent."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boland. Mr. Boland."

Boland: "Well, let... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can't express my strong support for this measure. This is so crucial. Many of our county nursing homes are literally on the brink of going bankrupt and we're going to be faced

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

with a crisis situation of hundreds, perhaps thousands of people, those we love, relatives of our constituents that will be, basically, forced either back into their homes or out on the streets, or into much more expensive situations, where we the taxpayers are going to end up... we're a humane society. We're going to end up taking care of these folks one way or another. But it will either be a greater burden on the families or a greater burden on us later as taxpayers, as we try to help these folks in some other way. So, it's absolutely crucial, I believe, that we pass this. Yes, this will cost an awful lot of money. But you and I know that when we've ever wanted to do things for big corporations or powerful individuals or the industry or many other special interests, we've always found the money somehow. So, the question of where the money is, we will find it. We'll find it just like we always found it for all these other big interests. Only, this is something most crucial. This is some of our most vulnerable individuals, and I hope that we can all support this. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Three people have spoken in support of the Bill. There shall be one more person in opposition to the Bill. The following are seeking recognition in the following order: Mr. Morrow, Mr. Black, Representative Feigenholtz, Representative Erwin. Of those four, there shall be one in opposition. Mr. Morrow, are you in opposition?"

Morrow: "Mr. Speaker, actually I'm neutral on this Bill. Can it be..."

Speaker Madigan: "There will be one more in opposition. You are one of the four seeking recognition. There's only one more slot for opposition."

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Morrow: "I'll..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "I'll decline. I'll decline my comments, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. The next person is Feigenholtz, in

opposition? Representative Feigenholtz in opposition."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not speaking in opposition to this Bill, but I'm glad I was recognized anyway. I was inspired by my colleague, Julie Hamos, who brings up a very, very good point about what we do here. Today's our last day here. We're all going to go home for a long holiday, and when we come back we're going to be with the budget. And there are many, many dealing wonderful things on the menu, and we have to decide what our priorities are. Let's see what's out there. We've got a lot of Bills in the Senate now about the Olmstead decision. And a lot of that involves applying for waivers with the Department of Public Aid, and we're all wondering, are the people or the advocates who don't have lobbyists here, high-priced lobbyists, working for them going to be able to live more independently in the least restrictive setting using our Medicaid dollars. What about those 200,000 adult... parents of KidCare eligible children, and the Federal Government that is going to give us 65¢ on the dollar to insure them. Are we going to fund that? Is that going to be in our budget priority? The proposal that Representative Granberg is presenting to us today is going to set... basically, index the long-term care industry unlike any other human service in the State of Illinois. Every year we've got people who come to us about the cost of doing business and about COLAs. And what happens? We send them home with practically nothing, if anything. And so, although, I think that the nursing home industry and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

that the elderly people who are in acute care in this state deserve this, I ask all of you to think long and hard about what our priorities are in this state. 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? Representative Pankau voted and Mr. Fritchey. Has Mr. Fritchey voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 102 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Myers. Rich Myers, do you have a Bill that you wish to call? Could you tell me the number? 1941? 1921. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1921, is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1921 amends the non-Home Rule Sales Tax. Provides for three things. Two are very important ones. In the previous legislation, the tax can be imposed at half percent increments. This allows it to go up in quarter percent increments after a referendum by the public. It also allows some of the proceeds to be used for property tax relief. It also allows for collection to begin in the months of January or July, instead of only January. I ask for passage of this Bill."

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

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 86 'ayes', 27 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Granberg, House Bill 16. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 16, a Bill for an Act in relation to disabled persons. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I want to thank the Director of the Department of (sic-on) Aging. We've been working with her, and she's been extremely, extremely helpful. They have no objection to this legislation. They are neutral, and we're hopeful of passing this on to the Senate and forging an agreement with the Senate. What this does is, ensure... or help ensure that our families, our parents, can stay at home. And those care givers can be properly funded to keep our parents at home so they don't have to go to nursing homes increasing the cost to the state for care, and at the same time giving support to our social structure, giving support to that family network. It's important for all of us, and I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1935. Mr. Clerk, change the sponsorship from Collins to Lou Jones. The Chair recognizes Representative Lou Jones. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1935, a Bill for an Act relating to

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  heirloom marriage certificates. Third Reading of this

  House Bill.'
- Jones, L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1935 amends the State Finance Act, Vital Records Act, and the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act by providing that an heirloom marriage certificates shall be issued by the State Registrar of Vital Records upon request. And upon payment of a fee to be determined by the State Registrar. Annazette Collins will answer any questions that you have in regards to this legislation."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

  The Chair recognizes Mr. Scully."
- Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."
- Scully: "Representative, how much do you hope to raise with this program?"
- Jones, L.: "Annazette is going to answer the questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Collins will answer the question."
- Collins: "I didn't hear him. If he could repeat his question."
- Scully: "How much do you hope to raise with this program? How much money do you hope to raise with this program on an annual basis?"
- Collins: "We don't know at this time, but in Alaska, they raised about... about \$800 thousand. So, we're hoping that people who will purchase the marriage certificate will pay the extra \$25 for the heirloom certificate. We'll put that money into another fund so we can have affordable housing. So, it'll be an affordable housing fund. And that money will be used to lend out grants to developers who want to develop in the TIF areas."
- Scully: "Now what is the projected cost to the state of providing

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

this service?"

Collins: "It's about 15 to \$20 per heirloom certificate."

Scully: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, this... this is..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, Mr. Black..."

Black: "...a mandate the way it's written. And it would be... it would be implement, excuse me, it would impact every county in the state. This is not just limited to Cook, correct?"

Collins: "No, the Amendment says that it is limited to Cook

County only and it's still not a requirement. If you go

get a marriage certificate and you want the heirloom

certificate, then you pay the additional \$25 to get it, but

you don't have to do it."

Black: "Okay. No, you're right, I apologize. The Amendment did take it out and make it only applicable to Cook and it is a program that you could... or a certificate you could ask for certainly. The... are you familiar... we created something like this several years ago. It was called the heirloom birth certificate. Are you familiar with that at all?"

Collins: "Yes, I heard that argument."

Black: "Are you aware that that program has never made enough money to cover its expenses?"

Collins: "Yes, I heard that argument."

Black: "All right. Is... I guess I... one of the things I don't understand. If you want the heirloom marriage certificate and you pay this fee, is it a \$50 fee?"

Collins: "This project, Representative Black, isn't a mandated

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

project. It's a project that the City of Chicago wants to try, so that they can try to raise money for affordable housing. At this time, they're looking at it like people that getting married, that they're looking to buy houses and a lot of people now cannot afford to live in the city. So the city is trying to come up with a plan so that they can help raise money for people who cannot afford homes in the City of Chicago. So this is one way of doing it. So it's not mandated that anybody can..."

Black: "No, I..."

Collins: "...that they have to do that. We just..."

Black: "I understand that. I stand corrected. It's certainly not a mandate, let me make that very clear. Thank you very much for your answers, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we did this some years ago with an heirloom birth certificate and one of the personal disappointments is that when great my grandchildren were born I was just convinced that that would be the neatest thing I could do is to get an heirloom birth certificate for my grandchildren. My two children didn't agree. So I was not able to do the heirloom birth certificate. And the only reason I stand in opposition to the Bill is that the Department of Public Health has testified that they believe administering this program would more likely than not provide a negative revenue stream, as they would expect extremely low demand for these documents as they have discovered the extremely low demand for the heirloom birth certificate. And so it is with the knowledge that they would probably lose money that I articulate their position and intend to vote 'no' on the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Mr.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you. I've got a quick question for the Sponsor. Is there a provision in this that if it does not raise the funds that was anticipated that it would... that it could sunset?"

Collins: "Well, at this time ... has agreed when we move it to the Senate side to take out the provision with the Public Health Department."

Rutherford: "I can't hear you, I'm sorry."

Collins: "So that they won't have anything to do with it. And so if they lose money, it'll be just the city."

Rutherford: "So, it would still stay on the books?"

Collins: "Yes."

Rutherford: "Actually, I'm going to stand in support of your legislation because I think it is something that if we could find opportunities to bring in resources for what the Representative's looking to designate it for without taking out of city coffers or General Revenue. It's a voluntary program that I think it should be something that should have a chance to have its shot and tried and if it doesn't work, it goes away."

Collins: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 80 'ayes', 35 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Novak, House Bill 2576. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2576 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #3 has been adopted to the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Bill. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor

Amendments have been approved for consideration. The
fiscal note that was requested on the Bill has been filed."

beaker Madigan: "Put this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and

Speaker Madigan: "Put this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2576, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2576 is a result of a January 9, 2001, U. S. Supreme Court decision released in a decision limiting the Federal Government from permitting the construction permits when a landowner wants to fill an isolated wetland that is located within one state and has no connection to navigation. Simply, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Clean Water Act only navigable waters and the Army Corps of Engineers could not require a permit. This case was up in northern Illinois dealing with solid waste agency and the Army Corps of Engineers. This is an initiative by the Home Builders Association to have the Illinois EPA be the sole administrator of wetland programs under the Federal Clean The intent of this language is to bring focus Water Act. to this issue to the state level and to provide a uniform program for the regulations of wetlands and soil erosion control. The list of proponents of this Bill are: Builders Association of Illinois, the Illinois Association of Realtors, the Chicago and Northeastern Illinois District Council of Carpenters representing Cook, Will, Grundy, Lake, McHenry, Iroquois, Kane, DuPage, Kankakee and Kendall, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the National Solid Waste Management Association, Illinois Chemical Industry Council, the Illinois Association of

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Aggregate Producers, the Regional Chamber of Commerce and Growth Association, commonly referred to as RCGA, the Illinois Association of Water and Soil Conservation Districts are neutral on the Bill. I realize this Bill needs some work. It probably needs a substantial amount of work. But for the last couple of weeks we've been passing a whole bunch of Bills out of this chamber that need work. And they're being sent over to the Senate. And they were sponsored by Democrats and they're sponsored by Republicans. So I'd be more than happy to entertain any questions on this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. The order is... the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. There are five people seeking recognition in the following order: Moore, Steve Davis, Shirley Jones, Erwin, Black and Slone. Mr. Novak has spoken for the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Moore."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Moore: "Representative, you said that the only authority, according to the Supreme Court, that the Army Corps had for the regulation of wetlands was navigable waters?"

Novak: "Correct."

Moore: "Well, I'm looking at the Home Builders Association of Illinois letter in regard to another wetland proposal that says that they also have the authority to do waters that were navigable in the past, primary and secondary tributaries to water..."

Novak: "That's correct."

Moore: "....and waters and wetlands that are adjacent to navigable waters."

Novak: "Right. Right. I stand corrected Ms. Moore. You're

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

correct. I'm sorry for the oversight."

Moore: "Okay. So if they have this, what authority don't they have?"

Novak: "Pardon me?"

Moore: "What... if this is all... if they are allowed to regulate all of these wetlands, which specific kinds of wetlands can they not regulate?"

Novak: "Well, it all depends on how you define a wetland."

Moore: "Well, there are specific classifications for those. Are you familiar with those?"

Novak: "Well, which ones... give me some examples."

Moore: "No, no, I'm asking the questions."

Novak: "Am I familiar with different kinds of wetlands?"

Moore: "Yes."

Novak: "Does that mean..."

Moore: "I mean you're proposing a Bill to regulate wetlands."

Novak: "Correct."

Moore: "Are you familiar with them?"

Novak: "I am."

Moore: "Okay. Would you please explain to me then if the Corps is still responsible for this, what specific wetlands are left that they cannot regulate?"

Novak: "What the court, and they specifically spell it out, and I believe it was a unanimous decision. What the court specifically spells out is that they can't, the Corps of Engineers cannot manage isolated wetlands."

Moore: "That's the answer I'm looking for Representative."

Novak: "Okay."

Moore: "Very good."

Novak: "Thank you, Ms. Moore."

Moore: "The isolated wetlands of course are wetlands that aren't next to the navigable waters, but because of development

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

may be, as it sounds, isolated. They... with the natural history of our state we have, as a matter of fact, had a number of different wetlands that have needed regulation for a number of reasons. One, is for water purity. One, for watershed protection, another is relates development. We, in the Legislature, passed legislation here to allow Storm Water Management Commissions to go forward and look at the issue of storm water soil erosion control. And this piece of legislation eliminates any of the control for the northern Illinois area, including Chicago as testified by the City of Chicago, for the regulation of the isolated wetlands. I am wondering if Mayor Daley would love to come to the IEPA to ask for permission to discuss issues that relate to the Lake Calumet wetlands, as an example. I am disappointed to see that there is no program. There never has been a program with the IEPA. They have no standards to regulate this. The soil and water conservation districts will no longer be able to regulate the wetlands that they have been doing such a fine job on it, because, because it says in this Bill that no other government entity has any authority to regulate wetlands or erosion control programs, except as maybe delineated to it by the agency or otherwise specified by law. And so, we do not, the soil and water conservation districts are going to be threatened by this. So will the Management Commissions in the entire Water northeastern area. Wе have several different interpretations by three different lawyers. Chicago maintains that this does, in fact, preempt Home I know the Home Builders say it doesn't. I think Rule. this is an attempt by the Home Builders to try and eliminate any regulation in the northeastern Illinois area.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

And frankly, I can't imagine that they would support this. I know that, at least in my area, they have been doing a fine job in cooperating with the local governments and trying to do soil and water erosion as an example. The erosion control that they do really does help provide for clean water in our streams and rivers. I would urge a 'no' vote on this. This issue needs a task force. It needs hearings and it needs some answers, but it doesn't need this kind of special interest grab to try and eliminate any regulation in an area that's so important, especially in the northeastern Illinois area. I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' to this very bad Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. There has been one person in support, one against. The following people are seeking recognition in the following order: Steve Davis, Shirley Jones, Erwin, Slone. The Chair recognizes Steve Davis."

Davis, S.: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, S.: "Now, Representative Novak, you said in your opening statement that this Bill needs a lot of work and I couldn't agree with you more and I do stand in support of the Bill, by the way, Mr. Speaker. However, I do have a couple of questions that I would like to ask. I know there's more in this Bill than what the courts have said that the Corps of Engineers cannot do. So when the courts made a ruling that the Corps of Engineers do not have the authority to regulate wetlands... when they took that authority away from the Corps of Engineers, apparently that has just opened it up for any little town, village, county, or city to promulgate any rules that they wish when it concerns wetlands. Would you agree with that or not?"

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Novak: "Mr. Davis, you hit the nail right on the head. You're absolutely correct. It would be a literal potpourri of regulations from all parts of the State of Illinois where home builders and realtors and other interested parties who are responsible people for development would have to jump through a myriad of hoops before they can get permits to proceed with their development. You know I just want to add to that, Mr. Davis, we have advocates down here of statewide land development planning. These are some of the same people that are opposed to this Bill, but they say there should be local control for all this flood... but at the same time on the other side of the coin they're saying we should have state-mandated land development emanating from Springfield, Illinois. So, I find the degree of hypocrisy very blatant. But, the answer to your question, Mr. Davis, you're exactly right."

Davis, S.: "See here's one suggestion that I would like to throw out and I think it's something that can be worked on. I don't think that Representative Moore would disagree with this. That we need some agency in the State of Illinois to take over the responsibilities that were currently taken over by the Corps of Engineers, to at least have public hearings and to try to promulgate some statewide standards when it comes to wetlands and bring everybody to the table do that. And I also agree with her that soil and water conservation districts should be able to continue to work in the same manner that they do now. And I don't.... and I don't think that we... in the final version of this Bill, that they should be in there. And I think that erosion control can be taken care of at the local level. But when it comes to the true meaning of wetlands and the true dealings with wetlands, I can't understand why anybody in

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

this chamber would think that since the Federal Government has been doing this for years and years and years that a State Government should not at least have some oversight. I don't think that we should have the EPA down doing local citing every time that somebody wants to build subdivision. However, it seems to me that the Illinois EPA the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Natural Resources, I don't care which department it is. Some department needs to promulgate statewide standards for wetlands and we cannot allow each individual county, city, township, local entity of government to be able to control the wetlands process in the State of Illinois. So, I agree with you that this Bill needs a lot of work, but I also think that there are areas of agreement and I would urge everybody to vote 'yes' on this Bill, so we can move the process forward, so we can bring everybody to the table 'cause we know we're running out of time and we need to keep the process moving forward cause if we do nothing we end up with a mishmash of wetlands legislation at the local And I would urge you to think about this when you vote for the Bill. Thank you."

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

Two people have spoken in support of the Bill, one in opposition. The Chair recognizes Shirley Jones."

Jones, S.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Jones, S.: "Representative Novak, did you try to work with the City of Chicago on this Bill?"

Novak: "Yes, Ms. Jones. I spoke to one of the lobbyists for the city and I spoke to Mr. Ward with the Home Builders and they, Mr. Ward indicated to me he would be more than happy to consider exempting the City of Chicago out of this."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

- Jones, S.: "Are you willing to take this Bill out of the record and hold it until you take the City of Chicago out?"
- Novak: "Ms. Jones, with all due respect, the time limit is...

  today is the last day and this Bill is far from being completed. We'd like to get it over to the Senate and to continue with the negotiations. And that could be... that one point that you just brought up would be on the top of the priority list."
- Jones, S.: "Can't you work with the City of Chicago over the summer or either during the Veto Session so we can work on this Bill further? I know you've got a deadline, Representative. But to the Bill. This Bill here will stop the people from working on the lakeshore line of Chicago. Also Chicago Park District do have wetlands. This will stop us from doing a lot of things in the City of Chicago, if you pass this Bill. And we, working on our beautiful shoreline of Chicago and you going to try to stop it with this Bill? Representative, I urge you to take this Bill out of the record."
- Novak: "Ms. Jones, I can't take it out of the record in all due respect to you. We have a deadline today and I want to move this Bill into the other chamber. So we can work on it and address your concerns."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jones."

- Jones, S.: "Yes. Do this preempts... do we get 71 votes on this Bill?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Are you questioning the number of votes required for passage?"

Jones, S.: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "We will ask the parliamentarian to respond to that. In the meantime, if we're prepared to move on to the next speaker?"

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Jones, S.: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. So, two people have spoken for the Bill, two against the Bill. There will be one more in support and one more against. The following people are seeking recognition: Erwin, Slone, Winters. Chair recognizes Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Well Speaker, I, too, speak in opposition to the Bill. And I do urge my colleagues. I think Representative Moore and Representative Jones have made some very good points. For those of you in the City of Chicago, whether it's Washington Park, Columbus Park on the west side, there is innovative and program that many of our Members have funded to reclaim ponds and lagoons in Lincoln Park. mean all throughout the city, in all of the parks, that could be stopped by this Bill. It is a preemption of local control. And there's a very good reason why we want your communities, wherever it is, to have control over important wetlands in their own communities. I appreciate that people are working on this, but by passage of this now, it sends exactly the wrong message. And if the Sponsor will not take it out of the record, then I certainly urge you at a minimum to vote 'present', to not support this effort and I would disagree. I mean, I do think it's a preemption of Home Rule and would have thought it would have required 71 Speaker, I certainly would request a votes. But Mr. verification."

Speaker Madigan: "The parliamentarian is prepared to render his opinion."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Jones, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, House Bill 2576 does not contain the requisite language to preempt Home Rule powers. Therefore, it does not preempt home rule powers

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

and the Bill requires 60 votes for passage."

Speaker Madigan: "There shall be one more person in support of the Bill and we will go to Roll Call. One more in support. The following people are seeking recognition: Slone and Winters. So, if neither of you are in support of the Bill, Mr. Winters indicates he's in support of the Bill. Representative Slone, are you in support of the Bill? We've already heard from three in opposition. The Chair recognizes Mr. Winters as the last proponent of the Bill. Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Representative Novak, I understand that this is not a Bill in its final form, is that fair to state that?"

Novak: "Mr. Winters, to say the least. You're correct."

Winters: "We, basically, are facing what many would term a crisis in the environmental area with the Swank decision of the U. S. Supreme Court not allowing the Corps of Engineers to cover any isolated wetlands in the state. The estimates of the acreage involved vary very widely. But we are moving ahead trying to say that the state, some state agency, has to be responsible for some type of statewide rules. Any particular reason why you chose the EPA, rather than Department of Agriculture or DNR?"

Novak: "Well, the Environmental Protection Agency is charged under the broad purview of it's Act to protect the environs of the State of Illinois. And I think it's the most appropriate agency to handle the matter."

Winters: "If in the Senate... in the negotiations if we do pass this over to the Senate, would you have any major objection if DNR ends up as the agency that might be most appropriate

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

to set those regulations for the state?"

Novak: "That's a possibility and that's a possibility that would be open for discussion, Mr. Winters. Yes."

Winters: "Okay."

Novak: "When it gets to the Senate, you know I hope with... your indulgence, of course, it gets to the Senate we can have some meetings and begin to continue the dialog on this issue."

Winters: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do support the concept of allowing the state to regulate wetlands under a single... single set of standards, so that communities and builders, developers within those communities can know regardless of what county that they're in that they are going to be looking at the same criteria in protecting and preserving wetlands. So I would urge the support throughout the house to move this Bill over to the Senate for further negotiations. 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 22 'yes', 83 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Persico, House Bill 2025. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2025, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2025 amends the Cook County Truth in Taxation Law of the Property Tax Code. It contains clean up language for the law. I would be happy to answer any questions, but Representative Mathias

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

would care to answer most of them. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair will now call a Bill which is on the order of Postponed Consideration, House Bill 1004. I have spoken with the Office of the Minority Leader and the agreement is that Representative Flowers will speak for the Bill. There'll be one opponent. We'll go to Roll Call. Representative Flowers, 1004."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Winkel and I agreed to the language that's now in House Bill 1004. And what it merely does, it give the school districts the opportunity to prohibit cell phone use and also it says when you call a school that within the first five prompts you must be able to speak to a live human being. And I know now of no opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Most of us have heard the arguments on this legislation. But there is a very practical reason. I know that there is... I understand what the Sponsor's tried to do with this Bill. It's... she's trying to provide for protection of our students. But you know, if our schools are going to have a problem with that they're going to have a problem with that. There's nothing we can do about a student that is

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

unhappy with his life and unhappy with what's going on. And how they take it out is certainly something we can do about it. But can you imagine what it's going to be in the classroom having beepers and phones going off while a teacher is trying to teach? I don't think this we should have. I think this is something that ought to be left the way it is. And I would ask the Body to vote 'no' on this Bill and let the schools deal with the problem of violence. But I don't believe that we should be allowing students to have phones. The issue would be in the past was that it was being used for drugs in the school. I believe that that's still going to happen if you allow phones to be there. So, I will rise in opposition to this Bill."

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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 75 'yes', 37 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Saviano, House Bill 2148. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano."

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

Bill 2148 as amended is an Agreed Bill. What it simply

does is creates registration requirements for plumbing

contractors. I would ask for your favorable vote."

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

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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 102 people voting 'yes', 13 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hannig, House Bill 2282. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2282, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This Amendment, which Representative Burke offered yesterday, becomes the Bill. It addresses some insurance issues with the currency exchanges. It increases the deductibles from 100 to 1000. It also has some language that the Department of Financial Institution requested on unclaimed property. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all 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. Mr. John Jones, House Bill 403. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 403, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 403 does two things; requires all gun dealers in the state to obtain a

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- license from the State Police and would protect the hunters and sportsmen by preventing any municipality from banning a rifle or shotgun."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Just a parliamentary inquiry, this is a preemption of Home Rule, Mr. Jones?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The parliament..."
- Hamos: "Could you please tell us how many votes this requires?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The parliamentarian is prepared to render his opinion."
- Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Hamos, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, House Bill 403 preempts Home Rule in a manner which prohibits Home Rule regulation in an area in which the state is not itself regulating. Therefore, this Bill preempts Home Rule in a manner that requires 71 votes for passage."
- Speaker Madigan: "John Turner."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner, one second please. Ms....

  Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for that answer. And if this should get the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."
- Speaker Madigan: "They're giving you more credit than you really deserve, Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner."
- Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the parliamentarian. Did I hear him correctly and say that the state does not regulate firearms and that was the basis for his ruling, that this measure would preempt Home Rule?"
- Parliamentarian Uhe: "That's correct."
- Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, to that ruling. I think the state does

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

regulate firearms and I can cite some statutory sections to the Speaker and to the parliamentarian. First of all, the state regulates firearms including rifles and shotguns under Section 24-3 of the <u>Illinois Compiled Statutes</u> by setting forth a waiting period for both long guns and hand guns. Further, the state regulates certain types of rifles and shotguns under Section 24-1(a)72 by banning rifles with a barrel less... of a barrel length less than 16 inches and shotguns with a barrel length of less than 18 inches. Further, Mr. Speaker, the state regulates the manufacture of rifles that can fire more than one bullet by the single function of the trigger being the automatic weapon. regulation is found under the Illinois Compiled Statutes, that's Section 24-1(a)72... 71, excuse me. Further, Mr. Speaker, under Section 24-4 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes Chapter 720, the state requires a register of firearms sold. Additionally, there is a requirement of recordkeeping by any person who sells a firearm, including a rifle or shotgun, under Section 3 of the FOID Act. And this recordkeeping, by the way, does correspond to city's registry requirements, and the state does mandate that either gun dealers or individuals maintain records I'd also like to point out to firearms. t.he parliamentarian that the <u>Illinois Compiled Statutes</u> at 24-5 regulates firearms including rifles Section and shotguns by requiring that they have a serial number. And the fact that possession of a firearm without a serial number is a... is prima facie evidence of a criminal offence, I believe it's a Class II felony. Also, like to point out to the parliamentarian that the parliamentarian has ruled contrary to the ruling just given in 1999 under Senate Bill 203 with regard to the regulation

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

in that particular instance, motorcycles. And parliamentarian and Mr. Speaker, you, by following his advice, found that the state did generally have regulations on motorcycles with regard to access on the highways, moreover, found that there were certain regulations with regard to motorcycles and equipment. The issue at that time had to do with helmets, and although there was no regulation on helmets, there were regulations about other equipment that was required. So in essence, the Chair has ruled before that these general types of regulations specific as in that case to motorcycles, these regulations today specific as to guns do invoke the Subsection I of Section 6 of Article VII of the Constitution. Hence, if the Speaker follows the parliamentarian's advice today it would be backtracking upon a prior ruling made by the Speaker. Moreover, it'd be inconsistent with rulings that have been handed down over the last couple of weeks with regard to Home Rule. And I would urge that the Speaker reconsider its position inasmuch as it's abundantly clear that the state does regulate firearms. And since the state does regulate firearms, the specific Section in the Home Rule portion of the Constitution that I've already cited, should result in the Speaker ruling today that there is no preemption of Home Rule and that therefore a vote of 60 would be all that would be required for this to pass."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Turner, thank you for the citations and I appreciate your comments. I must respectfully disagree with your interpretations of the statutes that you've cited and the authority that you're cited. And the ruling stands at 71 votes."

Turner, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to overrule the Chair on the ruling that 71 votes are required."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to overrule the Chair. And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' So, if you support the ruling of the Chair you vote 'yes'; if you do not, you vote 'no'. Mr. Clerk, open the record. Those who support the Chair, vote 'yes'; those who do not, vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Several people have not voted. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 61 'ayes' and 45 'noes'. The Chair is sustained. I believe we're on the main Bill with Mr. Jones who has presented the Bill and the Chair shall recognize Mr. Brunsvold. Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'd like to address the Bill. I kind of sat here and contemplated, you know, what I would say about this Bill. And I guess I'm going to put a hat on today that I don't normally put on. I'm going to put on the sportsman's cap for Chicago. I don't know who represents the sportsmen of Chicago, really don't. I get calls and letters from people that live in Chicago. I go to sportsmen shows in and around I see a lot of people there, a lot of people Chicago. there. And a lot of them are shooters and hunters and frankly, I don't know who represents them. I talked to the Chicago Reps on the floor here and I know I've been out shooting with some of them. And they hunt and they shoot sporting clays and you know they have a pretty good time at doing that. This Bill sets up a preemption against regulations on target rifles, basically, and shotguns. That's what it does. It's a preemption of that, that And I thought, well you can own a shotgun and a issue. rifle in Chicago. And I think you can. I'm going to read here from the Chicago Municipal Code. And there are the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

usual FOID card regulations and then it goes into about 13 other requirements to own a rifle and a shotgun, of which registration is one, plus, Social Security numbers, manufacturer, and caliber, source of the firearm, where'd you get it, two recent photographs, other than what's on the FOID card, and then a statement in one of the last Sections says a superintendent shall find necessary to enforce. Now, I do not know what that means. And also you have to have a vision test. I don't know what that vision test is about. I don't know how they came up with that Section. But, you know I don't know if you can, most people in Chicago can own a rifle and a shotgun and want to go through this procedure. The Mayor of Chicago and the council go about doing their regulations. And the Mayor said in front of a committee that he would just as soon take guns away from everyone. And I think he's in the process of doing that. In fact, he's halfway there. This Bill, I think, regardless of the ruling of 71 votes, this Bill ought to get a lot of votes. And I'm asking for the Chicago Legislators, that have sportsmen in their districts, to support this Bill. Now, I don't see any drug dealers or gang members dragging a \$8 thousand Krieghoff shotgun down the street. And we're talking about target rifles and shotguns, long guns, that can't be hidden under coat or something like that. These are sporting rifles and shotguns that are very expensive and are not really I've seen the murder reports out of Chicago and you would be hard pressed to find a sporting rifle or a shotgun on the list of items that people get killed with in Chicago. So, this is a sportsmen's issue. And I stand here asking the people of this Body to support the sportsmens of Chicago. Now, if they do not want me to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

stand here and support them then I wish they'd call and tell me. 'Cause I don't need to do this and I'll sit down and shut up. But if the sportsmens of Chicago and I don't know who represents them and maybe the Members of the Chicago delegation can tell me who they are, because I think they need to vote for this Bill to make sure that those people in their districts have the ability to pursue hunting and target shooting, really all over this nation. And so I stand here asking at least for 100 votes. Bill should have 100 votes on it when we get done today because it does two good things. It registers the gun dealers and also says that no Home Rule community can pass laws saying that the people can't have sporting rifles, target rifles and shotguns. And I'd ask for your support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Two people have spoken for the Bill. The Chair recognizes

Mr. Osterman."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osterman: "I've lived in Chicago my entire life and not once have I had a sportsmen that I've known come to me and say they've had a problem with their guns being registered in the City of Chicago. Not once have they come in and said they have a problem. So, for the sportsmen, for the people that live in the city, I've never heard that complaint from anybody. And I know people that do hunt. Mr. Jones, Representative Jones, your Bill, basically, preempts Home Rule when it comes to a Home Rule entity licensing or doing anything with firearms related to shotguns and rifles. Is that right?"

Jones, J.: "Shotguns and rifles only."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Osterman: "Shotguns and rifles only. So, it's pretty innocuous, it helps the hunters so that they don't have, you know, to be worried about having their guns licensed and things like that, right?"

Jones, J.: "Correct."

Osterman: "Okay. I got one question and again, I'm from Chicago, so I don't deal a lot with guns, although my colleague, Representative Brunsvold, wants to take me hunting. What is a rifle? In state statute define, what is a rifle. And I don't mean to be facetious in asking that question, I honestly I want to know. 'Cause I'm confused on what a rifle is."

Jones, J.: "Representative, it's defined in the statutes and it's a long-barreled gun."

Osterman: "In your Bill though, does it say... in your Bill it says rifles and shotguns. It doesn't say long barrel. doesn't say target rifle. It says rifle. I've got a book over here the Jane's hunting recognition book (sic-Jane's Gun Recognition Guide), I've been studying up on guns. So, when I do go hunting with Representative Brunsvold I'll know the type of firearms to use correctly. In here there's automatic rifles, and they're rifles that are not automatic, but they're rifles in here. These are guns that I've seen Chicago Police Department confiscated, taken off the streets from gangbangers and drug dealers, that are used in the City of Chicago. Now, your Bill lets these guns be used and owned and transferred in the City of Is that correct? I mean it's all rifles, not specifically, long-gun rifles, target rifles, things like that. It's all rifles, correct?"

Jones, J.: "Representative, I apologize, could you repeat it..."

Osterman: "My question was, what is a rifle defined in your Bill?

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Because there are a lot of rifles, many of them banned by the City of Chicago, many of them don't look like they would be used to kill a deer or rabbit or anything else like that, but used against human beings. A street sweeper shotgun, it's a shotgun with 12 rounds stuck underneath. That's a shotgun. Now would that be able to be bought, sold, and used under your Bill?"

Jones, J.: "Representative, we're not changing the definition in the statutes of what a shotgun and what a rifle is."

Osterman: "I... all I want to know is what is a rifle, defined under your Bill?"

Jones, J.: "The same as current law."

Osterman: "Which is what? I don't know."

Jones, J.: "It's a long gun. You know, without having the statute right in front of me, I can't answer your question."

Osterman: "Well..."

Jones, J.: "But it's defined in the statutes."

Osterman: "I would ask people, until that's clarified, I'd ask you to pull it out of the record and define it, specifically. This Bill is very innocuous, which surprises me a great deal, because the NRA when it comes to drafting legislation and working with pro-gun Legislators, they are very specific about the way they draft their bills. I've seen it in committee. I have... and I'm not against the hunters. I'm not against people that want to own a gun for hunting in the City of Chicago and use that gun properly. What I'm afraid of is, is that these guns that fall under this term, 'rifle', are used by gangbangers and drug dealers and they're not used for hunting. That's what I'm concerned about. I've seen these guns. I was at a police station and saw these guns on a table this long, guns taken

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

off the streets of the City of Chicago in the last ten days prior to me seeing them, those are rifles, as well. And under your law, you're going to tell us that we... the City of Chicago can't do anything to protect its citizens. Is that correct?"

Jones, J.: "Representative, those guns you're talking about are already illegal. We're not changing that at all."

Osterman: "No, but under your law it says, 'rifles and shotguns'. It does not define, specifically, what it is. And under State Law it doesn't define what it is. Under Federal Law, it defines what they are, but under State Law it doesn't. the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, although it seems very innocuous and it is not. Unless clearly identified under state statute and someone can correct me if I'm wrong, there are guns that are used that are rifles and shotguns, used by gangbangers and drug dealers, that are killing people in the streets of Chicago and other places. Home Rule, on one issue specifically, that I care dearly about is gun control. Home Rule entities should be able to provide safety for their residents. That's the most fundamental thing that they should be doing, providing safety for their residents. That's what we should be doing in this state. If a city wants to pass laws about gun control, they should do it. The City of Chicago has the toughest gun control laws in the country. You want to know why? Because they see the violence everyday. That's why they have the toughest gun control laws in the country. would hope that everyone would look at this Bill and vote 'no' against it. It's taking away the ability for a city to protect its citizens. I ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Two people have spoken in support of the Bill, one person

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

against. There will be one more in support of the Bill. The following people seeking recognition are: Mr. Bost, Mr. Schoenberg, and Mr. Black. There shall be one more in support. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "The former speaker said, and he quoted many guns that already illegal in Federal Law. Ladies and Gentlemen, if it's illegal in Federal Law it will remain illegal. people on both sides of the aisle from the city, as well as from a collar county and as well as from downstate, have said, yes there's certain gun laws that need to be in place for the safety of our citizens. But, you know, Legislator and I've heard it from many of you, I'm in support of a person's right to be involved in hunting, be involved in sport shooting. I'm in support of that. you vote against this Bill, you're saying you're not. You're saying you're not. And the reason you're saying you're not is, is because you're saying that if a local municipality says that you cannot own, possess, have in your automobile, have on your person, a shotgun or a rifle, now understand shotgun, rifle, what those illegal weapons were that we're talking about awhile go, were banned by Federal Law. Those weapons are not included in this. So the only thing we're dealing with is those... are those that are legal for sporting activities, whether it's hunting or target shooting. So anybody on this floor and there's been several. I know enough that we would get the required number of votes that say you are in support of the hunters in this state. And you're in support of their ability to participate in the sport which they enjoy. Then what we're saying... what you're saying, if you're going to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

vote 'no', is that you're not in support of them. Because it's the only thing it deals with. As Representative Brunsvold said earlier, the sportsmen, those people that are involved in hunting and target practice in this state, certain rules and regulations set up by certain by municipalities, (a) either can't participate at all, or (b) they have to have someone that they know outside of that community where there they can store their shotguns, their rifles, before they ever go to hunt, before they ever go to target ranges, before they ever do those things that they Now, it is true that if we leave this in the hands enjoy. of the municipalities that they can go ahead and just any guns at all, any guns at all. And the argument from the last speaker said that they have strict rules in Chicago, they have strict rules there and they want to keep those strict rules there. Well, folks, if they're such great rules, why is the crime rate like it is? They're working, right? No, they're not. No, they're not. Now, each one of us can disagree on that and that's fine. when we start talking about this particular piece of legislation, it has nothing... nothing to do with the It has nothing... nothing to do with those gangbangers. people who are illegally carrying guns, improperly using guns, causing havoc on our streets. This has to do with the sportsmen of the State of Illinois. I would request my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this Bill. We should not set law at the local level, which takes away the right of these people to participate in a sport that they love, whether it's hunting or target shooting. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Three people have spoken in support of the Bill. Mr. Schoenberg."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong opposition to House Bill (sic-House Bill 403) and I'd like to first address several of the prior erroneous and inaccurate comments made by speakers on the other side of this issue. First of all, I'd like to read from you a citation from the Chicago Municipal Ordinance on the registration of firearms. read how, in 8-20-040, Registration of Firearms, 'All firearms in the City of Chicago shall be registered in accordance with the provisions of this chapter', it goes on to talk about why you should be registered. Then, Section 'this Section shall not apply to', and it lists eight exemptions. One of those exemptions, number 5 and I quote, 'Any nonresident of the City of Chicago participating in any lawful recreational firearm-related activity in the city or on his way to and from such activity in another jurisdiction, provided that such weapon shall be unloaded and securely wrapped, and that his possession or control of such firearm is lawful in the jurisdiction in which he resides.' The Chicago Municipal Code is clear in the rights of lawful firearm protecting owners, recreational sportsmen, who live outside of the City of Chicago. It's clear, the parameters set places on them and exempts them out providing their activity is reasonable and... providing their activity is reasonable and lawful. So, with respect to the prior speaker, there.... that, you'll pardon the expression, shoots down your argument there. Now, I'd also like to point out how the crime data in the City of Chicago has consistently shown over these past several years that violent crimes are down. Now, this not a coincidence. And somehow it troubles me, moreover, that violent crime continues to be associated

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

with the myth of large urban areas. My friends, we could launch a whole longer discussion about the ravages that the proliferation of crank within downstate communities has caused and the grief and the pain that it's caused families throughout downstate Illinois. But do we typecast all downstate communities as being ones where they're drug dealing communities and there's widespread sell of crank on every corner and in every cornfield in downstate Illinois? No, we don't do that. So, let's shatter these geographical myths once and for all and stop playing to people's fears. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to remind you that I represent a number of suburban communities that have tougher laws than the city... that have tougher laws than we currently have on the books of the State of Illinois. And so, this isn't just the City of Chicago. A number of suburban communities have exercised this right under the Illinois Constitution, as well. as I've told Mr. Jones earlier, the Village of Wilmette has officially taken a position that should this Bill or anything like it become law, that they are going to go into court tomorrow to challenge their prerogative to protect their residents under Home Rule. Finally, I'd like to point out, in summation, I'd like to point out one last delicious irony. And that is, just several days ago I sponsored a Bill that would have provided a singular, tougher, uniform standard for providing background checks at gun shows. At gun shows you can buy... you can buy firearms from federally-licensed dealers or nonlicensed dealers. We were seeking to impose a tougher uniform standard check. The proponents of weakening our firearm laws in local communities, they only like uniform laws when it comes to weakening the laws of this state, not when it

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

comes to strengthening the laws of this state. But my friends, I guess when it comes to protecting the safety of those we love in our communities throughout the state, whether it's in the City of Chicago, whether in the suburbs that surround Chicago, or in downstate communities, when it comes to that, we don't make up this hypocrisy, we just live it. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Three people have voted (sic-spoken) in support of the Bill, two against. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just an old country boy and I'm trying to count and I'm running out of fingers. I thought there were only two that spoke in support. By my count, Representative Turner simply made a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "I counted Jones, Brunsvold and Mr. Bost."

Black: "You mean the person that presents the Bill is also counted as someone speaking in favor of the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "That's what he did. I think he said he was for the Bill."

Black: "Well, I don't want to delay this anymore than you do, Mr.

Speaker. I'd like to ask some questions, but if you rule I
can't..."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Black, in response."

Black: "Thank, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You're being very kind to me today, I wonder what's going on."

Speaker Madigan: "No, not just today Mr. Black. You know that."

Black: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative Jones, do you have a licensure provision in your Bill?"

Jones, J.: "Yes, we do, Mr. Black."

Black: "And that would include anybody in any city of the State

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

of Illinois that wants to sell long guns, correct?"

Jones, J.: "This includes any person in the State of Illinois that wants to sell firearms must license with the Illinois State Police."

Black: "So, if a person who wanted to sell firearms that are historically used only for hunting or sporting purposes, that dealer would have to licensed with the State of Illinois and would also have to report the transactions on his sales?"

Jones, J.: "That is correct."

Black: "Is that not a considerable tightening and toughening of the law that currently exists?"

Jones, J.: "Yes."

Black: "I think that's a... you know, many people were saying that we should license more than we do. This Bill certainly has a very strict licensing provision in the Let me ask you another question if I could, Representative. It's been alluded that there are no differences and that if I... if Representative Brunsvold and I want to travel to a trapshooting contest in Wisconsin transport and we're taking Representative and Brunsvold's vehicle. Now the last time I was with him at an event he had a sport utility vehicle and they don't have So he puts his very expensive Beretta, trapshooting shotgun in a case, unloaded, in the back of I put my old have them 12 gauge in my case in the the SUV. back of his SUV and off we go. And we stop for breakfast in a community that has a prohibition on the ownership or possession of any firearm. We go in for breakfast. The local police officer comes out, looks in the back of Representative Brunsvold's sport utility vehicle and sees two shotgun cases. Would we not be at some risk of being,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

if not arrested, detained and may in fact lose possession of our shotguns being transported in that fashion?"

Jones, J.: "You most certainly would."

Black: "And was it not earlier represented that, oh no, oh no, you can transport a gun to a sporting event legally constituted, midwest regional sporting clays or trap shoot and even though you're in a community who outlaws the transporting or possession of those guns, you're covered under a Federal Law. Doesn't the Federal Law clearly state that the weapon must be in a locked trunk or compartment of the vehicle?"

Jones, J.: "Yes."

Black: "What do we do in the case of a sport utility vehicle? I don't think that meets the definition of a locked compartment, does it?"

Jones, J.: "No, it does not... it does not meet the definition."

Black: "This is what we tried to straighten out on the Safe Neighborhoods Act a couple of years ago. My only concern and I understand, and by the way when we discuss any of these issues I don't think any of us should get up and say, 'Ha, ha, I shot down your argument.' This is not a subject to be trifled with in any way, shape, or form. It's as important to me as it is to any of you. This issue, however, remains is that when you have a potpourri of gun regulatory provisions, I cannot reasonably be assured that I can transport a legally and lawfully owned weapon to a sporting event sanctioned by any number of sporting bodies, stop in a community for breakfast or lunch or dinner with my firearm unloaded and properly cased, but I don't have a trunk, so it's in the back of my SUV. It won't fit in the glove compartment. Now, I'm legal in my jurisdiction, but I may very well be illegal in somebody else's jurisdiction.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Correct?"

Jones, J.: "That's exactly right."

Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not asking... Black: "Thank you. we're not asking that we be allowed to carry a firearm, a rifle or a shotgun over our shoulder, in our backpack, under our trench coat, in the front seat of our car. we're asking is a reasonable standard so that I know if I want to join with Representative Brunsvold and go to a midwestern regional trap shoot competition, at which there may be thousands of people participating. That Representative Brunsvold and I have our guns unloaded, legally encased in a proper case, but unfortunately, don't have a trunk in our vehicle and they are in plain sight in the back of the SUV, all we want is some reasonable expectation that we will be treated the same as in every other jurisdiction. That, that in fact, could be a legal and lawful way to transport a gun. I believe under existing law, there are local communities who would say, 'I don't care if it's cased, I don't care if it's unloaded, I don't care if it's in the back of an SUV, we don't allow these weapons in our community. And therefore, we may fine you, arrest you.' And I don't think that would happen, but they certainly could confiscate a shotgun used in trap competition. And let me tell you, I've seen some of the trapshooting shotguns that Representative Brunsvold uses. These things cost well in excess of a thousand dollars. They're certainly not something that you're going to find on the street. So, really that's all the Bill does. We're not trying to pull the wool over your eyes. We're not asking that we be allowed to run back and forth to any community with a careless disregard on how we transport our firearm. What we are asking is that there should be a

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

statewide standard, so that a hunter or a sportsman knows exactly how he or she can transport that firearm to a legally sanctioned event. That's all this Bill does."

- 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? The Bill will require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Shirley Jones voted? Has Mr. Leach voted? Has Shirley Jones voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 67 'ayes', and 39 'noes'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority required for passage, fails. Mr. Giles, House Bill 279. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 279 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 and Floor Amendment #2 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 279, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency medical dispatches. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 279 provides annual recertification requirements for EMDs, emergency medical dispatchers, licensed in Illinois. These new requirements include at least 12 hours of continuing education each year. This is... this measure is... the City of Chicago is exempt from this measure. They have such a program right now. The

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

proponents of this legislation is the Department of Human Services, the Illinois Emergency Medical Dispatchers. I ask for the passage and I will defer all questions to Representative Burke."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise to support House Bill 279. As the previous speaker suggested this, indeed, important initiative that would protect individuals who depend on the response of 9-1-1 operators in our state. There are throughout the nation 18 states that currently nationally recognized curriculum abide by a and certification program. And we are simply, this legislation, asking for pieces of that that would help to provide 9-1-1 operators the ability to appropriately to emergency situations. We, indeed, expect operators that answer the 9-1-1 call to be prepared in medical emergencies and this Bill would begin to address the subject of having those people properly trained and prepared to respond again to those emergencies. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Mr. Giles and Mr. Burke have spoken for the Bill. The

Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative Burke, is there language in the underlying Bill that specifies who is to pay for this training and certification to make the dispatcher medically qualified?"

Burke: "Mr. Black, there was in the original Bill language that did, in fact, identify one particular entity. In this legislation there is no reference made to a specific

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

certifying agency."

Black: "Can you tell me approximately how many hours of training it would take... well, let me back up, before I get to that. What category or classification would they have to meet? Would they have to be an EMT or an EMS?"

Burke: "It's an EMD."

Black: "So, they would have to be an emergency medical technician."

Burke: "EMD..."

Black: "How many..."

Burke: "...excuse me, EMD, as in David."

Black: "Oh, all right."

Burke: "Emergency medical..."

Black: "Is that category currently... the reason I'm asking, I've never heard of it. Is it currently recognized and are there prescribed courses to become an emergency medical dispatcher?"

Burke: "Yes."

Black: "Where are these... are these schools located throughout the state or would they tend to be concentrated in the more heavily populated areas?"

Burke: "Mr. Black, it's more of a particular protocol that would be administered by the Department of Public Health. So, there are, in fact, national standards that have been defined. And I suggested earlier that there are in fact 18 states in the country that do abide by these particular national standards. And we are asking that the Department of Public Health incorporate those nationally, acknowledged standards in the certification of our EMDs in the State of Illinois."

Black: "Could you give me the approximate number of hours one would have to go through to get the designation? Would it

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

be 100 hours, 50 hours?"

Burke: "The designated period would be 12 hours."

Black: "And then the Bill would require a recertification or a continuing ed?"

Burke: "An annual recertification."

Black: "All right."

Burke: "And that's what we are addressing in this particular Bill."

Black: "Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have come to respect Representative Burke's expertise in this One of the... one of the worst mistakes I ever made was to speak in opposition to Representative Burke's Defibrillator Law, subsequently saw the light and very glad that I did so and joined with you. They have saved countless lives. There's no question about that. I, like many, thought it was a mystery medical device that only trained professionals could use. You were right. You were absolutely right on that. But I must express some concerns about this. Again, only recognizing the diversity of the State of Illinois. There are rural counties in Illinois who are just now bringing 9-1-1 onto line. My home county has had it for some time. We struggle constantly trying to find people who will do the job. It can be high stress, the number of calls, the fact that you are... you can't be wrong. I mean, obviously, we're humans and we're going to make mistakes. But it's a high burnout job, not exceptionally well paid I might add in some areas of the state. And I think if we were to go to some of our rural counties with this mandate, and I don't quarrel with the intent, in a perfect world, absolutely. They should have an emergency medical designation, so they would understand

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

the severity of the response being requested and send the right equipment. But this isn't a perfect world. And what may... what may work very well in the more populous counties, my only fear is when it comes downstate and I know the staffing requirements... the shortfall and the difficulties we already have in finding people who will work in 9-1-1 centers, I don't know. I'll defer to the Representative's judgement. I'm not sure we could convince enough of them to get the designation without, obviously, increasing their pay. Which many of us in rural areas know the county or the municipality or the answer... the public service answering point simply doesn't have... they don't have the resources to do that. So, I must reluctantly stand in opposition because I've been in many 9-1-1 centers downstate. I know how hard they work to just keep them staffed. They do the best job they can with continuing ed, with training, but turnover is high. And when you start to put additional requirements on these people, they tend to leave. And then we've got an even worse problem than we do So, in all due respect to the Sponsor, who has an outstanding reputation of sponsoring legislation that, in fact, have helped save many lives in the state, I'm not convinced that this would work in all of the counties in the state. And it's for that reason I will vote 'no'."

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

Two have spoken for the Bill, one against. The Chair recognizes Mr. Osmond."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Representative Burke, did... in Representative Black's debate did he ask if there was going to be any funding available to help any of the communities meet this

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

requirement?"

Burke: "No, Sir, he did not make that inquiry, but if you are interested there has been no request for funding in this."

Osmond: "Is there any limitation in this that restricts it to just larger counties or anything to do with population?"

Burke: "No and I would suggest to you that if I were in Springfield or on the south side of Chicago and dialed 9-1-1, I'd like to know that that person was able to respond to my call."

Osmond: "Is there anything in this that would prevent... I know up in our community if our dispatcher is on break, frequently, a police officer will sit and do the dispatching. Is a policeman, by nature of his training or her training, does that meet the qualifications for this?"

Burke: "Well, specifically, with respect to firefighters and other emergency response professionals throughout the state, they do, indeed, face similar continuing education requirements. So, we're not asking anything particularly extra for the operators to be certified in. We are simply saying they should meet a specific basic standard that other emergency responders are compelled to meet."

Osmond: "If I'm an EMT certified, can I be a dispatcher then?

And..."

Burke: "Oh, indeed, you would..."

Osmond: "...does that have any problems with that?"

Burke: "You would be perfectly suited to be a dispatcher if that..."

Osmond: "How about a policeman? Would they also be..."

Burke: "Yes. Currently, these other emergency responders are, indeed, prepared to respond to emergencies that would be coming through on 9-1-1 lines."

Osmond: "My concern about it is going to be cost for continuing

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

education, same as what Representative Black had mentioned that there may be a difficulty finding people that are either certified or the communities... do you know what the cost of this... maybe it's not a big deal. What's the cost for a 12 hour continuing ed course?"

Burke: "We're being advised by the Department of Public Health that the cost would be a thousand dollars. But I might suggest to you that this is per year. Through the testimony that was offered in the committee from Dr. Clausen, who is... has been acknowledged as the preeminent national expert in this particular area. He has developed a criteria and a certain curriculum and a basic, almost a flip-card system that has also been duplicated in other environments. He is not the only individual that has come up with these particular curriculum. It's a very easy thing to incorporate into your 9-1-1 emergency operator system. The basics are there, the national standards are It's just a question of whether or not we as there. responsible... that our governments want to take advantage of those systems that are already available for our use. The costs are minimum. The cost, I might comment further, that in Cook County alone last year there were over \$60 million in awards to victims who suffered at the hands of not prepared emergency dispatch operators. Sixty million dollars, in Cook County alone. And who knows how far it would extend across the State of Illinois."

Osmond: "Would that include Chicago?"

Burke: "Chicago, last time I checked, Chicago was in Cook County."

Osmond: "Then why is Chicago exempt from this Bill?"

Burke: "Because Chicago already has particular standards. And they are revamping currently."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Osmond: "Okay."

Burke: "And the Department of Public Health of our state has endorsed those particular standards."

Osmond: "So, the \$1,000, is that the initial training or is that the annual recertification cost? Must be the initial training, isn't it?"

Burke: "That's for the 12 hours."

Osmond: "Initially, and then what continuing ed hours after that?

Are you saying it's \$1,000 a year for the course and recertification, too? And that would be per dispatcher."

Burke: "Yes."

Osmond: "It would have to be. So, some of the communities... my community has two dispatchers. I don't know what some of the others might do. I would think that that cost for initial training would be higher than it would be for a recertification, but you know the numbers are there."

Burke: "We... we actually don't have very hard stats on that. We know that in dealing with the... in negotiating with the Department of Public Health that they stand ready and prepared to work with communities across the state to make this as feasible as possible, whether it be economically feasible or just in terms of implementation. They understand that there is a very, very serious need and concern for those who are expected to respond to emergency situations."

Osmond: "There is no question that a good dispatcher saves lives and that one dispatcher that is confused, that may get the directions wrong, to send the ambulance units out to the wrong Circle Drive or the wrong Lake Avenue, it saves lives. I think the concept is terrific. I would just be a little bit cautious about the mandate that we're going to be putting out there. Although, I think if it were... if

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

that was an issue in my community, I'd gladly go to a Rotary or Lions Club to try to get the money. And I will support the Bill. 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 90 'ayes' and 23 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Stroger. House Bill 2588. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2588 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 does become the Bill. And it is basically the solution to House Resolution 19, which we passed earlier in the year. This Resolution had to do with the Masters in Social Work Program at Governors State University. As you probably recall, we had 77 students who found out that their degree was going to be coming from a institution that was not certified to offer that degree. It left them in a terribly precarious position. I want to thank the Board of Higher Ed who has worked very diligently on this, along with the State Board of Ed, the Department of Professional Regulation. The end result of this is that all of these students are going to be able to take the tests for licensure in the field that they were heading for when they were misdirected by this terrible decision by the Council of Social Work Education to deny candidacy to Governors State University. It has really been a 'win-win'

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

The students do have to come back and complete some courses as defined by the Department of Professional Regulation. But they will be able to get their license immediately. The six young ladies that are in the school social work, which unfortunately the University never even intended to offer. The State Board of Ed is working with them and they have assured me after reviewing their transcripts that all six of them will also be able to get the type 73 certificate that they have worked very hard for and dedicated many hours of their life. I think this is a great solution. The... not everybody won every single thing they want. But I'm really proud that all these organizations worked so well together. And I think this is something we can go home on Easter and be very proud to represent. So, I ask for your favorable vote on the Amendment and on the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2588, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stroger."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman speaks in support of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "I was just gonna ask for an 'aye' vote. I would

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

entertain any questions if they have 'em."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman speaks in support of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "I, too, rise in support, and I just wanted to point out that besides remedying the problems at Governors State University, I think it's important to note that the Board of Higher Education has learned from this and I think that we'll find that there will be a lot of other good benefits in terms of accrediting new programs in higher education... institutions of higher education in this state. And as Representative McCarthy pointed out, in our committee both Representative Dave Wirsing, the Republican Members of the Higher Ed Committee, think there have been a lot of people who've worked very hard on this. So, I, too, urge you to support 2588."

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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you could give your attention to the Chair. We have stopped accepting applications for Bills. We have worked with everybody all day. We've stopped accepting applications. I have the Bills which will be called from now until adjournment today. And I am going to read the numbers, but we will not take anymore applications. So, the following Bills will be called: 1776, 2220, 3194, 3095, 1815, 760, 50, 1814, 2463, 2565, 3002, 2058, 27, 1820, 63, 241, 3375, 236, 1926, 3060, 1887, 2115, 2390, 2595, 2634, 1805, 2538. Do not approach

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

the podium with anymore requests, we're finished.

Representative Hamos, House Bill 1887."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1887, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental protection. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill, and this Bill has to do with... it's a prevention oriented approach to dealing with environmental hazards that can hopefully prevent health problems for children and families. The first part of this Bill looks at lead paint poisoning and the way that we deal with the issue now. Currently, when there is a test for lead and it comes back positive, the Public Health Department must be in a reactive mode, but it is not... there is no authority to try to prevent problems before they happen. So, the first thing that Bill does, is it says that when there is a positive lead test result the Department... the Public Health Department must inspect the dwelling. Secondly, the Public Health Department may, is and is now authorized under this Bill to go into other units in a multi-unit building to find lead before children Thirdly, if the Public Health Department are poisoned. does find that there is lead in that home, then information has to be given to that tenant and to prospective tenants about the possibility of a lead hazard. Fourthly, the Bill says that white goods that are taken in and recycled or shredded by resp..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos, excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen, please, give your attention to Representative Hamos so that we can move through these Bills as expeditiously as possible and get you on the road home. Please give your attention to Representative Hamos.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Proceed."

Hamos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the fourth part of this Bill has to do with white goods that are taken in by scrapyards and junkyards and then recycled or shredded. And it requires them to dispose of these white goods in the same way that landfills are forced to deal with it. So, again it's a prevention-oriented approach to preventing environmental hazards that do hurt our children and families and I ask for your favorable support."

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? Representative Wyvetter Younge voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 25 'noes'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Leitch, House Bill 760. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 760, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 760 is a Bill as we described last evening in the Amendment. Amendment #5 became this Bill. The Bill cleans up two provisions in the sales tax TIF area. It cleans up 13 provisions in the real estate property tax sales, property tax TIF district. And importantly, it includes extensions requested by Representative(s) Scully, Moffitt, and Representative Younge. I'm available for questions, but would recommend your 'aye' vote."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 241, Representative Slone. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 241 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair would suggest since this is on Postponed Consideration that one person speak for, one person speak against, then we go to Roll Call. Representative Slone for the Bill."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Insurance Department. It was formerly Representative Flowers' Bill, so it may sound familiar. And the Bill would require insurance... health insurers or managed care plans to provide coverage for reimbursement to medical providers for epidural anesthesia and for reimbursement for medically-appropriate prescription nutrition supplements. That's all that's left in the Bill. And I would appreciate your 'aye' votes. Thank you. I'd be happy to take..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke, in opposition."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. I have checked and currently this is not part of employee benefits under the health insurance plans and that they do not provide coverage for supplemental food products and they have asked for me to so note that they are in opposition to it, and I am in opposition."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Those for the Bill will vote 'yes'; those against will vote '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 60 'ayes', 50 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Parke, House Bill 50. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 50, a Bill for an Act concerning tobacco settlement proceeds. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 50 relates to 3000 residents participate in investigational cancer trials annually. House Bill 50 would benefit all Illinois residents, patients who are uninsured, or covered by Medicaid, medicare and self-insured plans does not cover experimental cancer treatment would also have access to investigational treatments. This Bill provides that up to 10% of the amount received by the state, pursuant to a tobacco settlement agreement, shall be dedicated to assist in the payment for services provided under a qualified investigational clinical cancer trial program in Illinois. I stand ready to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, I just would like to take up an issue that we touched on briefly in committee. These cancer trials are the same trials that you have vociferously contended in the past should not have to be covered by insurance companies. And while I appreciate the fact that

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

you are now arguing for their merit, I am wondering if you could justify for the Body why insurance companies shouldn't be required to cover such important and meritorious trials, but that we should take this money out of tobacco settlement?"

Parke: "Mr. Fritchey, first of all, you have to understand, insurance companies are only the conduit. business community ends up paying for the clinical trials if they're required, if it's something in agreement. this is right on the backs of small businesses. So, I defending small businesses as I have in the past, to say that these clinical trials, if they're worthwhile, not be experimental. Where else ought we share the burden, than to have to share the burdens from the tobacco settlement that affects everybody's health. The whole idea that you have expounded on this floor, is that you want this money to go towards treatment of people who are injured by smoking. Cancer is one of the major illnesses that you get from smoking. We want to spread it out so that the whole community of this state provides the cancer trials. That's why we put this Bill in, so that small business does not bear the brunt of only having to provide through their premiums and their increases for this, state ought to share in the cost. This is experimental. We don't know if these will work. But what want to have, is that if there is a way of solving the problem of cancer, the scourge of our population, then this is one way in which we can do it. Now also, I know that if we send this to the Senate, this Bill just like your Bill, going to be modified in the Senate. They're gonna move it around and come back with something in a conference committee. All I want to do is say 'I want the cancer

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

trials to be discussed as a possible place to put some of this tobacco money."

Fritchey: "Oh rest assure, Representative, I am in agreement with And I have said before for no other effects than to show my recognition of the issue. I have a family that is unfortunately rampant with cancer deaths and cancer survivors. So, I am very much in agreement with you. just do want to clarify the point so that if it does come down the road sometime later where we are trying again to do this in a way of unfortunately we can't get money from the tobacco settlement to do this and we come back another time to look to have insurers do this, that the point is made that there are those that feel that it is equitable, if not necessary, to do this and to have these trials available to individuals as long as it's not the insurance companies that have to pay for it. I am awkwardly in a position of having to support this Bill. I do think that the end results should be achieved by different means. I appreciate what you're doing. I think it's an inventive road to take, but I hope that we can find a way to both reach the same goal. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill is on the Order of Standard Debate. Two people have spoken in support of the Bill. Representative Garrett and Howard are seeking recognition. There will only be one more in support. First one to seek recognition was Garrett. The Chair recognizes Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Garrett: "Representative Parke, I have a couple of questions regarding this piece of legislation. Are there costs

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  associated with it, estimated costs?"
- Parke: "No, the Bill is... as I recommend is to provide up to 10% of the amount distributed by the state from the tobacco settlement. So it is a percentage not an amount."
- Garrett: "So, if we receive \$350 million a year it would be \$35
  million allocated for this?"
- Parke: "It's 30 million, Representative, and it's up to 30 million."
- Garrett: "So, the cap would be \$30 million? Do you have any
  idea..."
- Parke: "Wait... there is no cap. If it is 350 million, then it might... could go up to 35 million. If it's 200 million then could be up to 20 million."
- Garrett: "So, so my question is, how much... has there been any discussion on the anticipated cost for this? For instance, if this program went through, could it conceivably, could the projected costs be \$50 million, and we'd be turning people away? And I want to say I'm not voting... I don't know how I'm gonna vote but I do have some questions on this piece of legislation."
- Parke: "Again, this is up to, if this is what the ultimately... I believe, as most Members of the Body..."
- Garrett: "So, it's based on a percentage not on a..."
- Parke: "Well, let me answer your question, Representative. Most of us believe that our Bill and Mr... Representative Fritchey's Bill will probably be put in some kind of a conference committee and the conferees will decide what the ultimate distribution of it. All I want is that cancer trials ought to be considered."
- Garrett: "What... okay I just want to make sure I understand this point. There is no estimated cost as to how much this would cost the state. There are no estimated figures out

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

there. So, it could cost the state \$5 million if it goes through. It could cost the state more, even though it will be a certain percentage. Is that correct?"

Parke: "I believe that's correct."

- Garrett: "Okay, and then secondly, what happens to those people
   who would like to participate in the clinical cancer trials
   who are uninsured?"
- Parke: "Well, we have... we passed other legislation in the past that was... Representative McCarthy and Senator Parker in 19... last year passed a provision that requires the Department of Insurance to conduct a study to determine the cost and benefits per year providing coverage for investigational cancer treatments and that report will be coming out March 1 of the year 2003."
- Garrett: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you, I got most of that.
  Senator Parker's Bill..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could reduce the noise level and listen to the speakers, we'll be leaving here earlier."
- Parke: "Their law that passed provides that policies of accident health insurance must include an offer for coverage for routine patient care for insurers participating in approved cancer research trials or clinical studies. These provisions also require the Department of Insurance to conduct a study, a study, to determine the cost and benefits per year of providing coverage for investigational cancer treatments. This report is due to the General Assembly by March 1, 2003."
- Garrett: "So, it appears from your legislation, and correct me if

  I'm wrong, that whatever revenues are derived from the

  tobacco settlement fund to cover the cost of these clinical

  cancer trials, that it would be only for those who have,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

who are currently insured in the State of Illinois."

Parke: "They would be through whatever programs are available at the time that they submit their request for coverage, and I have no idea what the criteria is that they have established through the Department of Insurance or the Department of Public Health. Whatever is on their docket, whatever they approve, is there. I have no idea what the law is currently. So whatever it is, that's what it'll be used for."

Garrett: "But currently, the way your Bill is drafted, if there isn't something else in place, the dollars would be allocated to those who are currently insured, only."

Parke: "No, I don't think that that's what it says. My Bill says that if they are in phase 3 or 4 of a cancer level, that they can submit for a request, if this becomes law as I put it in. And I don't know what the Department will determine as a criteria. This Bill's not in place yet, so if people who have cancer now, whatever the rule is currently, that's what they'll have to abide by. If this is put in place, and the way I have it, then whatever is the agreement with the Department and how they structure this, that's what they'll have to have..."

Garrett: "So..."

Parke: "This is put in place by the Department of Public Health who will establish and administer the program."

Garrett: "So, you haven't... So, Representative, you haven't given the Department of Public Health any direction as to people who are uninsured or insured if they will be covered or not. So conceivably, this could cover people who are uninsured?"

Parke: "Yes."

Garrett: "Okay, thank you."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just heard Representative Fritchey refer to the fact that there are many members of his family and friends who have experienced the loss of those who have suffered from cancer. And of course, there are probably many others of you in this room, who like myself, have had these experiences. Since I first became aware of cancer back in the late 1940's and that's when my great grandmother was stricken with cancer and passed away. I've continued to feel frustration that medical science has not yet been able to conquer this disease. And of course, I know there have been many, many efforts that have been exerted to to try to combat cancer, which is what I believe to be the most dreaded ailment known to mankind. And obviously, there's been some success. Prior to my own mother succumbing to lung cancer several years ago, she was in remission for a significant period of time due to the various medications and treatments that she received. Unfortunately, however, medical science had not then and still has not advanced sufficiently to have saved my mom and even today, to help the countless numbers of others who are afflicted with cancer. Despite the fact that there appears to be very little hope on the horizon, nevertheless, I think it is essential that we do all that we possibly can to try to eliminate this dreaded disease. I view this legislation as extremely important, because it'll provide necessary funds to facilitate clinical trials which I know to be an extremely effective tool in this ongoing battle. In my opinion, there couldn't be a better use for proceeds from the tobacco settlement. I urge you all to vote 'yes' for House Bill 50."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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 113 people voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2390 is on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative May will speak to the Bill and there'll be one opponent and we'll go to Roll Call. Representative May."

May: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. House Bill 2390 amends the School Code to give a tax equivalent grant half of a percent of the EAV to the school districts that have military bases, several hundred acres, several hundred students, when they have no property tax. This affects ten districts in the state: Glenview District 94 with Representative Beth Coulson, North Chicago District 187 with Representative Susan Garrett..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative, everybody knows the provisions of the Bill..."

May: "Okay. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "So, the Lady has spoken in support of the Bill.

There'll be one in opposition. Mr. Cross and Mr. Jerry

Mitchell are seeking recognition. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, all I request is a verification in the event the Bill passes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jerry Mitchell in opposition."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to the Speaker (Sic-Sponsor), and she came to talk to me about this Bill and I tried to explain to her, there's only one pot of money. And that money's gonna come from the money that is

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

given for education. If the Lady had sought a separate appropriation above and beyond the money that is dedicated for education now, I could have supported her legislation. But the fact of the matter is, no matter how much respect I have for the speaker or for her district, the problem is, is that if I vote for this I'm voting to take money from my own district and my own kids. That's a problem and it's not just for me, but it's for all of you. Chicago folks, your money is determined the same way. It has to come from the categoricals. There's no other place to take it. We figure the general state aid and then what's left covers our categoricals. Some of that goes into the school improvement block grant that many of our districts need. If we take money out of there, it comes right out of pockets. Now, she told me when we were discussing it, they only have about approximately \$8 thousand per child to spend. I'd love to have \$8 thousand to spend for the kids in my district. We don't have it. I wish we did. I wish we could afford to give this money to Representative May, but we just can't. Think long and hard on this vote, because it does take money away from every single district that you have fought so hard to get for your own kids. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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 60 'ayes', and 52 'nays'. And Mr. Cross has requested a verification. And the Chair would ask staff to retire to the rear of the chamber and would ask the Members to be in their chairs. If the Members would be in their chairs it

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

will greatly expedite the verification of the vote. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those who voted 'yes'."

Clerk Rossi: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representatives Acevedo. Bassi. Beaubien. Boland. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Bradley. Collins. Coulson. Crotty. Currie. Dart. Davis, S. Delgado. Erwin. Feigenholtz. Flowers. Fritchey. Garrett. Giles. Hannig. Hartke. Hassert. Hoffman. Granberg. Hamos. Howard. Jones, L. Kenner. Krause. Holbrook. Lang. Lyons, J. Mathias. May. McCarthy. McGuire. McKeon. Mendoza. Miller. Moore. Morrow. Mulligan. Novak. O'Connor. Osmond. Osterman. Pankau. Persico. Reitz. Ryan. Schoenberg. Scott. Soto. Stroger. Turner, A. Yarbrough. Younge. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Representative Hartke?"

Speaker Madigan: "Hartke is in his chair."

Cross: "Representative Hamos?"

Speaker Madigan: "Hamos is in her chair. Mr. Cross, could you verify Mr. Schoenberg?"

Cross: "Oh, of course."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross. Cross."

Cross: "Representative.... one more, Representative Bugielski?"

Speaker Madigan: "Bugielski is in his chair."

Cross: "Okay, thanks a lot."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question, there are 60 'ayes' and 52 'nays'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wait, House Bill 1814. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1814, a Bill for an Act concerning crime victims. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

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

  This is the Crime Victims Assistance Act. All we're doing with this Bill is creating an emergency fund, which would allow them to spend up to \$2 thousand in emergency situations like, funerals and other things that have to be done in a hurry. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? Has Representative Lou Jones voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3375, Mr. Smith. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3375, a Bill for an Act concerning state facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Smith."

- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill at the request of the Department of Central Management Services, would simply include the communication center on West Jefferson Street here in Springfield as one of the state properties under the control of the Department. Be happy to answer any questions. I believe Representative Scully would also be available for any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3375?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Boland, would you like to vote? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Boland? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 3375, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Report."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on April 6, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'To the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1776, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1815, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2220, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3095 and Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3194."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 175, Representative Madigan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 175, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was... House Bill 175 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 175, a Bill for an Act in relation to regulation of dry cleaners. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 203. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 203 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Third Reading."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 203, a Bill for an Act concerning home construction and repair fraud. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 263. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 263 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 263, a Bill for an Act in relation to local governments. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 273 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 273, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 3... 539. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 347. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 347 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 356 (sic-347). Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 347, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 356."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 356 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 356, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 539. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 539 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 539, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 666."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 666 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 666, a Bill for an Act concerning airports. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 822. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 822 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Third Reading."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 822, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 856. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 856 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 856, a Bill for an Act concerning business transactions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1083. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1083 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1083, a Bill for an Act concerning groundwater. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1101. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1101 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1125. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1125 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1146."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1146 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental matters. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1148. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1148 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1148, a Bill for an Act in relation to environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1161. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1161 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act to create the Predatory Lending Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "1162, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1162 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act to create the Pay Day Loan Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1189. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1189 has been read a second time,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1190. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1190 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1190, a Bill for an Act relating to telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1199. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1199 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1199, a Bill for an Act to create the General Assembly Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1200. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1200 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act to create the General Assembly Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1201. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1201 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Congressional Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1202. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1202 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1202, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Congressional Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1203. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1203 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1203, a Bill for an Act to create the Cook County Judicial Subcircuit Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1204. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1204 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1204, a Bill for an Act to create the Cook County Judicial Subcircuit Reapportionment Act of 2001. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1206. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1206 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1206, a Bill for an Act in relation to veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1215. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1215 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1215, a Bill for an Act in relation to county government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1264. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1264 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1264, a Bill for an Act regarding taxes.

  Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1266. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1266 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1266, a Bill for an Act concerning assistance to citizens. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1267. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1267 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act concerning senior citizens and disabled persons. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1268. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1268 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi "House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1269. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1269 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1269, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1270. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1270 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1270, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, 1272, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1272 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1272, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1273. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1273 a Bill for an Act... House Bill 1273 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1273, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1276. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1276 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1276, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1288. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1288 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1288, a Bill for an Act respecting higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1300. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1300 has been read a second time, previously."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1300, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1306. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1306 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1306, a Bill for an Act in relation to child care. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "1308. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1308 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1308, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "1309. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1309 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1310. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1310 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1310, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1332. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1332 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1332, a Bill for an Act in relation to

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1340. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1340 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1340, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1347. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1347 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill "
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1350. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1350 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1386. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1386 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1386, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1388."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1388 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1388, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1415. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1415 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1434. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1434 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act regarding education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1436. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1436 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1437. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1437 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1437, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1438. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1438 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1438, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1440. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1440 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1440, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1442. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1442 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1442, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1445. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1445 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act relating to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1448. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1448 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1448, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1452. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1452 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1452, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1456. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1456 has been read a second time,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act regarding education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1458. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1458 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Bill 1458. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1458, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1460. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1460 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1465. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1465 has been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1465, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1466. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1466 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1466, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1478. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1478 has been read a second time, previously."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1478, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1493. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1493 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1493, a Bill for an Act in regard to highways. Third Reading of this House Bill"
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1495. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1495 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1495, a Bill for an Act concerning highways. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1519. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1519 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1519, a Bill for an Act regarding airports. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1521. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1521 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1521, a Bill for an Act in relation to aeronautics. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1523. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1523 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act in relation to

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  airports. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1527. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1527 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1527, a Bill for an Act concerning children's health programs. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1530. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1530 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1531. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1531 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1535. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1535 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1535, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1536. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1536 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1556. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1556 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1556, a Bill for an Act concerning health services. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1564. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1564 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1566. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1566 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1599. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1599 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi "House Bill 1599, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1614. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1614 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1614, a Bill for an Act in relation to state procurement. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1623. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1623 has been read a second time,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1623, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Attorney General. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1640. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1640 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1640, a Bill for an Act concerning natural resources. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1642. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1642 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1642, a Bill for an Act concerning alternate fuels. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1655. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1655 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1664. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1664 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act in relation to unemployment insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1679. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1679 has been read a second time, previously."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1679, a Bill for an Act concerning historic preservation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1684. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1684 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1684, a Bill for an Act in relation to health facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1745. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1745 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1745, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1746. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1746 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1829. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1829 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1829, a Bill for an Act concerning fees.

  Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1839. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1839 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1839, a Bill for an Act in relation to

42nd Legislative Day

- April 6, 2001
- education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1840. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1840 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1840, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1894. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1894 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1894, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 1949. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1949 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1949, a Bill for an Act concerning residential mortgages. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2077. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2077 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2077, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2122. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2122 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2122, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2125. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2125 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2125, a Bill for an Act concerning general obligation bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2137. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2137 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2137, a Bill for an Act concerning general obligation bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2277. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2277 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2277, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2428. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2428 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act amending the State Finance Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2568. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2568 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2568, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2602. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2602 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2602, a Bill for an Act with regard to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2613. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2613 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2613, a Bill for an Act in relation to gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2619. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2619 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2619, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2621. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2621 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2621, a Bill for an Act concerning land claims. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2626. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2626 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2626, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2641. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2641 has been read a second time, previously."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2641, a Bill for an Act in relation to state procurement. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2646. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2646 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2646, a Bill for an Act in relation to governmental ethics. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2660. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2660 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2660, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "2665. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2665 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2665, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2667. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2667 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2667, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2671. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2671 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2671, a Bill for an Act in relation to

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2683. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2683 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2683, a Bill for an Act in relation to pensions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2721, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2721 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2721, a Bill for an Act in relation to water reclamation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2729, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2729 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2729, a Bill for an Act in relation to counties. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2734. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2734 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2734, a Bill for an Act in relation to elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2744, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2744 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2744, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2765, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2765 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2765, a Bill for an Act in relation to airports. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2778. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2778 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2778, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil immunities. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2809. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2809 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2809, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2828. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2828 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2828, a Bill for an Act concerning tobacco settlement funds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2844. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2844 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2844, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2845. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2845 has been read a second time,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2845, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2881. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2881 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2881, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2893. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2893 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2893, a Bill for an Act in relation to utilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2900. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2900 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2900, a Bill for an Act relating to telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2901. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2901 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2901, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2902. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2902 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2902, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2905. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2905 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2905, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2911. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2911 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2911, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2914. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2914 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2914, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2917. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2917 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2917, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2920. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2920 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2920, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Third Reading of this House Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2970. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2970 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2970, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2971. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2971, a Bill for an Ac... House Bill 2971 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2971, a Bill for an Act in relation to WIC vendors. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2982. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2982 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2982, a Bill for an Act concerning families. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3097. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3097 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3097, a Bill for an Act concerning contact lenses. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3288. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3288 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3288, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3289. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3289 has been read a second time,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3289, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3308. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3308 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3308, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire prevention. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3426. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3426 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3426, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3439. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3439 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3439, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3440. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3440 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3440, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3463. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3463 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- 42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3463, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3489. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3489 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3489, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3490. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3490 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3490, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3491. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3491 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3491, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3492. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3492 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3492, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3493. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3493 has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3493, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3494. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3494 has been read a second time, previously."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3494, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3495. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3495 has been read a second time, previously."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3495, a Bill for an Act in relation to State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3566. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3566 has been read a second time, previously."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3566, a Bill for an Act concerning schools."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 3606. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3606 has been read a second time, previously."

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

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3606, a Bill for an Act concerning space needs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 705."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 705, a Bill for an Act concerning credit service organizations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 829."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 829, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 916."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 916, a Bill for an Act amending the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Telephone Solicitations Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2228."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act concerning evidence. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "House Bill 2523. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2523, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke "House Bill 3184, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3184, a Bill for an Act concerning land development. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, may I have your attention please. You have just heard the Clerk and I read all of the Bills that were on the Agreed Bill List, on the Agreed list #3. You voted on them early this morning. Your instructions are to vote 'yes' on this Agreed Bill List unless you wish to vote 'no' on all of the Bills. All those in favor of the Agreed list will vote 'yes'; and those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. On this Roll Call, there are 93 Members voting 'yes', 19 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 3095. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3095, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments, Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Poe, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that's a clean up language for IDOT, that deals with airports and aeronautics. And what this Amendment does, there was some concerns from the City of Chicago and we

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  took those concerns they had out of the Bill, and that's

  all this Amendment does."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act in relation to aeronautics. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Morrow."
- Morrow: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would defer any questions on House Bill 3095, to Representative Poe."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, again, as I said this is just a cleanup language for IDOT. It's some rules that they... out of date and some updates that they wanted to make. And it's just technical changes for IDOT."
- 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 110 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 63, Mr. Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 63, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1, 4, and 5 have been adopted to the Bill. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed. A land conveyance note has been requested on the Bill as amended and the note has

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

not been filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know when the land conveyance note was filed. I anticipate it was filed just a few minutes ago. I don't know how that would be applicable to this Act or to this Bill. I would move that the Act is not applicable."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the request for the land conveyance note is not applicable to this particular Bill, and on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, to be frank with you, I didn't hear a thing that Representative Granberg said and you caught us a little off guard, and I know it wasn't intentional."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Cross, very recently a note request was filed to this Bill for a land conveyance note and Mr. Granberg has moved that a request for a land conveyance note is inapplicable to this Bill. Mr. Cross..."

Cross: "Well, thank you for that. Representative Black, I think, wants to address that. I..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Cross: "...wanted just to slow it down a minute."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, let me get a feel for... obviously, if a coal mine is going to be developed anywhere in the state, somebody is going to have to either purchase land, land taken by condemnation, land under quick take. So, there's, obviously, a land conveyance, wouldn't you agree? I mean,

- 42nd Legislative Day

  April 6, 2001

  the land is going to move from one person's ownership to another, correct?"
- Granberg: "That's not bad, Mr. Black, that's not bad. I know you don't have a lot to work with, but that's pretty impressive. In some point in the future, you could technically say that."
- Black: "Okay. So, if if somebody will have to convey land to a second or third party for the purpose of ripping the land all up and digging up all the coal, it would only seem reasonable that we prepare a land conveyance note, so we would know how orderly a process this land conveyance is going to be."
- Granberg: "I'm sure you're well-intentioned, Mr. Black, and if there was being land conveyed at the present time, we would do everything to comply with your request. I'm just not quite sure... I know you don't want to hinder the development of economical... of Illinois coal. So, I am not sure if you would persist in this request. But, there is no conveyance being made contemporaneously, so I don't think the Act is applicable."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's Motion. We often find ourselves in positions where we are thrust into certain roles and I take my cinnamon roll where I can get it, and I take this role very seriously. Obviously, there's a land conveyance if you're going to mine coal. And I know that many of you who are friends of the environment and concerned about it and would want to know what the impact is and how the land would be sold and how the title would be conveyed. So, I mean, if you rule it inapplicable you're saying that somehow we can mine coal without conveying title to land and I'm not sure how that can be done. Technology does amazing things, but

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

I'm not sure it's that amazing. So, I would stand in opposition to the note being ruled inapplicable."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Gentleman's Motion be adopted?' This requires more 'ayes' than 'nays'. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes', and 53 'noes'. And the Gentleman's Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, is there another request for a note?"

Clerk Bolin: "The housing affordability impact note has been requested on the Bill as amended."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assume that note was filed just recently, too, by the Republican Party. I'm not sure why they're taking these extraordinary steps to keep a Bill that helps Southern Illinois and coal development from being heard, but if that's what they want to do, I guess that's what they'll do. Housing affordability, I don't think there are going to be any apartments or housing complexes built in these mines. There is no connection, no correlation and I would so move that the Act is inapplicable."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief, we all want to go home. If my house is located on top of the coal mine, I'm certainly going to lose some money when my house is dug up for the coal mine or worse yet, sinks into the shaft of the coal mine. And I think that's what I am getting here, the shaft. Obviously, you can't mine coal without having some impact on the surrounding real estate.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

So, I would, Mr. Speaker, stand in opposition of the note being ruled inapplicable and would ask for a verification of the vote ruling that the note is, in fact, applicable."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg has moved that the request for the note is inapplicable. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk... has Mr. Hartke voted? Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes', and 55 'noes'. And there is a request for a verification. So, if the... again if the staff would retire to the rear of the chamber, if the Members would be in their seats. The Members could please take their seats. Representative Slone, if you could take your seat. Mr. Fritchey, if you could sit down. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting 'yes'."
- Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Clerk Representatives Acevedo. Boland. Bradley. Brosnahan. Bugielski. Brunsvold. Burke. Capparelli. Crotty. Currie. Curry. Dart. Davis, S. Delgado. Erwin. Feigenholtz. Flowers. Forby. Fowler. Franks. Fritchey. Garrett. Giles. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hoffman. Holbrook. Howard. Kenner. Lang. Lyons, J. Mautino. McCarthy. McGuire. McKeon. Mendoza. May. Miller. Novak. O'Brien. Osterman. Morrow. Reitz. Ryan. Scott. Scully. Schoenberg. Slone. Smith. Stroger. Turner, A. Yarbrough. Younge, and Mr. Speaker." Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Stroger?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Stroger is in his... Mr. Stroger, remove Mr. Stroger."

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Black: "Representative Steve Davis?"

Speaker Madigan: "Steve Davis, Steve Davis, has arrived."

Black: "Representative Charles Morrow?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Morrow. Remove Mr. Morrow."

Black: "Representative Brunsvold?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold is in his chair."

Black: "No, no, no, that's Representative Wait."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Black: "There must be something to eat over by Representative Novak."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold, remove Mr. Brunsvold."

Black: "Is Representative Slone in the chamber?"

Speaker Madigan: "Lady's in the front."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, you told her to go to her chair and she didn't. Would you properly chastise her? I have nothing further."

Speaker Madigan: "Nothing further. On this question, there are 54 'yes', 55 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "I would like to verify the 'no' votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has requested the verification of the 'no' vote. I had previously asked the parliamentarian if that request would be in order and he had told me that it would be. So, if the Republicans could be in their chairs and if their staff could retire to the rear. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting 'no'."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the negative:
Representatives Bassi. Beaubien. Bellock. Berns.
Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Coulson. Cowlishaw.
Cross. Daniels. Durkin. Hamos. Hassert. Hoeft.
Hultgren. Johnson. Jones, J. Klingler. Kosel. Krause.
Kurtz. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons, E. Mathias.
McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell, B. Mitchell, J. Moffitt.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Moore. Mulligan. Myers. O'Connor. Osmond. Pankau.

Parke. Persico. Poe. Righter. Rutherford. Saviano.

Schmitz. Sommer. Tenhouse. Turner, J. Wait. Winkel.

Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. and Zickus."

Speaker Madigan: "Questions."

Granberg: "Is Representative Morrow back in the chamber?"

Speaker Madigan: "He is. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, we verified the 'yes' vote and came to a number, 54. And then there was a request from Mr. Granberg to verify the 'no' vote, and we're in the process of doing that. So, we have not announced the verified vote. Mr. Cross, to concur with the Chair. Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I assume that we can continue to verify the 'yes' votes since you have not completed the process and made and announcement."

Speaker Madigan: "You're correct."

Cross: "So, you're going to go to the 'noes' and then we can go back to the 'yeses'?"

Speaker Madigan: "I think it's a valid point."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "So, can we... Mr. Cross, in light of that, can we verify Mr. Morrow?"

Cross: "If Charles feels like that's the right thing to do. I guess so."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Clerk, restore Mr. Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, my name was used in debate. With me being a mathematician, I understand creative accounting and this is just creative accounting. Stop your whining."

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Further questions of the 'no' votes?"

Granberg: "Representative Bost?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Granberg: "Representative Jones?"

Speaker Madigan: "Well, just a second."

Granberg: "Oh."

Speaker Madigan: "Is Mr. Jones, John Jones is in the chamber."

Granberg: "Oh, Representative Bost is in the chamber?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost is in the chamber."

Granberg: "Representative Klingler?"

Speaker Madigan: "Klingler is in her chair."

Granberg: "Representative Saviano?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Saviano's in his chair."

Granberg: "I'm sorry I couldn't.... Representative McAuliffe?

It's hard to see through the Sponsor of the empowerment

Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg, what is the name again, the last name?"

Granberg: "McAuliffe, but he's there, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe's in his chair."

Granberg: "I just couldn't see him. Representative... for the old days, Representative Ackerman? Is a... okay.

Representative Hamos?"

Speaker Madigan: "Hamos. Is Representative Hamos in the chamber?

Remove Representative Hamos from the chamber and restore

Mr. Brunsvold to the Roll Call. Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the time. I wish we could have bipartisan cooperation helping Southern Illinois. And I hope the press, I hope the press is observing this."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross, do you have further questions?"

Cross: "Yes. Representative Hamos? Representative Boland?"

42nd Legislative Day April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Boland's in his chair."

Cross: "Representative Dart?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart's in his chair. Mr. Cross, would you verify Representative Collins, right here?"

Cross: "Sure. Sure. Representative Franks?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks is in his chair."

Cross: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak. He's just outside the men's restroom."

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

Speaker Madigan: "On this question, there are 56 'yes', 54 'no'; and the Gentleman's Motion is adopted. Are there any further requests for notes?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further note requests. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 63, a Bill for an Act in relation to coal. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite the... despite the best..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank you for the cooperation in allowing this Bill to be heard today. I... apparently the other side of the aisle did not want this Bill to be heard and that's unfortunate. Yesterday there were a couple statements made. I just want to go back to those very briefly, 'cause I know that people are concerned about them. One was, the Illinois Environmental Council is opposed to the Bill. The

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Environmental Council is supportive of the Illinois environmental provisions in the Bill. They have concerns about the remaining portion of the Bill. They filed a witness slip yesterday in committee and the testimony was by John Thompson, that they support the environmental provisions of the Bill. They are in opposition to the Bill as it is because of the additional areas. We are currently in the process of reaching consensus on those other issues of concern. Secondly, the issue of fiscal impact. stated yesterday that this would cost the state \$39 million a year. That could be true if the Governor decided to exercise the option to issue \$500 million worth of bonds. It does not state the Governor issues \$500 million worth of That would be in his discretion. Given the merits of a project, he could issue 50, he could issue 100, whatever it might take to bring a due base energy plant to Southern Illinois. Secondly, in regard to the fiscal impact. The sales tax on Illinois coal used to generate, just a few years ago, \$60 million a year in revenue, to GRF. Now it is 39. We think it could go down as far as 22 next year, \$22 million. Two years ago over \$21 million dollars in income taxes were paid by Illinois coal miners and the assisting jobs. If we don't do anything to help the Southern Illinois economy and the coal mining economy, there's not going to be any taxes going into the General Revenue Fund in this state. The purpose of this Bill is to generate the economic development in Southern Illinois. need to generate jobs. We need to have an economic development strategy to create those good-paying jobs. This Bill will accomplish that. It will create thousands, thousands of good-paying jobs, new generation plants, new mine to mouth operations. That's what this is about. What

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

we have done is to bring everybody to the table over the course of the last four months. Mine workers, coal association, environmentalists, utilities, consumers. worked on a bipartisan basis. We worked with the state agencies of this Governor. And those are Republican state We worked with the Governor's Office. I assume agencies. we all know he's a Republican. We worked together. have Republican sponsorship of this Bill. This is a comprehensive package that does an economic development strategy for Southern Illinois, improves the air quality for Northern Illinois and implements an energy strategy that creates new generation for this state, so we don't have to become reliant on out-of-state generation. good for all the citizens of this state because we don't want to become like California. That is this Bill. think there are great components in this Bill. it's a bipartisan effort. We started on this Bill four months ago. Mr. Daniels came forward Wednesday with his package which has merit. We think they complement each other. Dan Reitz put his Bill. We consolidated all the legislation. We want to send one Bill to the Governor. want to develop unanimity on every Section of that Bill and I am confident we can do that. And that's good for all the people. We shouldn't pit Southern Illinois against the We shouldn't divide this society. Let's bring suburbs. everyone together. Let's resolve the long-term issues of this state on a bipartisan basis, working with all interest groups, not on our own, not Democrats, not Republicans. Let's work together. This Bill will accomplish that purpose."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tenhouse."

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

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

In response, I guess I have to say, you've accomplished an unprecedented task here. You have brought the lobbyists together, all in opposition to this Bill. Because, regardless of what you said, the witness slips are in my hand. One signed by Lynn Pativan, opponent, House Bill 63; one signed by John Thompson, opponent, 63. You know, and you look here, the other point is we Illinois Manufacturers' have also the opponents; Association, State Chamber of Commerce, Chemical Industry Council, the Refiners and the Petroleum Council. This is amazing. I mean I've been here awhile and I've never a Bill where you can get that many environmentalists and business people in opposition to the same Bill. You've been able to bring us together, and certainly in terms of bipartisanship, when you've had all these meetings since December you haven't invited a single Democrat. You know it seems kind of... or Republican, maybe you haven't invited the Democrats, either. God knows who you've been with, but we won't talk about that. But, let's get to the issue. And the issue is this. We... you talk about dividing this state, I don't know. You start talking about an issue. When you start stealing a Bill certainly would benefit the people of Southern Illinois and of all of Illinois. You know I can't help but think of some of the other points you made here. You start saying \$39 million cost doesn't take place. Economic and fiscal, what do they say? Thirty-nine million dollars annual debt service. That's a fiscal note that was filed. They say general obligation principal debt increases by \$500 million. Potential general obligation debt \$950 million and yet there's no cost. Your part of the Bill is the problem, Sir. And unfortunately, you seem unwilling to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

deal with us, to help us at all, to work with us. You talked about bipartisanship, if this is bipartisanship, this is bunk. This is bunk. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know if we start talking about trying to work together to accomplish anything, this is not the way to do it. I would ask that Members on both sides of the aisle take a good hard look at this and realize that this is not the way to pass legislation. If you started in December and you managed to get the environmentalists and the business groups both opposed, maybe you should have started before Thanksgiving."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. The previous speaker indicated that witness slips were submitted before the House Energy and Environment Committee concerning opponents. I agree with him on two, Mr. John Thompson from the IEC and Ms. Lynn Pativan. But, as far as my recollection is concerned there were no witness slips ever filed by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, by the IMA, or by the Chemical Industry Council opposed to this Bill. I read all those witness slips yesterday, one by one, in that committee. And I do not recall those slips. Now, if you can produce those slips and bring them over here and let me see them, I stand Bring them over here and let me see them, I'll corrected. stand corrected. Now, to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a very important initiative to the economy, not only in Southern Illinois, but to all of Illinois. And as my good friend Vince Persico and I worked very very hard on what we thought was a very prudent and rational electric deregulation Bill three years ago, that's now going on its fourth Bill, that an overwhelming majority of the Members

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

of this Body supported, with rate reductions and a rational transition period to a new economy to a competitive market. That's happening. I'm kind of... a little bit disappointed in the wholesale market developing and the competitive markets developing slow. But, in hindsight in looking at California, maybe we should take a second look and sure those markets do develop in a slow and comprehensive manner. This is a major component of the energy question in this state. A lot of states are debating this issue. What is the component? What type of mix of energy do we Half this country uses coal to need in the future? generate electricity. Half the State of Illinois' sources come from coal, the other half just about from nuclear energy and other sources of power. It's important that we advance this issue and all Amendments have merits in this issue. It's important that we focus on one single avenue, take this over to the Senate so the appropriate Senate Sponsor can look at this Bill and work with Representative Granberg and the Democrats and t.he Republicans and my committee and Senator Mahar's committee and all the other interested parties, so we could present a comprehensive Bill to Governor Ryan for him to consider. You know, you talk about new generation, if you check with the ICC there's over 20,000 megawatts of new generation that are scheduled to come online in this state since the deregulation Bill became law, signed by former Governor Edgar in January of 1997, excuse me, in December of 1997. A market is developing. So, we're very, very happy with the outcome of the deregulation law. It's a wise approach. You know there were a lot a 'nay' sayers about that Bill. They said we shouldn't come... we should come into the market quicker. Let's have open access quicker, so we can

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

have competitive choices. Well, to the 'nay' sayers, think they're awfully quiet nowadays, because of what's been happening in California. Our approach was the right approach. Representative Granberg's approach and I see Representative Bost is a cosponsor on this Bill, is the right approach. We should move it along to the Senate, talk seriously about issues, about putting coal miners back to work, upgrading our transmission lines and making sure that we use this vast natural resource we have in this state to generate more power to meet our needs. Because Ladies and Gentlemen, we will need that power in the very near future. I ask you for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I think that we need to frame this discussion in the following fashion. There are really two parts to this One part we're very pleased with and we are Bill. extremely proud of the development of that language that occurred over several months as a result of meetings. And yes, we say they are bipartisan because most of the people we met with down in Southern Illinois are, Democrats. And the development of this plan that had several core components to it, one component was that we wanted to make sure that we helped taxpayers and we didn't drain their pocket because of a tight budget year. We know that this is a year when we get to the budget table it's going to be very difficult to balance our budget. We've got a Medicaid shortfall. We've got a shortfall in early We have a shortfall in the Comprehensive intervention. Health Insurance Program. As a matter of fact, the General Assembly House and Senate can't even agree on supplemental appropriation which, as Representative Black

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

said yesterday, is a travesty that we haven't gotten that But the Bill we had before you and presented to you as a result of our work product last Tuesday in an effort to have a bipartisan spirit... truly bipartisan spirit, was one that would create jobs... an estimated 5,000 jobs, in fact create the opportunity for development in Southern Illinois for new coal, would pay for new transmission lines so you could put that electricity on the grid. And then would, in fact, be a great opportunity for this state to move forward in energy without cost to the taxpayers. Get that point, without cost to the taxpayers. Now, one of the reasons that we came to you and said to you that we thought we ought to proceed with both Bills is the great fear we have that with the Amendment that's contained in House Bill 63 in its original form is so fraught with problems because of its cost that we are fearful in the final analysis people would say, we're not gonna go along with the cost of this because... let's analyze this. House Bill 63, in its original form has \$500 million in GO bonded indebtedness that would cost an estimated \$39 million a year, if it was fully implemented, taxpayer money. What was its original Its original intent was to use that taxpayer intent? dollars to retrofit fossil fuel plants that are already in These are fossil fuel plants, by the way, that existence. are owned by fuel companies which deal with this issue and know that environmentally, and in order to make their fuel plants in accordance with the Clean Air Act, they have to spend millions of dollars. So instead, they turned to Representative Granberg and said, why don't you help bail us out because we really need your help. Well, you know, where I come from, that's called corporate welfare.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

called corporate greed. That's called helping the fat cats to meet their obligations and using taxpayers' money to And no matter what part of the meet their obligations. state you come from, that's what it boils down to. So, one Bill deals with the corporate fat cats. Look at the supporters of the Bill. They were mentioned. listed right there, right in front of you. You could see No wonder they're doing that. it right there. You're gonna bail them out and retrofit their fossil fuel plants with your tax dollars. You're gonna have to answer your constituents for that. We know that old plants are outmoded, out of date, and even if you do retrofit them, they still don't meet the environmental standards. why we wanted to build new plants, new mine-mouth plants at the base of the mine to eliminate transportation costs and meet the environmental standards. That's why t.o t.he Environmental Council likes our Bill. And they don't like the other part of that Bill. That's why they have now registered in opposition to that, 'cause it doesn't meet the standards that we need. That's why the Lung Association is against House Bill 63 in its original That's why Citizens Action is against House Bill 63 in its original form. So, you have on the one end, two parts of the Bill, one for the corporate fat cats, one for Southern Illinois economic development and job creation. The Bill, one for the environmentalists, the people that want to keep clean air, that's the Southern Illinois component with the new plants. The other Bill is for the polluters, the corporate guys, that even if they retrofit, it's still gonna be... you know, Mr. Speaker, it's just like a car. If you have a 10-year-old Oldsmobile and you remodel or recondition the engine, you still have a 10-year-old

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Oldsmobile and it's still not as good, in standards and pollution quality, as a brand new Oldsmobile would be in So, I look at this Bill and I say, all today's market. right, so what's wrong with it, cost factor. Well, why not just take these two Bills, pass 'em to the Senate, and deal with them there. I said all right. I talked to our Members from Southern Illinois. Representative Bost, who, in fact, is a Sponsor of this Bill said we need to do something, let's look at both Bills. I said, okay, but don't put them together. And that's the fatal flaw that the Sponsors failed... fell into. Because when it hits the Senate, this is dead, dead, dead. Because when you get to the budget table, as I have been now for 20 years as the Republican Leader of the House, you can predict what's gonna happen, because I'm not gonna put this Bill over our children's welfare, over education, over early intervention, over the budget cuts that we're gonna have to make to take care of the poor people in the State of Illinois and neither are you in the final analysis. That's why this Bill, in its final form, will not work. and Gentlemen, you're gonna hear a lot about this Bill before it's all over. And I predict just read... those of you from Southern Illinois, read about House Bill 63 in its original form and why Southern Illinois won't be fooled by the legislation that's contained here. Oh yeah, you want to talk about job creation right now. Of course there's job creation, 'cause you amended our Bill into your Bill to try to make it better. It's unfortunate. It's unfortunate. Now, to my Southern Illinois Legislators, I want to tell you right now, I understand why you will vote 'yes' for I know why you have to, because you come from this Bill. coal company (sic-country). But you also know the efforts

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

that you put in, the efforts that you created for job development, economic development, and utilization at years reserve of coal is the right way to go. Hang in there, we will prevail. This won't make it to the Governor. You heard it here. This won't make it to t.he it does, in this form, it will Governor. Ιf amendatorily vetoed to take this ill-conceived, miserable provision that takes away from the kids of Illinois, that takes away from early intervention funds, that takes away from comprehensive health insurance and our justice system that will not work. I, for one, intend to vote 'no' it's not honest, it's not sincere, it's because disingenuous. And I, for one, intend to do everything I can to pass the right component of the Bill. Having said that, my Southern Illinois colleagues have to do what they have to do, but the rest of us in the State of Illinois that will suffer from the pollution that this Bill will create because of the bad plants, will vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Excuse me, Mr. Black,

Representative Slone was ahead of you. Representative

Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Slone: "Mr. Granberg, I believe you stated that the revenue stream that would be required to finance the bonds if they're fully used is 39 million year?"

Granberg: "If the Governor would choose to fully finance the bond program, it would be \$39 million a year."

Slone: "Okay. What I.... I understand that the last year on which we have data is 1999 on the Sales and Use Tax on coal. What was the amount of the revenue stream at that

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

time?"

Granberg: "Thirty-nine million."

- Slone: "Okay. I talked to John Thompson from the Environmental Council again on this issue today. And my understanding is that at that time, the amount, the total amount of the revenue stream was something on the order of 28 or 29 million which would be a \$10 million shortfall and I also understand if I'm and please correct me if I'm wrong here, that a certain percentage of that goes to local governments, it does not go to to the state. Is that correct?"
- Granberg: "I have not seen Mr. Thompson's statement,

  Representative Slone. The information we had in December

  was 39 million."
- Slone: "Okay. My understanding is that 20% of the money goes to local governments. Do you know if that's correct?"
- Granberg: "There's a portion of that goes to local governments.

  But again, this is up to the Governor on whether to fully implement the plan. We anticipate and that's why we'll be continuing to meet with the Governor's Office, that he can select project by project. We do not anticipate the Governor's Office issuing \$500 million worth of bonds.

  That would not be practical to do that. You ought to do it in a piecemeal approach based on the viability of each individual project."
- Slone: "Okay. Mr. Granberg, the commitment to burn Illinois coal is one of the criteria for receiving the grant funds, is that correct?"
- Granberg: "There are two main criteria. Before you can even go to the board, which is composed equally of coal people and environmental people, which they agreed on the composition, you have to meet two criteria. The two criteria are: use

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

of Illinois coal and reduction of .... emissions. You have to meet those two criteria."

Slone: "I know that some of the pieces of legislation that have tried to encourage the use of Illinois coal in the past have encountered Federal Constitutional problems because of Interstate Commerce Clause. Can you address that issue and how this would be affected?"

Granberg: "Briefly, that's what we've been working through over four months with the attorneys and with everyone involved. It's violative of the Interstate Commerce Clause if you show priority to the use of Illinois coal. So we have addressed all the legal concerns. That's one of the reasons it's taken us four months. That's why the Bill crafted as it is. That's why we have sought input, not only from all the groups informed, including the Illinois Environmental Council, because they have been very, very helpful. That's why they are supportive of all the environmental provisions of the Bill. In fact, they call it the best environmental vote, one of the best. environmental votes in ten years on those provisions. Their concern is like yours that we are currently working through to make sure that the main priority is the building of new generation of mine to mouth plants. So we have cleaner air 'cause they meet new plan standards."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Granberg. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentl... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed."

Slone: "We still have 24 grandfathered coal-fired power plants, I believe it's 24 or 25, left in the State of Illinois. They way disproportionately cause air pollution in this state that has been shown to lead to asthma attacks, emphysema, and other pulmonary disease, excessive emergency room

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

visits and as many as 400 excess deaths in the Northern part of the state where our air quality leaves a great deal to be desired already. There are two key pollutants that are involved in all these excess health problems. And they are sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Nitrogen oxides are governed by Federal Law and the Supreme Court has already held that the utility companies have got to meet nitrogen oxide standards by the year 2004. Sulfur dioxide is really what's at issue here, and under Mr. Granberg's Bill I don't believe that the utilities are going to have to do anything about sulfur dioxide that they're not Nor will they have to do anything about already doing. nitrogen oxides that the Federal Government is not already requiring them to do. So, what this amounts to is a transfer of the cost of the clean up of these 24 or 25 coal-fired plants from the utility shareholders to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. And it sets up a pretty complicated system to do that. But, it is... there's no guarantee that we will have health improvements. There's no guarantee that we'll have air improvements. And despite Mr. Granberg's efforts here and I complement the Gentleman on the time he's put in on this, I still think that what we have left here is not a good Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've listened to this debate. I've listened to the arguments that have occurred.

And there's just a few things I think need to be answered here. I'm going to support the Bill. I was cosponsor of both Bills. I understand the need for each of the Bills.

I also mentioned during the debate yesterday that I think the issues should have been separated. Earlier,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Representative Novak talked about the rewrite... the electrical rewrite. Working in a bipartisan manner with he and Representative Persico and the Members of the Senate, bipartisanship. In the telecommunications was rewrite, as we worked together with both your side of aisle and our side of the aisle, that's bipartisanship. But I have to argue with the fact of just coming to a person and I'm glad that they came to me, so let me explain that to the Sponsor. I'm glad that I was asked to be on the sponsorship of this Bill because it is something that I would support and do support. But to say bipartisanship exists because we put our name on the sponsorship of a Bill, it's not right. Bipartisanship is something that occurs when each Member has the opportunity to participate in the conversation. Just because you deal with a state agency that's controlled by someone that is a Governor of this state and is from our party, that still takes us out of the process. Now, as I said, I support the Bill, 'cause I supported each part of it. I'm still very upset with the process of putting the two together because I have a fear of what we've done by putting them together. I understand the Sponsor's concerns of what we're wanting to deal with, with the other power plants in this state. I want them to continue to burn Illinois coal. I want the ones that aren't burning Illinois coal, that over the years we've tried to convince and make sure that they were burning Illinois coal that have pulled away from that, to continue to burn Illinois coal. It was said earlier that this possibly doesn't offer something for both ends of the state. Actually, it does. In the language that was placed forward by... Leader Daniels' language, it does provide something for both ends of the state. That part of the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Bill really does allow for us to allow mines in the State Illinois to open, use mouth-mine (sic-mine-mouth) generators to transfer electricity to the northern part of the state. And there's been some questions, okay, well how do we prove that, how do we know that? Well, the reality it's pushed into the grid and we know that there's a need for electricity and it will be a benefit and if we can produce it in and out of the nonattainment areas that will be a benefit for the northern part of the state and the environmentalists. But I'm really bothered by the frustration that I feel and that you can hear back and forth, because instead of working to separate the Bills and move them forward in that manner, we play games and I think we brought them together in that direction instead. this gets enough votes. I'm asking for you, regardless of where you're at in the state, to vote for it. But there is still the concern I expressed yesterday. Part of this Bill, when we say it's bipartisan, understand what bipartisanship is and I hope that I was clear in that. I'm not going to stand up and rant and rave because I think there's enough of that that's went on. But, I would... I hope that you get enough votes to get it over to the Senate and that we can work on from there. I'm not happy with the process by which it was done."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... I guess I'm just happy we're trying to do something for coal. And there's... I had a Bill last week, if we're going to talk about the logistics of this process. I had a Bill last week on Third Reading that we could have moved out and was working with Representative Granberg trying to find something, if we're going to proceed with one Bill then that's what we need to

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

do. But then, the other side, I mean we had a press conference and we had a Bill that I agree with. I think there's good parts in all three Bills. I don't totally agree with Representative Granberg's Bill. And we'll continue discussions on that, I hope, as it moves through the process. I do believe that we need some bonding in here. We need some incentives and be able to have grants out there for mine-mouth generation facilities that are going to be around. And without that, the components within Leader Daniels' Bill are good, but we also have tax credits in there either. So, it's not... none of these... none of this is without some state participation. And I think... I consider most of that to be a good investment, as we try to create coal jobs and we can still do this and help the environment. If we move this, let's move this through the process. Let's try to one... as long as we keep in... at the forefront we're going to create... increase production, create coal mining jobs in Southern Illinois, increase our capacity. And at the same time that we build mine-mouth generation, build those at new source standards and clean up our environment. I think we can do that. I hope we can do that. And let's move this Bill Let's work on something when it comes through the through. Senate. But as I said, I appreciate everyone giving this issue at least the debate it deserves and I appreciate everyone's help to help Southern Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of the issues have come up, excuse me, I think were not fully explained. For example, it was... and not deliberate, there's no distortion, I'm not saying that. It was indicated that the Governor would decide in

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

most cases where this money would be utilized. And as I read the underlying Bill of House Bill 63, the Clean Air and Development Board, 15 voting members, those members will be selected by the four Leaders of the General Assembly, the Governor, the United Mine Workers, the IEBW, the Illinois Coal Association, the IEC, the Sierra Club, the American Lung Association. One nonvoting member to be selected by the Illinois Energy Association. It's that board as I understand it that will make the appropriations to the generating plants. And there is a complicated matrix in House Bill 63. I will grant you that if, if the generating facility is able to increase its usage of Illinois coal it will get more points on the matrix which I assume will be translated into more dollars from the fund. But there isn't anything in the Bill that mandates them to use Illinois coal. In fact, if they retrofit some of these plants and go to scrubbers in order to save a few dollars, they can probably save more by putting in a scrubber that will return a higher return on their investment for clean air by using Western coal, which is a low-sulfur coal. So, you know when we say that this Bill is strictly and solely to benefit the Illinois coal mining industry, I'm not sure that that is altogether a true statement. Now, I have a producing coal mine in my home County of Vermilion, been in... been producing for about the last eight years. much to my surprise a very successful operation selling every ton he can mine. And another mine is set to open, but is in the permitting process. Let me tell you there... the controversy has... a major, major controversy has evolved and generated in a county that 100 years ago was comprised almost entirely of coal miners. There were generations of coal miners in my home County of Vermilion.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

And now that a mine is opening in Southern Vermilion County, it's been appealed, I don't know whether it's in the courts or what have you. But it is generated some extreme opposition. And this is in a county where 100 years ago coal was, in fact, king. So, whenever you talk about coal and generated coal-fired generating facilities you certainly generate a great deal of controversy today. That goes without saying. And I think part of controversy that we're faced with here today is what I made reference to yesterday. You know, I... in the pure and simple form, what I would like to see this Body do is to be a marketplace of ideas. And when we... when we allow things to happen, and I understand some of the reasons for what is happened. But, when we... when we take a Leader's Bill and collapse it without his permission, that as I said the other day, I don't remember that happening very often, it ever happened before. When we tell people how many Bills they can call after we already start the process, then you have to go home and make up some reasonable explanation as to why this group's Bill can't be called or maybe you can run around and find somebody else to carry it, if you've been here long enough you know how to do I had a dream last night that I was on eBay and several of you Legislators were offering at auction the chance to carry a Bill if you hadn't already had five. hope it doesn't come to that. But, it... it may well... that may well happen. A stronger way to do this process, I would think, would have been to run Representative's House Bill 63 on its own. It would have passed or failed on its own merits. Representative... there was another Bill about mine-mouth that again could have been called on its own, would have passed or failed on its merits and then there

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

was the Bill that Members of our caucus presented earlier in the week that could have passed or failed on its merits. In my, and I listened in on the Senate awhile ago, I put on my earphones. And I know you'll be shocked to know that they're not here. I have learned over the years that sometimes you need to send more than one Bill to There are not as many of them and they tend to take things a little more slowly and look at things perhaps a little more carefully and sometimes if they don't their nap they're a little more cranky. I think it would have been in our best interest to send three Bills to Senate rather than one. I think we're all after the same We have to generate electricity in this state. are a tremendous consumer of electricity. Lot of us on the floor will disagree as to whether or not we should generate that by coal, whether we should generate it by natural gas, nuclear-generated energy looks better all the time. some of the environmentalists pretty much have done away with nuclear-generated electricity. We could go to solar energy. We didn't see the sun for 60 days, so I'm not sure that would work. We could go to wind generating. great place to put one of those would be in this chamber. We could probably power the entire Capitol on that wind generator. So, there are lots of disagreements on how we're going to be able to generate the electricity that need so desperately and that we see every day other states are wrestling with. So, I... I wish it hadn't come to I wish we hadn't come to this argument that, you know, there are times I think back and I see myself on the playground at good ol' Franklin Grade School in Danville, Illinois where we were on the playground and saying things like, 'My dad can beat up your dad. My Bill's better than

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

your Bill.' I don't know whether your Bill's better than our Bill or not. We didn't get to debate any of the Bills on its merits. They're all lumped together in one package, take it or leave it. That's not a very good way to do It's not the way you do business when you go business. shopping for clothes, cars, or appliances. And yet, often told it's the only way we can do business down here is to take it or leave it. Sometimes all we can do is to express our frustration with the process by casting a 'no' vote. I don't like some of the things that have gone on I have said so publicly. this Session. I am not criticizing the Speaker or anybody in here. The and the Republican Leader have to deal with issues of a macro sense, I can deal with them on a micro sense. I've just not been happy with the way we're going and the way we're going and I know we've talked about it both sides of the aisle. If we don't begin to be participants, equal participants in the process, most of us can go home. Most of us can go home and they can summon us when they get a budget and they can summon us back when they get a list of 20 or 30 Bills that we're going to vote We are not equal participants in this process anymore. And the more we collapse Bills and the more we refuse to let individual Members carry their ideas forward and let the process work. You know, as frustrated as I get with the process, it works pretty doggone good. Bad Bills generally don't pass. Bad Bills have to be strengthened, that's why we have the Amendment process. What's happened in the last few years? All of a sudden those of us who are just individual Members here begin to see our role shrink. And I don't think that's healthy for the process. I don't think its healthy for the people who elect us to come here.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

So, when all is said and done and I've looked at the rules and I can't get anything out of the Rules Committee unless I can get a unanimous vote. Who are we kidding? You're not going to get a unanimous vote to get a controversial Bill or a Bill important to your district out of the Rules Committee on a unanimous vote. We used to be overrule the Chair with a majority. We have to have 71 votes to overrule the Chair now. All of those things lessen my ability as an elected Member of this Body to adequately represent my district and the people who send me here. I think this... this difficult process that we're in today is just... it's a manifestation of what we're allowing to happen. Our ideas can't be heard, our can't be advanced. No, we're going to collapse your Bill. Your Bill can go here. Your Amendment can go there. when we say, 'I don't want to do it that way. I think my idea has merit.' You know what we're told? Take it or leave it. That's not right. That's just not right. And I'm getting too old to be Don Quixote. So, I'm going to vote 'no'. Not so much on the merits of the Bill, since I come from a county that has a heck of a lot of coal underground and I'm a... I certainly use a heck of a lot of power and electricity in my house and in my apartment and I want that to continue. And I want it to be as cheap as possible. And for those of you that think we can generate all of it be natural gas, who are you kidding? Did you look at the price of natural gas the last four or five months? Coal is going to be a useful and used product. We have a lot of work to do to clean it up, but don't think for a second you can just turn your back on the coal industry in this state. We have 300 years of reserves, known coal reserves. We cannot only empower Illinois, we can power Illinois and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

sell surplus to other states if you'll just work with us and let us use Illinois coal. And we had three good ideas, but we collapsed it into one. I think it's wrong. I intend to vote 'no'. In just a simple act of frustration against the process. I'm sick and tired of the process telling me I don't count. I don't count. You go home. When we figure it out, we'll call you back and you can vote on it. Mine's just as important down here as anybody else. So, I'm going to vote 'no' because the process doesn't work anymore to protect individual Member rights. And, Mr. Speaker, should this Bill get the requisite number to pass, I will insist on a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Granberg, to close."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To my good friend from Vermilion County, you made the statement that it doesn't require Illinois coal. Well, if you look at page 6 of the Amendment, let me read to you about what the board does. 'To approve projects and funding if the owner of the generating unit receiving the funding agrees to: (a) burn Illinois coal, (b) employ qualified personnel to install the equipment and operate it and (c) reduce its emissions of sulfur dioxide.' You have to use Illinois coal. Period. Then it goes to the board. The board, after reviewing these applications, makes recommendations to DCCA. So the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs reviews the recommendations of the board. The board is composed of Illinois coal people. You have to use Illinois coal. goes before a board that is controlled by people who want use Illinois coal and reduce SOx, which is environmentalists. And then it goes to the Governor. So, of course, we're going to use Illinois coal. That was the intent of the Bill. My other friend from DuPage said,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

'This is a corporate buyout. We're going to use all this money to put on scrubbers for these utilities that make all this money and rape consumers'. The primary purpose of this Bill through this formula, and if you read the Bill you will see it in the formula, is to burn Illinois coal and reduce SOx. The best way to do that is to build new generation capacity. That means do mine operations because they generate new capacity and they perform at new plant standards, the cleanest possible That means building new coal mines or using standard. Illinois coal at new generation facilities, not scrubbers, new generation facilities. Now, the board could, if it made the case, at the request of the environmentalists, Ms. Slone... Ms. Slone, at the request of the environmentalists we put a provision in there that yes, funds could be used for scrubbers. Because their concern was reducing current SOx emissions for the suburbs because of Midwest. generation. That provision was put in there for those people who live in the suburbs around Cook County, to reduce emissions for the people who reside in Lake, McHenry, DuPage and all the other counties around Chicago. That's why that provision is in the Bill. The primary reason is to create new generation, secondary reason is to help that area because you are the ones who might suffer from poor air quality. So, read the Bill, that's what it says. Yes, there is bipartisanship. We worked with the Governor's agencies. We worked with the Governor's Office. We worked with any Member who wanted to work with us and to We introduced this Bill in December. spend the time. Representative Daniels introduces the Bill in the House this week, Wednesday. Now, there were those who said, 'Well I'm sure all of them worked with Democrats and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

brought everyone together'. Well, I defended the Gentleman 'cause I said, 'No he wouldn't do this for political reasons, it's not 2002 yet.' But, then they said, why would you do it in Pinckeyville.' I said, 'Well he's concerned, he's goes down to Pinckeyville a lot.' what we all do. And I know you're concerned about Pinckeyville and we respect that, as we both are. So, that is what this about. We see the language Wednesday, deadline is today. We think there are some very good proposals in that language. So, why can't we put them together and work together because we believe they complement each other? One is a grant program, one loan program. Why don't we work together to help everyone in this state? If we were worried about authorship, we would have killed the Bill in Rules. If we were going to be partisan, that Bill would have never gotten out of Rules Committee. We're putting it together with Democratic proposals, with the Governor's proposal, agency proposals, consumer proposals. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with bringing people together? There is no pride of authorship. This Bill would have never gotten out. brought it out to work together. That's what this should be about. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this does help jobs, House Bill 63 before the Empowerment Illinois Amendment. We received a commitment from a new power company to build a \$1.2 billion plant. We received that already. A solid commitment. That creates thousands of jobs already. that worthwhile? I think it is. We create jobs, spinoff industries and we improve the quality of the air at the same time. That is the best of both worlds. Why are people concerned we have to do one or the other? We can do We can help all the people in this state if we just both.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

work together and forget about our parochial interests. We can forge these compromises like this Bill. This is what it's about. And I would hope all of you would vote for this Bill because we can achieve consensus. We can continue to work together to address your concerns and we can send this Bill to the Governor and help all of the people in this state. And Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the statement, whatever happens to this Bill and if it fails, I hope my friends in the press look at who votes against it because those votes will be on that side of the aisle."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; and those who are opposed can vote 'no'. This Bill will require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 60 'ayes' and 49 'nays'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Granberg."

Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, we'd like to extend the deadline on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Did you want to..."

Granberg: "Postpone Consideration, extend the deadline."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, what we'll do now is to put the Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Granberg: "Correct."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait, did you wish to call House Bill 2463?

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2463, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wait."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

- Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Bill does it deals with pharmacists and it just says that the pharmacist in charge in case of a death or change of ownership has, instead of ten days would have up to 30 days to replace this pharmacist in charge. I'd be happy to answer any question."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Smith, House Bill 3375. Did you wish to call the Bill, Mr. Smith? Mr. Michael Smith, 3375? Clerk advises that the Bill has already passed. Representative Flowers, did you wish to call House Bill 236? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 236 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Flowers on Amendment #1."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I agreed in the Children and Youth Committee, House Amendment #1 restores the language of the current law that prohibit the juvenile court from ordering specific placements, services in child welfare in regards to DCFS. House Amendment..."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady... excuse me. Proceed Representative Flowers."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Flowers: "House Amendment #1 makes no changes in the provision of current law that permits a court to determine that a service plan is not reasonably calculated to facilitate achievement of the permanacy goal and to specify in writing the factual basis purporting that determination. It makes no changes in current law that would require the court to also enter an order for DCFS to develop and implement a new service plan or to implement changes consistent with this finding. As I previously indicated, however, the court cannot order specific placement, specific services, or specific providers. So, this is the current law. House Amendment #1 does not give the court the power to order, nor to approve the Department's specific plan as provided. On the other hand, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Amendment #1 does make one important change to insure that is accountability for the decisions that the there Department makes. As indicated, DCFS still has the final say, but the Amendment insures that the court can be an active participant in the decision making. The Amendment allows the court to recommend placement, recommend services, and providers and require DCFS to follow the recommendation or to simply indicate why it will not do so. The Department must consider the recommendations, but can simply take other action so long as it accounts to the court why it won't follow the recommendation. And simply put, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is accountability. Amendment #1 does not jeopardize the federal funds because it does not give the court any authority to approve, nor order specific placement. DCFS claims that this Amendment would do so, but the only thing that this Amendment would do, Ladies and Gentlemen, is require some accountability with DCFS. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 and

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

for the passage of House Bill 236."

- Speaker Madigan: "This matter is an Amendment. The Rules provide that there shall be one for the Amendment, one against the Amendment. There are three people seeking recognition: Representative's Klingler, Mulligan, and Cross. Now, Mulligan and Cross. Mr. Cross."
- Cross: "Inquiry... will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Cross: "Representative, is it your intention to keep this Bill on Second and have the... ask to have the deadline extended?"
- Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative. If I couldn't get the Bill called that's what I was going to do."
- Cross: "Well, Representative, it's our understanding from our count, I don't want to make a big deal about it though, that this is your sixth bill. And we had understood that you were going to ask to have the deadline extended."
- Flowers: "Representative, if I couldn't get the Bill called, that's what I said I was going to do."
- Cross: "So... all right, I just was trying to figure out her intentions. That was just a procedural question I guess,

  Mr. Speaker. We had understood that perhaps she was going to hold it on Second and extend the deadline."
- Speaker Madigan: "So, let the state... let the Chair state its intention that, Representative, if this is your sixth bill, we're not going to call the Bill on Third Reading. You are the Sponsor of the Bill? So, with that in mind, the Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, would you please extend the deadline?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative, let me make a suggestion that... Mr. Cross, I think you're prepared to agree to accept the Amendment if the Bill is left on the Order of

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Second Reading?"

Cross: "If it's left on Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Yeah. So, Representative, I would suggest adopt the Amendment, leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. And so with that in mind, those in favor of the Amendment, say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the... the Amendment is adopted and the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Berns, did you wish to call House Bill 2565? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Berns."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2565, a Bill for an Act concerning professional wrestling. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Berns."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Berns. Please give your attention to Mr. Berns."

Berns: "This is an agency Bill that will amend the Professional Boxing Act. Actually, Boxing and Wrestling Act, now. This will extend the sunset deadline for professional boxing, continue a ban on ultimate fighting, and will eliminate state regulation of professional wrestling. I am aware of no opposition."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. There is 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 111 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reitz. House Bill 1926. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act concerning road districts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1926 as amended allows township road districts which are located in tax cap counties to accumulate funds for major purchases, such as a road grader. And it adds maintenance in there, too. If they have roads that need blacktopping or things... asphalt, things of that nature. The Bill does not provide any exemption from tax caps. The Bill does not allow road districts to increase their annual levy beyond the cap. It simply allows them to accumulate funds to do larger projects that they're not able to... counties that are not under tax caps have this... the ability to levy additional things to meet those needs in their districts. Tax cap counties are bound a little bit. As there's no increase in taxes, whatsoever. Anything that they... they would do they could still do now under existing law. It just allows them to accumulate funds."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 75 'yes', 35 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. John Jones, House Bill 3002. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act concerning human services. This Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments.

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

No Motions filed."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act concerning human services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. John Jones."

Jones, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If... with leave of the Speaker and the Body I would refer to Representative Bellock. This is a Bill I picked up for her."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House
  Bill 3002 is an agency Bill with no opposition, that
  combines the mandated reports of the Office of Mental
  Health and of the Developmentally Disabled into one DHS
  official report which is comprehensive. The legislation
  does not remove any request for mandated reporting."
- 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take corr... Mr. Clerk, would you vote Representative Zickus 'yes'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner, House Bill 2595. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

the House. House Bill 2595 amends the Illinois Optometric Practice Act. It does three things. It allows for a one-year license restricted to practice at program locations. It allows for the reduction in fees from \$900, which is currently charged for residents for their license renewal, to an amount determined by the Department of Professional Regulations, which is recommended to be \$100. And it also is... it aligns the statute with current enforcement practices and it uses language identical to the Medical Practice Act, aligning the two professions of medicine and optometry. And I move for the passage of House Bill 2595."

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? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 111 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2058, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2058, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill would provide that nothing in the unlawful possession of firearm statute would prohibit a person under the age of 18 years of age from participating in a lawful recreational activity with a firearm such as, but not limited to, practice shooting at targets upon established public or private target ranges and hunting, trapping, or fishing in accordance with the Wildlife Code. What this is, is really setting forth that someone under the age of 18, in fact, if

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

is supervised by parents or at a target shoot or whatever, would be able to participate without being a felon. And I would defer any questions on this to Representative Winkel."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief question. Rick, what's the present prohibition against this, the reason we can't do it now?"

Winkel: "Representative, the point of the Bill is that it says something that probably would go without saying, but we want to clarify it and make it clear, make it express in the law that if a father takes his son or daughter hunting that they would not, the children would not be charged with unlawful possession of a weapon. It merely clarifies."

Dart: "Okay. So, to your knowledge there... under the existing law it's possible that this might not be necessary, but as you said, to clarify it. And just one other thing, Rick. Are you aware of any situations that have arisen where that was... there was a criminal prosecution based on that? Or was this just more to prevent that from occurring?"

Winkel: "It's more to prevent that from occurring. I mean naturally, and rightly so, under these days of heightened scrutiny, particularly with regard to firearms, we want to make certain that this would not occur in the future, that a father taking his children hunting, that there should be no fear of being charged with unlawful possession of weapons."

Dart: "So,... and for this exemption to work, the father... the child has to be with the parent? This isn't... they have to literally be together, is that correct?"

Winkel: "What this anticipates, I'll read it to you, nothing in 'this Section prohibits a person under 18 years of age from

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

participating in any unlawful... any lawful recreational activity with a firearm such as, practice shooting at targets upon established public or private target ranges or hunting, trapping, or fishing in accordance with the Wildlife Code or the Fish and Aquatic Life Code.'"

Dart: "Okay. Thanks, Rick."

Winkel: "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? Does Mr. McKeon wish to vote? Does Mr. Schoenberg wish to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 100 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner, Mr. Arthur Turner, House Bill 2634. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2634 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Art Turner, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill and it simply does this. It says that... it allows wards of the state to be granted a waiver for their tuition and fees to public universities. Currently, there are 48... we allow 48 students who are under the care of DCFS this provision. And we're just trying to expand that provision for all of the wards of the state, so that they would not be hit with a stipend and tuition."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

this Bill pass?' The Clerk advises the Chair that the Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Turner moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed"

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2634, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

- Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just move for the adoption. As I said, the Amendment became the Bill and it particularly deals with wards of the state."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, could you change the sponsorship from Speaker Madigan to Mr. Turner. Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote '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 105 people voting 'yes', 0 voting Mr. Clerk, could you record Mr. McKeon. The board should be changed to Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Leitch, House Bill 27. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 27."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 27, a Bill for an Act concerning the demolition of unsafe buildings. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that Representative Black has passed

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

on numerous occasions, but hasn't been picked up or successful in the Senate. It allows a township board to formally request a county to demolish or repair a building. If they don't, then there's a process whereby the township can go to circuit court and accomplish this. There is no opposition to the measure. It's passed out of here unanimously before and I would urge its adoption again."

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? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 100 people voting 'yes', 6 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McCarthy, House Bill 1805. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1805, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy on the Amendment."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment #1 basically added a couple new definitions of home inspection, of person, of residential real property. It also renumbered some of the things because we eliminated some of the original Bill. So, there's some renumbering that was needed. We also put in a definition that was at the request of the home builders in order to make sure that home remodelers would not be covered as home inspectors. So, I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act in relation to home inspectors. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This... House Bill 1805 creates the Home Inspector License Act. The intent of the legislation is to regulate and license Illinois home inspectors for the protection of the public. I am appreciative of the Legislators and the various interest groups who helped move this legislation forward. I have confidence that all the responsible home inspectors of our state will very much welcome these changes. And many of them have said that to me. I also have great confidence that the citizens of our state will be better protected by having these home inspectors licensed under the jurisdiction of the state. So, I'd move for the passage of House Bill 1805."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1820, Mr. Cross. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency telephone services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "Mr..."

- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a very simple bill, it allows county boards... it's not a mandate, it's made to set ordinances with respect to false alarms. I'd appreciate an 'aye' 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? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Rutherford. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1776?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1776 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rutherford, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford on the Amendment."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table Floor

  Amendment #1."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests the withdrawal of the Amendment. Leave is granted. The Amendment is withdrawn.

  Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rutherford."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 becomes the Bill and what it does, it simply sets specific standards for vegetation management by public utilities and also it sets specific notification requirements to the customer."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. And the... the Chair would remind the Body that... that this is an Amendment and that Mr. Rutherford will speak for the Amendment and there'll be one person against the Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I explained... Floor

Amendment 2, that did become the Bill."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, this is normally been controversial in the past. Is there any kind of agreement between some of the people affected by trees being trimmed and the utilities that have to keep the lines clear and free?"

Rutherford: "Well, this is probably the tenth draft of this

Amendment and the most recent version came up about
yesterday afternoon. We've worked very closely with the
affected municipalities and the utilities. We have two of
the utility companies, I know of, that are opposed to it.

And the other utility companies are neutral on it. The
municipalities are proponents... are in favor of it."

Parke: "And why are the two utilities still opposed to it?"

Rutherford: "They were opposed to it on the underlying Bill that passed and became law a year ago, already. So, I'm not

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

sure that it is necessarily as much the substance to this, but is definitely, I think, in the overall aspect of a utility having to notify customers about the intent to do certain vegetation management."

Parke: "Are you saying that they do not notify customers?"

Rutherford: "No, I'm saying that the law that went into effect a year or two ago specifically required notification by an electric public utility with regards to specifics on vegetation management. That is now law. The utilities were opposed... certain utilities were opposed to it at that time. I believe that they, yet today, are still opposed to it and that's probably a good part of the reason that they're still opposed to it."

Parke: "I'm... I'm missing something. I'm missing something on this, Representative. If they... if the law is in effect and they were unhappy with it before, why did you put a new Bill in? Why are you trying to make them..."

Rutherford: "No, what I'm doing in..."

Parke: "... pleased?"

Rutherford: "What we're doing in this one, Representative Parke, is per the request of some of the municipalities and actually for clarification by some of the utilities, is putting in specifics of what this notification should be, what it should entail. It also sets specific standards in regards to vegetation management."

Parke: "Does it affect all counties in the state?"

Rutherford: "It would be a statewide standard, yes."

Parke: "So, there... so all the counties in the city, in the state are affected equally. Cook county and the City of Chicago and all municipal governments?"

Rutherford: "Well, as we read the Bill it would apply to the public utility in regards to a statewide standard, unless,

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

there was a specific franchise agreement in place, which is in case of the City of Chicago, unless there was a specific ordinance that was in place, such as the City of Schaumburg, Champaign, Bloomington and Normal or unless there was specific written contractual agreements which may apply to other communities around the state."

Parke: "So, those are exempt?"

Rutherford: "I wouldn't quite say exempt is the accurate term here. There is provision that whatever they have in place has precedence over this statute."

Parke: "Thank you."

Rutherford: "You're welcome."

Parke: "To the Bill. This is... always seems to be a very controversial bill, I would suggest you try to pay close attention to how you vote on this."

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? Have the following people voted, Hassert, Wait and Scott? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 86 'ayes', 20 'noes'; this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Persico. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2220?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2220, has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Persico, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 adds to the Bill. It addresses some concerns regarding the power of the court instead of making

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

nonparticipation of the special administrator executor automatic, this Amendment requires that there be a petition to and approval by the court, and I ask for your adoption."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2220, a Bill for an Act concerning rights and remedies. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Persico. On the Bill."
- Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a result of Amendment #1, now upon the courts for approval, the special administrator executor need not participate in or review the prosecution of the action, the appropriateness of any settlement of the action, or any determination of the appropriateness of any fees awarded, and I would request, you know, respectfully urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2220."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Coulson, House Bill 3194. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3194, has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by

- 42nd Legislative Day

  Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Floor Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment to take opposition from the Bill, and basically, it just adds some technical wording to help clarify the language."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Amendment #3 is, again, a technical Amendment. We forgot to add some words."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes';
  those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment
  is adopted. Are there any further Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3194, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "House Bill 3194 amends the Occupational Therapy
  Practice Act. It replaces 'definitions' and add
  'continuing education requirements'. There's no opposition
  to this Bill at this time."
- 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

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Connie Howard, House Resolution 187."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The late Harold Washington of Chicago, devoted a lifetime of service to his city, his state, and his country. Mayor Washington served as an Assistant City Attorney from 1954 to 1958. He was a Member of the Illinois House of Representatives from 1966 through A Member of the Illinois Senate from 1976 through 1976. 1980, and a Member of the United State House Representatives from 1980 until 1983. In April of 1983, he was elected the first African-American Mayor of the City of Chicago, a position in which he served until his death in November 1987. His election and the challenges of his administration have been the subject of numerous books, essays, and articles in newspapers, magazines, and scholarly journals. Because he left a legacy of programs and accomplishments which has not been surpassed, I requesting that my colleagues in the House, resolve to declare April 15, 2001, as Harold Washington Commemorative Stamp Day. And that we urge all citizens of Illinois to be aware of the contributions of Mayor Washington, and to write to the United States Postal Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, urging them to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of Mayor Harold Washington."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. You've all heard the contents of the Resolution. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the Resolution is adopted. With regards to the

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Agreed Bill List #2, Supplemental #3, the Clerk has certified that all Bills have received a sufficient number of votes, and therefore the Bills contained on Agreed List #2, Supplemental #3, have received the required Constitutional Majority, and are hereby declared passed. Very pleased to announce that 106 out of a 118 Members, called five Bills each. Therefore, unfortunately, 12 of our Members did not call five Bills. And for that, we have deep regret. The Clerk for the Adjournment Resolution."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #24, offered by Representative Currie, be it resolved by the Senate in the 92nd General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, April 6, 2001, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 10, 2001, in Perfunctory Session. And when they adjourn on that day, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 17, 2001, at 12 o'clock noon."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Adjournment Resolution.

  Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. The Chair would like to thank all of you for your very hard and dedicated work during this week, which is normally a very difficult week in the House. You certainly deserve the nice vacation that you will now have for the next week, right up to Easter. Mr. Clerk, is there anything further? Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 188, offered by Representative Lou Jones. House Resolution 189, offered by Representative Osterman. House Resolution 191, offered by Representative May. House Resolution 192, offered by Representative McCarthy. House Resolution 193, offered by Representative

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

McCarthy. House Resolution 195, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 197, offered by Representative Fowler. House Resolution 198, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 199, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 201, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 202, offered by Representative McGuire. House Resolution 204, offered by Representative Art Turner. House Resolution 205, offered by Speaker Madigan; and House Resolution 210, offered by Representative Dart."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk has read the Agreed Resolutions.

Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, you require perfunctory time?"
Clerk Rossi: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned until Tuesday April 17, at 12 noon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 17 at 12 noon, providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. And we wish to say, happy weekend to Mr. Brady."

Clerk Rossi: "This Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 206, offered by Representative Granberg, and House Joint Resolution 26, offered by Representative Tenhouse, are assigned to the Rules Committee. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 207, offered by Representative Younge, is assigned to the Rules Committee, and House Joint Resolutions 28 and 29, offered by Representative Berns, are assigned to the Rules Committee."

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Clerk Bolin: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 24, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Senate Bill 42, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act relating to genetic testing information. Senate Bill 162, offered by Representative Wait, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Bill 188, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act with regard to education. Senate Bill 213, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Senate Bill 250, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning trusts. Senate Bill 251, offered by Representative O'Brien, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 403, offered by Representative O'Brien, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Senate Bill 434, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. House Bill 598, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning library districts. Correction: Senate Bill 434, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to mental health. Senate Bill 598, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning library districts. Senate Bill 726, offered by Representative Wait, a Bill for an Act in relation to conservation. Senate Bill 943, offered by Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. Senate Bill 993, offered Representative Hultgren, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Senate Bill 1011, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1081, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act regarding child care. Senate Bill 1098, offered by

42nd Legislative Day

April 6, 2001

Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Senate Bill 1180, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Senate Bill 1241, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, a Bill for an Act in relation to education. Senate Bill 1282, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act in relation to territory annexations. Senate Bill 1284, offered by Representative Wait, a Bill for an Act in relation to accounting. Senate Bill 1304, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning immunizations. Senate Bill 1306, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to procedure. Senate Bill 1521, offered Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act relating to education. Senate Bill 172, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Senate Bill 372, offered by Representative Moore, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Senate Bill 562, offered by Representative Parke, a Bill for an concerning abortions. Senate Bill 640, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act in relation to Senate Bill 724, offered by Representative Murphy, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Senate Bill 991, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning the Cook County Forest Preserve District. Senate Bill 1259, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to the General Assembly. Senate Bill 392, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill for an concerning energy resources policy. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."