122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by 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: "Let us pray. Most gracious and kind God, omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent Lord, we joyfully come before You. We serve You with gladness. We declare Your goodness and we make known of Your good deeds. For it is You that have made us, and yet not ourselves. For yet we're Your sheep and the sheep of Your pasture. Guide us, nurture us, protect us and strengthen us, this day we pray, in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Calvin Giles."
- Giles 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. Although we have no new baby to report, we would like the record to reflect that Representative O'Brien is absent and anxiously awaiting that outcome."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Stephens is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 116 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Corrected Committee Report.

 Representative Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on

 State Government Administration, to which the following

 measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday,

 April 17th, 2002, reported the same back with the following

 recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate

 Bill 1710. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint

 Resolution #56, offered by Representative Winkel is

 assigned to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Madigan: "On Page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 929.

 Representative Crotty, do you wish to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 929, a Bill for an Act concerning medical examinations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Madigan: "Representative Crotty."
- Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 929 would permit advance practice nurses and physician assistants will have a written collaborative agreement with a collaborating physician who allows those PA's and APN's to preform health examinations to sign off on the physical exam form. It would make an Amendment to the School Code as far as student physicals and also, with the Vehicle Code, with the bus driver examinations and also it further amends the Illinois Vehicle Code by incorporating the federal definition of medical examiner and allowing the PA's and the APN's to sign off on those exam... examinations, also. I would entertain any questions anyone might have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, this is a departure from, from public practice of many years standing. And while, while I'm very familiar with the advance practice nursing category, and in fact voted for that, and I'm very familiar with the physician's assistant having lived in a rural area... largely rural area in Illinois. What gives me pause or concern about this Bill, is that an advance practice nurse or a physician's assistant could conduct the entire physical examination without a medical doctor even being present. That's a... somewhat I think of a wide departure from past practice. I mean, what... what are your thoughts about that?"

Crotty: "Not...Sure. Not really, Representative. It was brought in testimony during our committee hearing, that currently the advance practice nurses and the physicians' assistants do currently go out and do examinations under the guidance and again under the... their agreement with their doctor. So, that is already being done. But what isn't being done, is them able to sign off on the physical. And at this time, that's what this legislation is for. also was stated that in many areas of the state, the City of Chicago for one, has a lot of clinics set up in schools and although their physicals have been done, it has taken some time for the physician to sign off on 250, was the examination forms and consequently students number... aren't really able to start school, until that's done. this is the reason why this Bill has come to us."

Black: "Was not... Was not part of the agreement that created the advance practice nursing or the APN category, correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought part of the negotiations for that very category would be that the APN's would not seek an

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

independent status. And this Bill appears to me to violate what I thought was negotiated when the APN category was established in law, because they are now standing alone, without benefit of a doctor even receiving the form, they are conducting the physical exam and signing the certificate on their own as an APN. I... it seems to me that that goes against what we negotiated some years ago."

Crotty: "And again, I want to make sure it's clear. They are not standing alone. They, they... These are APN's and PA's that have a collaborative agreement already with a physician. So, they are not standing alone. They are under the guidance of a physician. Absolutely, Representative."

Black: "Well... but as I understand this Bill, the APN or the physician assistant would be allowed, under the provisions of this Bill to conduct a medical examination and sign the form without the collaboration of their supervising physician. The physician may not, if I understand this Bill correctly, the physician may not even be in that facility..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hartke in the Chair."

Black: "...He or she may be back in the, you know, back in their office or at the hospital, and not even present at the facility where the exam is taking place."

Crotty: "These exams, again Representative Black, these exams are currently being made by the PA's and the APN's. But in, in this Bill, it says that the advance practice nurses who have a written collaborative agreement with a collaborating physician. So that's been covered under the Bill, so that they can't go out there and just do a physician... examinations without having an..."

Black: "All right."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Crotty: "...agreement with a physician."

Black: "Well, Representative, let me just ask you one question..."

Crotty: "Sure."

Black: "...for my peace of mind. And I know that there are places in Illinois where it gets more and more... where it is becoming more and more difficult to find medical doctors who will go out to the schools and give these medical examinations that are required under the School Code. the same time, these physical exams are sometimes the only medical exam these children may get in a year or two or three. And we see all of the time where someone was given one of these perfunctory exams to play athletics in high school. They didn't catch Marfans Syndrome or they didn't catch a heart murmur. The student goes out for a... to play basketball or football and drops dead on the court. Or drops dead on the football field. Can you give me... and I... I've always trusted your word. Is there a reasonable assurance that the public will have and that the parents will have that the APN and the PA are able to do a sufficient job of examining this student, that we are not increasing the risk arithmetically by not having a licensed physician on site."

Crotty: "If... I can assure you that I feel comfortable with this legislation because there is a collaborative agreement. There is a working relationship between those advance practice nurses and the physician assistants with that doctor. And that in fact, if doing a health exam on anyone where the PA's or the APN's should find a problem, that is definitely their job in that agreement to go back and make sure that the doctor is brought up to date on any of the findings that those nurses or physicals... physician

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

assistants should have."

Black: "Will this exam take place at the school or in the office of the physician?"

Crotty: "It could take place anywhere."

Black: "Either one?"

Crotty: "Either one."

Black: "All right. With your assurance that the Bill does not put anybody at risk, I intend to vote for it, simply because of the disparity in the number of physicians that exist throughout the State of Illinois. But I think it is something that will... it's incumbent upon... on all of us in this chamber, we be very careful how far we go in letting APN's and physician assistants continue down a path perhaps of independent practice. That may be a point where you and I will part company. But I, I think you've done your homework on this Bill. I appreciate, as always, your forthright answers."

Crotty: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair. Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chair... Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Miller: "Representative Crotty, the former Representative had just asked some question in regards to relationship of how this will work. Can you elaborate a little bit more on this? So, a APN will go in and do an examination on the child or the person and, and then what happens?"

Crotty: "Well there's an agreement with a physician. A physician, really hires and signs an agreement with either an advance practice nurse or a physician's assistant and it is a, it is a, a branch of his office that does go out into

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

an area that may, in fact, in this case with this Bill, do health examinations. And at this time, they are doing that now. Currently, that is being done..."

Miller: "The APN's are doing it?"

Crotty: "Yes."

Miller: "Okay. They're doing examination... is it with the physician being there or how is this, how is this work?"

Crotty: "Sometimes the physician could be in his office. But it's an examination, so the APN may be doing the physical exam, but she is... he or she is not signing off on that exam. It's held until the doctor then would just sign off on the exam. With..."

Miller: "When you said... I'm sorry to interrupt."

Crotty: "...Without... And the doctor has not really seen that, that person or examined that person but may now, according to law, would be the one to be signing off on, on the exam."

Miller: "Okay."

Crotty: "I personally think that it's far safer for whoever has seen the patient, be the person to sign off on it. I think..."

Miller: "Okay. When you..."

Crotty: "Go ahead."

Miller: "When you stated that the doctor is in his office, is that... is the doctor being within the physical plant of the office or is the examination occurring, for instance, at a school...?"

Crotty: "It can be both."

Miller: "...and a doctor could be somewhere else? A physician, I should say should be somewhere else."

Crotty: "It, it could be both."

Miller: "And that's current law?"

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Crotty: "Yes."

Miller: "Okay. As far as liability is concerned, who has the liability? And how, how would this affect liability consisting... particularly, in regards to the APN and let's say they do sign off on a school exam or some kind of exam and find out that they, they missed a heart murmur from the child? And the child ends up in physical activity and ends up, you know, ends up dying or having some kind of arrest on... from this experience? So, as far as liability, who has the liability?"

Crotty: "Well, I'm not an attorney, but..."

Miller: "Neither am I, thank God."

Crotty: "But I... playing, and gosh knows how people would play this out. But I think if I was a physician and I had not seen my patient, but yet I signed off on the examination and I in fact did not do the examination, I, as a consumer probably would come after him. Because he's signing a physical examination and he, in fact, has never seen me or the person that he's signing off on. The liability is, is probably something that could be addressed in their agreement."

Miller: "Could... I'm sorry, couldn't hear you. Could be addressed when?"

Crotty: "Well, in their collaborative agreement, if that's something that the doctor and the physician's assistant or the APN would like to incorporate in the agreement, that would be... that would be up to them."

Miller: "Well, would the APN have to carry some kind of liability or malpractice, based on if this legislation becomes law?

Because... Because essentially, they would be examining the person independent of any physician's advice or any... independent of any physician, period."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Crotty: "Represent..."

Miller: "And so, if they were examining a child or... wouldn't they, wouldn't they have to have some form of liability or should it... wouldn't it be advised?"

Crotty: "Well, to be very frank with you right now, they're already doing the examinations. So, I'm not certain if they... whether they do or they do not have some sort of liability insurance or whether that's actually probably paid for by the physician."

Miller: "Well, I understand that, but I guess I just want to at least have some sense of clarity. At least the way the law is structured now, there's still some sort of relationship between the APN and a physician."

Crotty: "And under this legislation..."

Miller: "There, there..."

Crotty: "There's no change in that, whatsoever."

Miller: "But if... but you're saying that, that there possibly could be a change in relationship."

Crotty: "Absolutely not."

Miller: "Okay, what assurances do we have there won't be then, if they're signing off on a..."

Crotty: "They have an agreement. They have a collaborative agreement. So the doctor has, in fact, already hired this person to do certain tasks, through that agreement. So, that would still stay intact. There is no change in that whatsoever."

Miller: "Okay. Now, do you find this in anyway, in our notes...

it's anyway that it could circumvent that a child or somebody, not seeing a physician throughout a course of years, I think it's first grade or fifth grade and high school, according to this, they could have those three examinations with never seeing a physician, to be admitted

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

into a school."

Crotty: "Nothing's preventing a person from still seeing their physician, nor is there anything to prevent that nurse or that assistant to find anything wrong with a person that they would not report that right back to their collaborative physician. There's nothing preventing anyone from seeing their doctor."

Miller: "Okay. All right, last question. Is there any... is any assurances... I understand a part of this is stemmed from increased access into poorer communities. Is that correct?

Is that..."

Crotty: "Well, according to the law right now, the access is there. It's just that it is very slow in coming after an exam has been done for the actual exam to be signed off on and preventing many students from attending classes because of that. That's really the genesis of this Bill."

Miller: "Okay. All right. Well, part, part... okay, so this is not going to increase access into poorer communities?"

Crotty: "It is..."

Miller: "Is that correct?"

Crotty: "It's not changing that because we already have that intact. You still have..."

Miller: "So, it has no bearings on it?"

Crotty: "No, it's just speedier service as far as signing off on an exam, where a bus driver may be able to start on the job, or a student should be able to start classes on time."

Miller: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Crotty: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor yields."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Bellock: "Oh Sponsor, right. Sorry. I know Representative Miller just asked the same question, but in our analysis it says the changes proposed in this current legislation would allow APN's and physician assistants to complete these examinations without collaborating with their supervising physician to sign these forms. Is that inaccurate?"

Crotty: "That is certainly inaccurate. If you look... bring up the legislation. You'll see on page 2, line 11, 'advance practice nurses who have a written collaborative agreement with a collaborating physician, which authorizes them to perform health examinations, or physician assistants who have been delegated the performance of health examinations by their supervising physician.' Absolutely."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Crotty: "You're more than welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Crotty to close."

Crotty: "I would just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 929?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all Would Representative Klingler voted who wish? and Mulligan, please vote your switches. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Poe, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Poe: "Yeah. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

like you to focus up into the balcony today. We have T.J. Jumper from the Riverton Middle School and he brought 25 students who scored the highest on their Constitution test. Also, one of those in that class is John Lowder's daughter, so we're quite proud of that. So, let's give them a great big welcome to Springfield and a big hand."

Speaker Hartke: "Congratulations students. Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes Representative McAuliffe. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. my pleasure to introduce today's special guest to the State She's a movie star with amazing stories to tell. From Alfred Hitchcock and Charlie Chaplin to Ed Wood Jr. and from drama and terror and to comedy and high camp. The career of actress Tippi Hedren and her rise to fame with many interesting stops along the Alfred way. Hitchcock discovered this cover girl, Miss Hedren, while viewing a commercial on NBC's Today Show. He immediately summoned her to Hollywood to take the leading role in his classic film, The Birds. She earned a Golden Globe Award for this role, her first in film. Hitchcock immediately cast the young actress in his next psychological thriller, <u>Marnie</u>, opposite a young Sean Connory. Soon, another Hollywood legend came a calling. Charlie Chaplin tapped Miss Hedren to star in what would be the last of the 'Little Tramp' films. The three films, back to back, provided an auspicious start for the Minnesota girl of Scandinavian culture. But this was only the beginning. Between over 20 feature films and numerous television appearances, she's been an active member of the Hollywood

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

community. Miss Hedren's later film credits and career path took a different turn, expressing her dedication to Over the years, Tippi's work as a humanitarian animals. and environmentalist have been so audacious that they have also... almost eclipsed her screen work. In 1969, while shooting <u>Satan's Harvest</u> in Africa she met a mellow lion and has dedicated much of her life since then to the conservation of the big cats. Her work as the founder and president of the Roar Foundation extended to coproducing and starring in a film, Roar and casting her daughter and fellow actress, Melanie Griffith. She still enjoys acting and received career achievement awards recently, in Spain and in France. The American Movie Classic is honored to have her as a celebrity ambassador, just as I am here honored to have the pleasure of introducing, Miss Hedren, to you. Please help me in extending a warm welcome to the right of my shoulder up in the gallery, to our special guest, Miss Tippi Hedren."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. Chair recognizes

Representative Osmond. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Osmond: "I'd like to rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Osmond: "I would also like to introduce an award winner. Today we have this... a Page for us, Miss Courtney Pierce. Miss Courtney Pierce was selected as Miss Illinois, in the USA Achievement Pageant. She's a sixth grader at the Antioch Upper Grade. She further went on to compete in the national award program, where she finished in the top five. All 50 states participated in this program, and the award given was based on community service. Courtney has worked actively in nursing homes, for foster children in some of

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

our day care programs up there and does a great job around our community. And I would like... ask all of our colleagues to welcome Courtney to our chambers today."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the chamber, Corkey (sic-Courtney).

Chair recognizes Representative Novak. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was a introduction of a famous movie actress just a short time ago. Did I see a few blackbirds perched up in the gallery up there?"

Speaker Hartke: "I'm not sure."

Novak: "Okay. I just thought I did, thanks."

Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Ryan. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Ryan: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to take just a moment to recognize two constituents in my district. The first is the first lady to ever win as a Democrat in Thornton Township. And these two young ladies want to be the first two senior Pages of the House. The lady right behind me, is my fine mother and her sister in the back. Please join me in welcoming them."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the House. On page 10 on the Calendar, on Conference Committee Report #1, appears House Bill 2207. Mr. Clerk... Representative Bugielski on Conference Committee Report #1."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I come before you this afternoon with Conference Committee Report to... #1 to House Bill 2207. The title industry in Illinois, and for that matter for the rest of the country, has been experiencing a very good news and bad news existence and to re... obtaining releases of mortgages.

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

The only thing that's the bad news, because of the volume transactions that we're going through, it has overwhelmed the capacity of many lenders and their services to issue release of mortgages that have been paid off and we're running into a... just a total backup of the system. In order to keep the closing... the wheels close... on these closings, the title companies have been issuing hold harmless letters to other title companies. And now, they're gonna come up with the certificate of release where they would sign off on a certificate of release, so that the people would be able to go through with their closings. This has been going on throughout the country and 22 states have adopted this already. And in the 22 states that have adopted this method, it has just proved to be excellent. We're trying to do this here in Illinois. We had the Bill last year. It went to Conference Committee because of some disparities between the House and the Senate. We got all of this worked out. Everyone involved in the financial industry along with the title insurance companies are now on board. They feel they have a very good Bill here and we're asking for the acceptance of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, what is the position of the realtors...

the Illinois Realtors Association on this legislation?"

Bugielski: "As far as I know, they're on board. I have not heard anything from them, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "In committee, did anybody object to the legisla..."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Buqielski: "No."

Parke: "...The Conference Committee Report?"

Bugielski: "No."

Parke: "What was put into the Conference Committee or what was the agreement that the Conference Committee report was set up for to find? In other words, what are the agreement come, that was not there before?"

Bugielski: "Right now, on the new Conference Committee Report, it allows the lender to object to the reason for any... you know, to object for any reason. That if they have an objection, they may object to this, where we did not have that before."

Parke: "And how long of a period..."

Bugielski: "And it gives them a... it gives them a longer time now. I believe it's 90 days. It go... extends it to 90 days."

Parke: "To 90 days."

Bugielski: "Right."

Parke: "Okay. And no one is objecting to the final form that you..."

Bugielski: "No one is objecting. And what I forgot to mention in my introduction on this is, that this is going to sunset, January the 1st, 2004. So, I mean, we're gonna be able to work on it as... we're gonna have all of the rest of this year, 2003... I mean 2002 and all of next year. And if there are any objections, this is going to sunset and we'll be able to work on it, but in all the other states, it's been working perfect."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First, an inquiry of

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

the Chair, if I might."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Just a housekeeping duty. Senate Amendment #2 on the underlying Bill, shelled the Bill. Now, I assume, that the Conference Committee Report made certain that Senate Amendment #1 and #2 are no longer a part of the Bill. Is that correct?"

Bugielski: "Yes, you are correct."

Black: "My goodness, the Clerk suddenly is... The Clerk's voice changed. Was that you, Mr. Rossi?"

Bugielski: "Well, I'm younger than the Clerk."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black, do you want the Clerk to answer that question? Mr. Clerk."

Black: "Yeah. I just want to make sure that the Conference Committee, made certain that we receded... the Senate receded from Senate Amendment #1 and #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Black, the Conference Committee Report reads that with regard to House Bill 2207, that the Senate does recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Black: "Okay, fine. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, a question of the Sponsor. Because I don't know exactly what we do in a case like this. There's a typo on page 6, line 3 of the Conference Committee instrument. I don't know whether we can change it on its face. I think there's one too many... If you'll look at that sentence, 'recorded with the recorder in each each of those counties.' Is that one too many 'each'?"

Bugielski: "Well, I... the person that was typing this into the computer stuttered at that time, so... I can't believe that

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

you found that."

Black: "That's my job, Mr... Representative, It's... I'm just..."

Bugielski: "Yes... I mean, that is..."

Black: "That's my job."

Bugielski: "...Strictly a typo, and I'll see what we can do when it goes over to the Senate."

Black: "I, I assume and the Chair may... It may be up to the Clerk. I assume that kind of a typographical error can be corrected, before it is sent to the Governor? That's... It wouldn't destroy the... that I'm in favor of the Bill, I just want to make sure that that typo doesn't... You know, every time we make a mistake around here, the Supreme Court gets involved."

Bugielski: "Well, I'm sure that we'll make, you know, sure that this gets taken care of before it hits the Governor's desk."

Black: "All right. Now, Representative, the only thing that the Bill actually does is to create something called the mortgage certificate of release. That's the gist of this Bill."

Bugielski: "Correct."

Black: "And that just allows for a clearance in a more timely fashion than waiting for the actual mortgage to kept... to keep up with the closing, right?"

Bugielski: "You're ... Absolutely right."

Black: "And I join with you. I think this Bill at one time did not enjoy unanimity of support. It does now and I congratulate you on the... on your fine work. And as long as you can get that typo corrected, otherwise we'll probably hear from the Supreme Court."

Bugielski: "Very good, and I will..."

Black: "You know, I... I noticed that you, before you had your

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

surgery, you never stuttered like that. It's something I think will come back to you in time."

Bugielski: "I think so, you know it's, thank God, it's just a word on 'each', you know."

Black: "That's right. Thank you very much."

Bugielski: "Very good."

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

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is just... it's gonna speed up and it's gonna be a big help for all of our constituents throughout the state, and I just ask for an 'aye' vote on... for Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 2207."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2207?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 3 Members voting 'present'. And Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 2207, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1527, Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1527, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

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

This Bill deals with the tragedy that occurred in my district in Macoupin County, in the county that I grew up.

In the case of a young man who was... who attended what we

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

would call in the rural area, a keg party, where an individual who was of age provided, that for a fee, individuals of any age, for any reason could come to this place in a farmer's field and drink to their heart's And unfortunately, we know of the difficulties that those kind of programs and that kind of lax of enforcements will oftentimes... will allow. unfortunately we had an underage young man who participated in that party and drank beyond his capacity and was ultimately killed in an automobile accident on his way home. The state's attorney in our county felt that he didn't have really a very strong case in his effort to try to put the person who had held this party behind bars. so he came to us in the Legislature and asked us to stiffen the penalties for those people, who almost without regard for human life, are willing to provide alcoholic beverages So, this Bill is a very simple to underage minors. proposal and it talks in terms of people who... the present law talks in terms of people who, who sell, give, or deliver alcoholic beverages illegally and this talks that this Bill then... this Amendment changes the law and provides that the first offense shall be... include a fine, shall not be limited to, but be a fine of not less than \$500. A second offense of this nature would be a \$2000 fine in the minimum and it also has language that says that the person is guilty of a Class IV felony, death occurs as a result of this violation. So, we're trying to send a strong message to adults that we have a responsibility to insure that when there's alcoholic beverages in our home or under our control, that we not provide these beverages to underage people who have not yet reached an age where our society believes they're capable

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

of making these kind of decisions. So, there's reasons why you have to be 21 years old to drink beer legally in the State of Illinois and there's penalties for people who violate those laws. Unfortunately in my view, sometimes those penalties are not stiff enough and this goes a step further in trying to give the state's attorneys the authority that they need to prosecute those kind of violations of the law. So, this Bill came over from the Senate without any dissent, unanimously. It's not been amended here in the House and I'd ask you to send it on to the Governor today. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, the... the underlying law, correct me if I'm wrong, did allow an exemption if the drink was given as the result of a religious observance or a special service, and I can't find that in 1527. It makes reference in our analysis to a Bill that Representative Dart had passed that did have an exemption for religious service or a special service. It appears that this Bill may have taken that exemption out. Is that your intent?"

Hannig: "No, Representative. This doesn't really change the underlying law that deals with the distribution of the giving of the alcohol for reasons that are spelled out in law. It only strengthens the penalty Section. So, there is the language that I think a little bit higher in the Bill that has not changed, line 28 or 29 on what I have in front of me, 'shall give or deliver such alcoholic beverage

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

to a person under 21.' Then it says, 'except in the performance of religious ceremony or service.' That language still remains. We just put in under that when you get to the provisions on what is the penalty for violating the law, this stiffens the penalty."

Black: "Gary, what... where did you find that? On what page, line 28?"

Hannig: "I'm looking on, on my copy of the Bill..."

Black: "Okay, I see."

Hannig: "It's on page 2."

Black: "Page 2."

Hannig: "Yeah."

Black: "All right. Under the age of 21 except..."

Hannig: "And look on..."

Black: "All right."

Hannig: "I think line 28."

Black: "So it doesn't change that at all."

Hannig: "...Line 28."

Black: "Okay."

Hannig: "Okay."

Black: "All right. Thank you. I appreciate that. Now, I think, and I certainly don't rise in opposition of the Bill. I just have a question or two that would give me some pause knowing how society has worked over the years. I know what the intent of the Bill is, and no one can quarrel with that. However, if in the privacy of your own home, at a wedding anniversary or even at a banquet facility, at the wedding of say, your daughter, and you may have a son who is a minor, 17. And at the toast to your daughter, his sister's wedding, he wants to sip a glass of champagne and his mother and father allow him to have a small glass of champagne to make that wedding toast. As I read this law,

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

technically if someone in that reception wants to take offense, the parents can be charged with a Class A misdemeanor for allowing that minor to have a sip of champagne at his sister's wedding."

Hannig: "Representative, it's my understanding that under the current law that in your own home, with your own children, that you have certain rights that would provide you within reason, I believe, to provide them with a sip of champagne under certain occasions. But I think also, you have to... we all have to accept the idea that the state's attorneys that we elect in our respective counties have to use some restraint when, when... and some common sense when they enforce these laws. So, in a case where it's done, I think, under very strict supervision of the family and it just a ceremonial kind of thing, that's not really the problem. We're trying to address the problem where people really don't care and they're giving alcoholic beverages out to minors and they don't care what happens to those minors after the fact."

Black: "And I don't quarrel with that at all. It's just sometimes common sense and restraint aren't always in abundant supply with some people who... who want to take the law very literally and perhaps make a reputation and I understand the exclusion, and you're right about your own home. But at a wedding reception, which may and probably would be held in a public facility of some kind... My only fear is that an over zealous prosecutor or an over zealous police officer, even at a ceremonious occasion, may come up to a parent and say, hey, under the law, you cannot let that son of yours toast his sister's wedding. You did so, I'm filing a complaint and you may very well be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. I, I know it's not your intent.

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

I would hope it not happen, but I think that's what happens when we craft the law. We tend to believe that everybody will follow common sense and use a little restraint. But it just seems to me that this is a cause celebre waiting to happen, if we're not careful."

Hannig: "But, Representative, the other point I need to make is, that already exits under current law. We don't really change that. We only change what the penalties are for violating the law. So, you know, someone who's over zealous and is gonna prosecute could do that now. And this really doesn't address it. Perhaps that's something we should address."

Black: "Okay."

Hannig: "But it's it's not something that we change in this Bill."

Black: "All right. I appreciate your answers to my questions.

Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Brady: "Representative, in committee there was some concern and question over the language in this Bill of 'willful intent'. And maybe I missed it in the... your discussion with Representative Black, but could you, could you summarize that again? I mean, we discussed the fact that the interpretation of 'willful intent' and I don't see that in here. Can you expound upon that for me please, Representative?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, the provisions in this proposal, and I could read them to you, are very short and to the point. And it talks in terms of any person who violates

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

the provision of item three, of this paragraph, of this subsection is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor and the sentence shall include, but shall not be limited to a fine of not less than \$500 for the first offense and not less than \$2000 for a second or subsequent offense. Any person who knowingly violates this... the provision of item three of this paragraph, of this subsection A is guilty of a Class IV felony if a death occurs as the result of the violation. Now, it's my understanding that that's language that was put together in the Senate Judiciary Committee after a consultation with both sides of the aisle and Mothers Against Drunk Drivers and some of the folks who do prosecutions and so we've tried to stay with that language here in the House. We have not changed that. But that's really all that's in the Bill."

Brady: "So, it's still gonna be very heavily reliant on the interpretation by local state's attorney in charging in this case."

Hannig: "Well, Represent... yeah."

Brady: "Or cases related."

Hannig: "Yeah, Representative, they chose not to address that in the Senate and we do not here in the House. I think it's a very legitimate area that we could have addressed in some Bill, but because of the way it came over from the Senate and in an effort to get it to the Governor without Amendments, I would like to just send it on today to the Governor for his consideration. But if the committee, or you and others would like to try to work out some additional language to clarify some of these things on when and where and how you can prosecute, I do agree that that would be an area that we could address somewhere."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Representative. Thank you."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again, I wish we weren't even here today to debate a Bill like this. I wish that we didn't have people in our society that would provide alcoholic beverages to underage teenagers. But it's not a perfect world. People will try to take advantage of young people in any number of ways, including selling them alcoholic beverages or perhaps even giving them alcoholic beverages and we in this Body have an obligation to try to set penalties which we feel are appropriate for people who take advantage of other individuals and who break the laws in the State of Illinois. So, this proposal, while it cannot correct what has happened in the past, and cannot undo some tragedies that occurred in my district, we hope can take us in a direction where we can prevent these things from happening in other parts of the State of Illinois. So, I would ask for your 'yes' vote and send this Bill to the Governor with a unanimous Roll Call."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1527?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does pass Senate Bill 1527. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative McCarthy, for what reason are you seeking recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- McCarthy: "Thank you very much. On behalf of myself and Representative Crotty and Representative Kosel, I'd like to welcome the students from Jerling Junior High from Orland Park to the gallery upstairs. I'd also like to say a warm welcome to their principal, Mr. Soustek and even the superintendent took the trip down to Springfield. So, I think that's meritorious and I'd like to represent... or welcome Superintendent Peter Yuska, as well. So welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol. On page 2 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1530.

 Representative Hoffman, Hoffman. Out of the record.

 Senate Bill 1531, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act to honor and commemorate the victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1531 amends the state Commemorative Dates Act in the School Code..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Feigenholtz: "...by designating September 11th of each year, as September 11th Day of Remembrance, which is a commemorative holiday and a school day. It is not a day off. To be observed through the state as a day set apart in honor of remembrance of the persons killed and injured in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. It also establishes a fund for... a special fund for September 11th and establishes... allows the Secretary of State... it's permissively to issue if there are enough applications for it, special license plates designated to September 11th.

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, I don't think anybody would find fault with this legislation."

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, what?"

Parke: "I said I don't think anybody would find fault with this piece of legislation."

Feigenholtz: "That's nice to hear, Representative."

Parke: "But I have a... when it's commemorative, does that mean that there's anybody who gets time off or..."

Feigenholtz: "No, no."

Parke: "...Is this... this is not a, this is not a..."

Feigenholtz: "It's a commemorative..."

Parke: "...recognized state holiday."

Feigenholtz: "No, it is a commemorative day. It is not a day off of school."

Parke: "All right. So, it's just simply symbolic?"

Feigenholtz: "That's correct. We have days observed like this already on the calendar. We have February 15th, which is the birthdate of Susan B. Anthony, Vietnam War Veterans Day, which is March 29th. October 1st, which is Recycling Day, December 7th, which is Pearl Harbor Veterans Day and so on. So, this is would be added to that list."

Parke: "On the license plate, this is a special commemorative license plate issued by the Secretary of State. How many applications are necessary before..."

Feigenholtz: "800."

Parke: "And what is the cost of that license plate?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, as you know, the base fee for a license plate

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

in Illinois is \$75 and for the special plate there's a first time \$40 fee at its original issuance and a fee of \$27 at renewal. \$25 dollars of the renewal is deposited into the License Plate Fund to offset the costs and so on."

Parke: "So, there's no specific fund that the money's going to go in for any purpose."

Feigenholtz: "No, there is... there is a fund established."

Parke: "What is the purpose of the fund?"

Feigenholtz: "The purpose of the fund... I'm glad you asked that."

Parke: "I knew you did."

Feigenholtz: "The purposes of the fund, or the money collected in the fund will go to grants to aid victims of terrorism and grants to local governments to cover the cost of that training, equipment, and other initiatives intended to prevent further acts of terrorism or to respond to further acts of terrorism or other disasters or emergency situations here in the State of Illinois."

Parke: "And who's... who administers this, this group that's gonna make these decisions? Is this a, a commission within the Secretary of State? Did the Governor appoint them?

Are they paid? What is the background on that?"

Feigenholtz: "The Director of Commerce and Community Affairs and the Secretary of State."

Parke: "Do they form a task force or subcommittee and do they... are they volunteers and do they get paid?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe... I don't know the answer to that question, Representative."

Parke: "Well, I'm kind of curious. When you do get the answer, could you share it with me?"

Feigenholtz: "I, I would never hide a thing from you, Terry
Parke."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- Parke: "Well, that's very good, Sara. I do appreciate that very much. Well, it sounds like a good Bill and a good idea and I will rise in support of the legislation."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Osmond: "Yes. Representative, I'm happy to join you as Sponsor on this Bill. I think you and I spoke that I received a letter from a girl from Warren High School, Sue Vollmer, who would like to make this Everyday Heroes Week in high schools and I think she's going to pursue that. When you were listing all of the holidays that are non-compensated, did you mention the holiday on March 17th?"

Feigenholtz: "No, I did not."

- Osmond: "Was that an oversight or is that... Well, anyways thank you."
- Feigenholtz: "It must have been. I don't... It actually wasn't, it wasn't the first thing that popped into my mind."
- Osmond: "I see. Well, thank you very much."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I encourage everyone to support this Bill. I think that this is going to be an important day in schools around the State of Illinois and the country for children to remember people who perished on September 11th, the circumstances around that unfortunate day in our lives and I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate
 Bill 1531?' All those in favor will signify by voting
 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 111 Members voting 'yes', 5 Members voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1624, Representative Mathias, Representative Mathias. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1658, Representative Miller. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1683, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1683, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1683 amends and streamlines the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. Section 2605 and provides that all veterans eligible under this Section will be awarded five points on any examination regardless of whether it's original entrance exam or a promotional exam. Additionally, it places a requirement that they provide proof that they are a veteran, so it would be a DD214 and those are the changes in the Bill. I appreciate your support."

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

Acevedo: "Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Acevedo: "I'd like to support of Senate Bill 1683. I passed this legislation... I tried running this legislation through the House last year. I commend Representative Mautino for doing a great job. There were some concerns and it was misinterpreted that this would hurt veterans, when in all

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

actuality this will help them in many ways. There were some questions brought up during committee and Representative Mautino worked with both sides of the aisle and I'm sure they've come to some sort of agreement. Thank you so much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, a Supreme Court discussion... an Illinois Supreme Court discussion in the last five years, the exact time frame escapes me. If my memory serves me correctly, the Supreme Court ruled that a veteran's preference was absolute. That if you had six people on a hiring list, five were nonveterans and one was a veteran. The veteran had preference, not points, preference, must be hired. Have I confused the Supreme Court decision or does that decision only relate to state employment and not employment at a local unit of government like MWRD?"

Mautino: "I believe that you are correct, and I believe that that is... that provision applies to state employment."

Black: "All right."

Mautino: "Now, currently, points are awarded at the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. They give 3.5 points on a promotional exam. This would move it from 3.5 to 5 points, and under their current law they're only allowed to use those promotional points once. This allows if they're going for an additional promotion, to go ahead and add those points on, on to subsequent promotions. And it was... the veterans' groups were in favor as well as Metropolitan Water Reclamation District."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Black: "All right. In the underlying Bill it clearly defines veteran of having served more than 180 consecutive days.

And I think that's been the general accepted practice for a number of years. Now, if I understand that 180 consecutive days, that generally does not allow for someone who has served a number of years in the National Guard, for example, to qualify as a veteran. Isn't that correct?"

Mautino: "Correct. Very similar to a lot of our state statutes."

Black: "Okay. So, what it, what it does... it simply no longer makes a distinction between those who have served in a combat theatre and those who have not served in a combat theatre?"

Mautino: "That is my understanding."

Black: "All right. And when did you say they have to give proof of their discharge? When do they have to show their DD214?"

Mautino: "Well, actually, under their previous rules and in statute, they did not have to show it. It was not required that you even presented proof that you're a veteran. So, this would say, at the time that you're going for the promotion, or the entrance exam, you would also have to show that you were an honorably discharged veteran."

Black: "So you would have to have your discharge papers with you before the job would be actually... not tendered, but before you actually begin work you would have to have proof of your military status, correct?"

Mautino: "Yes. Very similar to..."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "...what we do with our veterans' preference."

Black: "And there was one thing I, I apologize, I didn't hear clearly. Can the veteran use a portion of the 5 points and then when he, when he or she wants a promotion... Can he

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

bank those... Can they bank those points, or must they use all 5 points at the time of their application for that job and they can't use it again?"

Mautino: "Under this Bill, they would be able to use the full 5 points at this or any subsequent promotion. Now, currently, they're awarded 3.5 points..."

Black: "Right."

Mautino: "...maximum, one time."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative Mautino, are the 5 points cumulative over the career of that person?"

Mautino: "I apologize. Would you please go ahead and repeat the... repeat the question?"

Mulligan: "Are the points they get in their career cumulative?

Do they keep on growing? Like if you have an initial score when you start in and then you get another promotion, do your points keep growing from the same original base or is it on each individual job?"

Mautino: "A maximum of 5 points on any promotion that you're going to. So, you would have your entrance exam, you would have your score, you would have 5 points added. Let's say there's a promotion that's coming up. The next time you would have... you'd go through your end review process and then you would receive 5 points. It's the same 5 points. Basically, you would permanently carry that 5 points."

Mulligan: "All right. So, say you have 20 points, I don't know what the exact system is. You have 20 points when you begin. When you go for the promotion, are you starting

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

again from..."

Mautino: "You are starting at, at 20 points."

Mulligan: "And then you'd add the 5 on top of that?"

Mautino: "Right. So, 25 on your entrance exam. Let's see this... Let's say there's a scale on the next entrance exam of 20 points, you know, whatever... You don't start from 25 and then add 5."

Mulligan: "All right. I, I understand what everybody's trying to do and I certainly appreciate that. I think we deserve to do things for veterans, but could you tell me how many women veterans apply for points in... at the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District?"

Mautino: "No. But I would be happy to get that, that information for you."

Mulligan: "At some point in years gone by, this was definitely a penalty to women. But now, as more women are serving in the military, I'd be curious to see if they've caught up at all in applying for jobs where they have previous military records."

Mautino: "I would be also curious to see that and I do believe there are quite a few more women involved in all aspects of the military now."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Johnson."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Johnson: "Representative, you know, I just have two questions. I notice in my analysis that the Department of Veterans Affairs is neutral and also the Department of Military Affairs is neutral. Why is it that they were neutral? Why wouldn't they support this? Did you have any discussions

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

with them about that?"

Mautino: "No, I did not have discussions with General Harris or General Johnson about it. They've had no problems in the Bill with the committee and I assume that they would follow the will of the General Assembly in administering any statute."

Johnson: "Yeah, I guess that's what intrigues me a little bit.

You know, being a veteran, obviously, you know, to see our state agencies here not get behind something that is at least on its face very supportive to our veterans, I guess leaves an open question to me. But you don't know?"

Mautino: "No, as I..."

Johnson: "Thank you."

Mautino: "...As I'd mentioned, I hadn't had that conversation. I

do know they have no problems with the Bill or any
objections at all."

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

Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "Yes. If you would, Mr. Speaker. Take this out of the record for just a minute, I have to answer one more question on the technical portion of the Bill and if we could come back to it?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sure. Will do. Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1530, Representative Hoffman."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1530, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1530, simply amends the Vehicle Code and requires that persons using parking places reserved for disabled persons, properly display the registration plates

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

or the decal. This Bill will help law enforcement ensure that individuals who have disabled persons' registration plates or decals properly display them and they can enforce the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1530?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Crotty. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, are you ready again? Not quite. Senate Bill 1695, Representative Holbrook. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1695, a Bill for an Act concerning port districts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1695 is exact same as

House Bill 3975 which we passed out of here 108 to 1."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Holbrook: "It just makes an update on the Tri-City Port
Authority. It's taken over the decommissioned Mel Price
Center, down there. And makes a couple of changes of
current practice and puts it into the statute. I know of
no opposition to the Bill and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1695?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1683, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill affects the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, and it simplifies the points awarding system for veterans in both entrance exams and promotions. Requires that they give proof of being a veteran at the time that they go for entrance exam or promotion an appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1683?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Representative Wojcik. Representative Zickus, Representative Zickus. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 69 Members voting 'yes', 43 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1704, Senate Representative O'Connor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1713, Representative Garrett. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1713, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of that... of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate

Bill 1713 provides that any person who makes a false

statement or a misrepresentation in order to obtain access

to another person's bank account is guilty of a Class A

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

misdemeanor. There was an Amendment also adopted in committee that provides that a financial institution may require the account holder to submit an affidavit outlining the circumstances surrounding an alleged unauthorized withdrawal or payment before that institution is required to credit the account. This Bill's brought by the Community Bankers' Association, passed out of the Senate Financial Institutions Committee without opposition and passed the Senate unanimously. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates she will yield."

Parke: "Do ya... Representative, on the face of it, it sounds all right. Has anybody expressed any concern in either committee or to you privately?"

Garrett: "Representative, there's been no concern whatsoever. I think it's really a technical change, too. Thank you."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Further discussion?

Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative

Garrett to close."

Garrett: "This is really a good Bill that just takes care of a loophole and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1713?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1806, Representative Rutherford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1806, a Bill for an Act concerning the humane care of animals. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a legislation, somewhat initiated by the Humane Society, to help clarify some language on legislation we had done a year or two ago and it also broadens definition such as, is there any violations on cruelty to. Today it states dogs, but it would expand to other animals. I know of no one that's opposed to it."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Lawfer: "This deals with animals. Does this in any way deal with any agriculture production animals? Does this pertain like to hogs or cattle in any way?"

Rutherford: "No, Representative Lawfer. This does not change anything in existing statute with regards to any violations or penalties. It just reconfigures the... where the penalties are placed within the statute so it's, it's in a... it's a consistent flow through in the statutes."

Lawfer: "So it would not affect anybody that's in production agriculture."

Rutherford: "That is correct."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

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

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Black: "Representative, some time ago Representative Mike Weaver passed a Bill that clearly stated you could not give away baby chicks or bunnies, I think as a promotion for Easter. Did... Or maybe it was at a county fair. Does this Bill... Is this Bill duplicative in that manner?"

Rutherford: "No, actually what this does, this... this goes back into that area of... if that was in the statute before, this is not. What we're doing is actually cleaning up this whole Section. We're cleaning it up, putting in so that the penalties go against what the violation would be, inclusive of this idea of the chicks, ducks and so forth. And it also goes in... and this comes from an Appellate Court decision earlier, we're also clarifying where there may be cruelty and activities with regards to... in this case, it specifically says 'dogs'. We're expanding it to say 'animals'. So no, this would not be duplicative."

Black: "Okay. The reference to... baby chicks and rabbits, let me follow up on what Representative Lawfer said. That language in no way can be construed to say that a hatchery could not sell baby chicks to someone engaged in the chicken or poultry business."

Rutherford: "No. Not what... Not at all."

Black: "The language clearly states for pets or novelties or giveaways or..."

Rutherford: "That is correct."

Black: "Okay."

Rutherford: "It is in reference specifically to that, Representative."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Rutherford: "Yes, Sir."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

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

Rutherford: "Appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1806?' All in favor, signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1808, Representative Winkel. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winkel."

- Winkel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1808 provides that school zone speed limits rela... apply to vehicles on roadway on public school property. It's a minor change in the Vehicle Code. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is... Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor yields."

- Black: "Representative, the one thing I didn't understand about this Bill in committee, this roadway that goes through school property, is it a public thoroughfare or is it a roadway owned and maintained by the school district?"
- Winkel: "The roadway in the public school would be deemed to be a part of the public road system, for purposes of applying the Vehicle Code."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- Black: "So, it wouldn't necessarily have to be a roadway owned by the school, correct? If a roadway goes on school property, it would be subjected to this law."
- Winkel: "I'm gonna find the exact language here, Representative.

 It'd be a roadway on school property. So, it'd have to be a publicly-owned road. It'd be a road that's on the public school property."
- Black: "All right. So, in effect, any, any section of that roadway would be subject, I assume then, to the 20 mile an hour limit. Correct?"

Winkel: "Correct."

Black: "And the school district could set it lower if they wanted to. Right?"

Winkel: "That'd be right."

- Black: "Could the school district also close the roadway if it was not considered to be a through street? If that's what they wanted to do."
- Winkel: "Representative, I'm not sure of that. But I can tell you that this would only apply to a roadway on school property. That's the only change in the... in the Bill."
- Black: "Okay. That's the only thing I'm having trouble understanding, is that whether or not it is a currently designated a public thoroughfare or just happens to be some kind of access road that crosses school property."
- Winkel: "Representative, this, this arose from concern out of safety for students, faculties, staff, in particular in school parking lots."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative McCarthy."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

McCarthy: "Representative, I just have one question. Many of the school districts in my area, when you move into their driveway, they have signs that say 10 miles per hour or 5 miles per hour. This won't in any way change their ability to reduce it even further than 20, would it?"

Winkel: "Representative, as I read the Bill and as I believe it is intended, the only intention is that law enforcement can enforce the Vehicle Code on roads that are located on school property. There's nothing in the four corners of this Bill, that I see, that would prevent a school district from making that part of their road, lower than 20 miles an hour."

McCarthy: "Okay. So, the intent would be that if they're at 5 or 10, of course they could stay at that. And do you know that whether that would be enforceable, though? Or would it only be enforceable if it were 20 miles per hour?"

Winkel: "I believe it would only be enforceable according to the Vehicle Code, so that'd be 20 miles an hour."

McCarthy: "Thank you for the information."

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

Winkel: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1808?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1830. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk...

- 122nd Legislative Day

 Representative Slone, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accidently pushed the 'no' button instead of the 'yes' switch on the last vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so record your error and your wishes. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act concerning telephone solicitation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would create the restricted call registry. you may recall, last year we passed legislation that would allow consumers in Illinois the same ability to sign up for a 'no call list' or 'restricted call list', by calling and saying they want to... do not... no longer want to receive the endless barrage of phone calls that people seem to get at their homes at all times of the day, trying to sell you things that you don't want and you don't need. Ultimately, the Governor vetoed the Bill and we made some changes in this Bill that will address some of those issues. First of all, we provided a funding mechanism with the ICC, so that if you were to sign up for the 'no call list' or the 'restricted call list', that you would have to pay \$5, onetime fee in order to get the... one second, please. Anyway, you would pay a onetime \$5 fee in order to sign up for the, for the privilege of making sure that these calls stop and be part of the data base. In addition, it would provide that there would be a fee that would be paid, by people who would have to buy the list in order to do business here in Illinois, so that they wouldn't be calling

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

people who don't want the calls. I think other areas of this nation have passed these to success. AARP is in support of it and I would ask for a, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative Hoffman, on the surface this looks like a Bill I introduced a number of years ago and that I had asked last year, when you sponsored it, to be a cosponsor.

Except I noticed now, that AT&T and Ameritech are proponents of the Bill. Why are they proponents of the Bill now?"

Hoffman: "Well, last year we had, as we do this year, we had in the restricted call registry an exception until there is full competition with regard to the phone services in Illinois. Let me, let me tell you why I believe that they're proponents of the Bill. Because we have the Telecommunication Act in Illinois that's gonna be in effect until July 1, 2005, then there's a sunset date. as a, as an additional exception... excuse me. The Bill has an additional exception that would insure that if you have a preexisting business relationship with an individual that you could still call them, okay? The problem with that is Ameritech has a preexisting business relationship with literally all consumers in the state. So, they would have an unfair advantage as we go to competition and Ameritech gets into the long distance business. So, we put in there, that up until the sunset of July 1, 2005, you can still make those types of calls, so that Ameritech wouldn't have the preexisting business relationship to the exclusion

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

of everything... everybody else. Then when July 1, 2005, comes they can no longer make any of those types of calls because of the fact that there will be full competition in the marketplace."

Mulligan: "When you introduce a Bill that was similar... I don't know if this is the same one. Was this the same Bill from last year?"

Hoffman: "Could you please repeat that?"

Mulligan: "Is this the same Bill as the Bill you introduced last year?"

Hoffman: "It's, it's similar except we may... we had... we tightened up some of the exceptions so that it could... The Governor, one of the things that he indicated, is that the exceptions in order... were overly broad. In other words, too many people could still make these calls. We tightened it up to be very specific and we also made sure that there will be fair competition in the marketplace when it comes to individuals who deal with broad band in the telecommunications."

Mulligan: "And you added these..."

Hoffman: "But last year that provision... last year that provision of the sunset date of July 1, 2005, was also in the Bill."

Mulligan: "All right. So you added fees to this one?"

Hoffman: "What we did, is we, like some other states, at the request of the ICC, because we're in a tough budgetary time, we did two things. First of all, we said that in order to sign up it'd be a one time \$5 fee. AARP said that would be fine. They think that that's reasonable. That'll allow us then to begin the registry and pay for the registry itself, in the setting up and the establishment of the registry. In addition, what the Bill does is it says

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

that telemarketers will have to pay up to... will have to pay up to \$1000 in order to buy these lists. So, if you want to do business in Illinois, if you want to call in Illinois and you're a telemarketer, that you would have to buy these lists because you no longer could call the people who signed up for the list. And that could be up to a \$1000 fee."

Mulligan: "The original Bill that I introduced maybe four or five years ago, that AARP also supported was modeled after the Florida bill and had fees of while... you had to register for \$10 and seniors would... wanted to do that for half, which would have been 5. But there were very exemptions and AT&T and Ameritech opposed it. And after that they came out with several plans that have been very lucrative for them; call manager and different things that allow you to monitor your phone for approximately \$300 a year, which is a big difference than putting yourself on a 'no call list'. But if you're putting yourself on a 'no call list', how many people are exempt and who's actually not gonna be calling you, and what are the penalties for a company that were to violate, if you're on the 'no call list'?"

Hoffman: "It's a thousand for the first offense and up to 25 hundred, thereafter."

Mulligan: "And how would an individual... what would they do to prove that a company had called them?"

Hoffman: "What you would do is like, I mean, it would be very similar to what you do currently in telephone harassment cases. So, if a company calls, you would then call the ICC who would initiate an administrative proceeding pursuant to rules that we say they can promulgate, and then they will investigate it and they will go take care of that. And

- 122nd Legislative Day

 April 23, 2002

 through the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act they then

 will fine the company, first time \$1,000, 25 hundred,

 thereafter."
- Mulligan: "What... Have you done anything about computer-generated calls which are very, very irritating? When somebody... when you have a computer call you and pick up the phone and there's nobody there."
- Hoffman: "Yeah. They will... If they're soliciting, trying to sell something to you, they would also be covered. Just as if it were a human being."
- Mulligan: "And how long would you have a moratorium before the Bill went into effect for people to sign up and telemarketers to purchase the list?"
- Hoffman: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Hoffman: "I'm having a hard time hearing."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh. Please. Please proceed."

- Mulligan: "How long do you think it would take it to go into effect from the time you started to establish the list and when would you require a telemarketing company that does business in Illinois to have purchased the list and know what's going on with the Bill?"
- Hoffman: "I believe it's 45 days, but our staff is looking to make sure."
- Mulligan: "Have AT&T or Ameritech agreed to put in their monthly billing and informational sheet that tells you that you can sign up for the service at \$5 rather than their \$300 service that they charge?"
- Hoffman: "No, but what I'm hopeful we'll be able to do is the ICC will be able to utilize some of the funding that we provide by the people signing up and for the telemarketers having

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

to purchase, so that they can get the word out. Now, other states have been very successful in getting people when it gets in the papers and they hear about this, because people are just sick and tired of these calls. And so, they've been very successful where people on their own initiative have taken that initiative. Now, what I would like to is something else happening. So, there's two ways that you can... you can stop calls. First, under this Bill, you call and be put on the registry. But if there are companies that are exceptions, for instance I talked about the long distance, up until July 1, 2005, when then they will no longer be able to make these calls. During that time, you could tell a telemarketer from AT&T who calls you, you could say, I no longer want to receive these calls. And then under Federal Law, they have to take you off their list. So, what I would like to do is when a consumer signs up, have the ICC also tell'em if there are some exceptions then be very upfront about this. If you do receive a call from one of those people who are exempted under the Bill, which are limited, then you could also tell them, that individual company stop calling me and they have to stop calling you."

Mulligan: "I, I liked the Bill when I introduced it. I still like it to some extent. I wish it were a little tougher. It's one of the most irritating things... to certainly to have these calls. And is your Amendment going on now or has this passed the Senate in this form already?"

Hoffman: "It passed the Senate. We, we put an Amendment on here that all it did was it clarified the issue of making sure that the competition issue, with regard to broadband and all those types of things, was defined. So, it has to go back. Senator Sieben has accepted that. He will then

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

concur. It will go to the Governor's desk."

Mulligan: "All right. So you think that it won't have a problem once you put the Amendment on, going back to the Senate?"

Hoffman: "And I want... Let me reiterate. Every step of the way AARP was there. We, as well as AARP, would like to... and you, would like to have no exceptions, except for probably preexisting business relationship. I wouldn't mind seeing that Bill. However, I think there are some realities. One of those realities is, we're in a... we're currently going through this Telecommunications Act competition issue. So, we put in there something that I think is reasonable, that as of July 1, 2005, then these calls have to stop. Up until then, we're not gonna give one company an unfair advantage over others. And then, well, I'll make you a Sponsor."

Mulligan: "Would you please add my name, too? Yes."

Hoffman: "Yes, I will."

Mulligan: "I think that you'll find that people are gonna flock to this. The year that we passed something where the people could opt out of getting junk mail from... if you signed up with the Secretary of State's Office, I had more calls in my office about that one issue, for people wanting to know how they could sign up to opt out of junk mail. And I think that this will be... you'll find a lot of people doing this because it seems that I hear about this quite often."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Wojcik."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Wojcik: "Representative, in my analysis it states that the realtors were against this Bill. But is Amendment #2 on it

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

now to make their opposition removed?"

Hoffman: "No, they're for the Bill."

Wojcik: "They're for the Bill now."

Hoffman: "They're for the Bill. Yes, yes."

Wojcik: "Okay. Thanks."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. First of all, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. Could you ask Representative Mitchell not to stand on the furniture in the House chamber?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, I will."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell, please do not stand..."

Black: "He's scratching up the furniture."

Speaker Hartke: "...on the furniture."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: "I don't care if your shoes are off.

Representative Black."

Black: "Well, if he persists in arguing with the Chair, remove him from the chamber. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just simply rise in support the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of us get calls on this. And I would be the first to say, and I'm sure Representative Hoffman would join me. This is not the perfect Bill. It is what we can get at this point in time. I live on the Indiana border. Indiana's no-call registry went into effect this summer. Before it went into effect, over 800,000 Indiana residents had already signed up. I think it's a clear message our constituents give us time and time again. They are so tired of getting 10, 12, 15 calls a night, particularly

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

around the dinner hour, trying to sell you everything from aluminum siding to putting your name on a NASCAR race car for the right fee. I wish, I wish the Bill could go a lot further. I wish there weren't as many exemptions. One of the things that irritated me more than anything this primary, was now we have computers, who can make thousands of phone calls in a half an hour period and with a computerized voice urging you to vote for candidate A or candidate B tomorrow. This is a work in progress. There are already more than 20 states that have a do not call registry and I noticed... and Representative Hoffman might in his closing. I noticed six weeks ago, even the amplify Federal Government is now beginning to realize that they may have to do something about the number of unsolicited calls that are coming into your private residence when you not choose or want to be bothered by these kinds of calls. Nobody wants to see legitimate business hampered, but at some point, I, I, I... going to stand with my constituents and say enough is enough. This is a start, it's a work in progress. Let's get something on the books and we can amend it and General Assemblies in the future could amend it. But at some point, I think we need to say to a number of our business colleagues, if the only way for you to do business is to call a consumer at home, between the hours of 5 p.m. and 9 p.m., there... technology should give you a better solution than that. It's at the point where you just want to take your phone off the hook. has worked well in other states. It has not worked as well in some states. And this Bill is by far from a perfect And I don't think Representative Hoffman has any product. intentions of telling you that it is. He's attempted to answer some of the problems the Governor gave in his Veto

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Message last year. It's a start. It's a work in progress and I think most, if not the vast majority of our constituents would say, good, let's at least get something on the books, at least get something started, if it only prevents one or two calls a night coming into my home, it's better than it is now. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote and we continue to work on this as a General Assembly in the years to come."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I reiterate what Representative Black said and I thank him for his help and support along the way. thank Representative Mulligan for her help and support and the fact that she brought this to us years ago. People in Missouri who live 15 minutes from my district hav... their consumers have this opportunity. People in Indiana, their consumers have this opportunity to be able to sit down in peace, not get endless calls of people trying to sell them things they don't want and they don't need. You shouldn't have to buy a caller ID in order to be able to sit and visit with your family in peace. This Bill, I believe... although albeit a first step, is a step in the right direction. We will revisit this issue year in and year out to make sure that we have a Bill that's gonna be a model This is a first step. I ask for your for other states. 'aye' vote. Give consumers in Illinois the same rights that consumers in 20 other states have. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1830?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

122nd Legislative Day

- April 23, 2002
- who wish? Mr. Bradley. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 on the Calendar, on Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1524. Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act concerning average daily attendance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1537, Representative Crotty. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1537, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1545, Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Senate Bill 1569, on page 4, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1569, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1571, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1571, a Bill for an Act in relation to water reclamation districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."

- 122nd Legislative Day April 23, 2002
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1606, Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk..."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1606, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1627, Representative Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1627, a Bill for an Act concerning zoological parks and forest preserve districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1645, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1645, a Bill for an Act concerning energy efficiency. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1646, Representative Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1646, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1657, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1664, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health and developmental disabilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

- 122nd Legislative Day April 23, 2002
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1685, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1686, Representative Hassert. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1686, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1706, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1706, a Bill for an Act concerning freedom of information. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1726, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1730, Representative Coulson. Beth Coulson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1734, Representative Lyons. Joe Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1734, a Bill for an Act in relation to higher education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1756, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act concerning open

- 122nd Legislative Day

 meetings. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No
 Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions
 filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 177... 1782,

 Representative Currie. Barb Currie. Out of the record.

 Senate Bill 1668, Representative Hamos. Mr. Clerk, read

 the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1697, Representative Beaubien. Out of the record. Representative Saviano in the chamber? Representative Granberg in the chamber? Senate Bill 1782, Representative Currie. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1795, Representative Jones. Lou Jones. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1803, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1820, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act concerning hospitals. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1854, Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act to revise the

122nd Legislative Day

- April 23, 2002
- law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1880, Representative Holbrook. Representative Holbrook. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1705, Representative Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1705, a Bill for an Act concerning civil procedures. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1934, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1917, Representative Yarbrough. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1949, Representative Hultgren. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1966, Representative Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Turner, for what reason are you seeking recognition?"
- Turner, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a point of personal privilege. I'd like..."
- Speaker Hartke: "State your point."
- Turner, A.: "I'd like for the Members of the Body to welcome the Dodge Elementary School, located at 2600 West Washington Boulevard in the City of Chicago. Dodge Elementary."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield, your State Capitol.

- 122nd Legislative Day

 Senate Bill 1795, Representative Lou Jones. Mr. Clerk...

 Out of the record. Representative... Senate Bill 1968,

 Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1685, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1687, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1687, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1688, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act concerning dietetic and nutrition services. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 7 of the Calendar,

 Senate Bill 1978, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk,

 read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1978, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

122nd Legislative Day

- April 23, 2002
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1999, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1999, a Bill for an Act concerning ethanol. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2001, Representative Tenhouse. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2022, Mr. Poe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health and developmental disabilities confidentiality. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2037, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2049, Representative Scully. Mr. Scully. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning partnerships. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2052, Representative McCarthy. Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Illinois Wine and Spirits Industry Fair Dealing Act of 1999. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, let's go back to 20

- 122nd Legislative Day

 April 23, 2002

 001... or 2001. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2001, a Bill for an Act to create the Innovations in Long-term Care Quality Grants Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2068, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2072, Representative Bellock. Patty Bellock. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2072, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Is Representative Currie in the chamber? Senate Bill 2117, Representative Klingler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2117, a Bill for an Act concerning medical districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2149, Representative Hoeft. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2149, a Bill for an Act in relation to forest preserve districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2074, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2074, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

- 122nd Legislative Day April 23, 2002
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2050, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1782, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 1782."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1782, a Bill for an Act concerning postpartum depression. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2074, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2198, Representative Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2198, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Workforce Investment Board. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2209, Representative Beaubien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. 22... 20... 11... Senate Bill 2211, Representative Beaubien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2211, a Bill for an Act concerning taxation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2214, Representative Hassert. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2223,

- 122nd Legislative Day April 23, 2002

 Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2223, a Bill for an Act concerning the practice of nursing. Second reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2224, Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2224, a Bill for an Act in relation to child support. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2227, Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Is Representative Schoenberg in the chamber? Senate Bill 2245, Representative Saviano.

 Mr. Clerk, read the... read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2245, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2271, Representative Klingler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2271, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2313, Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

122nd Legislative Day

- April 23, 2002
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2313, a Bill for an Act concerning compensation of public officials. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2323, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2323, a Bill for an Act in relation to state finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Back on Third Reading on page 3 of the regular Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1926, Representative Bugielski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act concerning identification. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of Senate Bill 1926 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. House. It provides that the Secretary of State shall provide that any drivers license issued to a person under the age of 18 years of age must be distinct from a drivers license issued to a persons 18 years of age and older and also for those 18 years to 21 years of age, they must have a different license, also. This is a purpose to help alleviate the problems that we are having in selling tobacco products to students or to children under... minors under the age of 18 and also for alcohol for those under the age of 21. now, what we do... the Secretary of State has a color behind the picture, but now the new law would state that it's got to say a date on when the person reaches either the age of 18, in order to buy tobacco products, or after he reaches the age of 21, where then he would be considered

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

an adult to keep him from avoid... buying liquor products. This is going on in... this... the law has been changed in a number of states already. There's 19 states that have started this already. This is a big proponent brought on by Philip Morris, as well as the liquor industry and it's working out tremendously in these other states and we are starting it here in Illinois and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion?"

Bugielski: "And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, does there have to be a minimum number of drivers license ordered before we can print it?"

Bugielski: "I'm sorry."

Black: "Does there have to be a minimum number of drivers licenses applied for before we print it? I don't want a bunch of these drivers licenses printed and then put on the shelf somewhere. Do you have to order 800 or 1000 in advance?"

Bugielski: "No, this is a drivers license that you keep in your..."

Black: "I understand that. I, I just..."

Bugielski: "...in your wallet."

Black: "I just want some consistency. I mean, you know... <u>St.</u>

<u>Louis Post Dispatch</u> is worried about Illinois license plates. I don't want 'em to go after Illinois drivers licenses."

Bugielski: "Oh no, no. This is drivers license that you get."

Black: "Well, I know, I know but I..."

Bugielski: "No, no."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Black: "I mean, how much is this gonna cost?"

Bugielski: "It would be a one-time cost of \$46,000 just to change the software throughout the state. The cost is very..."

Black: "\$46,000 just to make a little change..."

Bugielski: "It's, it's very..."

Black: "...on a drivers license?"

Bugielski: "It's very minimal. It's a very minimal amount."

Black: "Well, why don't you just get a rubber stamp and stamp minor across the front of it?"

Bugielski: "Well, one of the things that would happen is... and I have a brochure over here, that you... it's pretty hard for you to see but I'll be more than happy to share it with you. In Ohio, what they did is they have our licenses go vertical right now or horizontal. The people under the age of 21 go up and down. They would be vertical license, and this would be a very big help to all of your store owners when they see that and also there would be a color bar on there that gives the name... you know, that would indicate that the person is under 21 and the cost is very minimal. And the Secretary of State isn't or... in favor of this simply because one of the Amendments that is puttin' on there would be, also state ID's would be included in this also."

Black: "Well, this younger generation likes to have various parts of their body pierced, couldn't we just mandate that they have a red nose ring put in until they turn 21?"

Bugielski: "No, it doesn't have to be red. The color would be brought up by the Secretary of State. We don't... we're not mandating the color."

Black: "Where does some of... doesn't some of the cigarette tax money go to the common school fund?"

Bugielski: "No."

April 23, 2002

122nd Legislative Day

Black: "I think it does. So..."

Bugielski: "No."

Black: "So, we don't, we don't want those minors to smoke, right?"

Bugielski: "We don't want them to smoke and drink."

Black: "Boy, things have changed since I was a kid. But, whatever. So, you assure me that there'll be a sufficient number of orders for these license..."

Bugielski: "Oh, absolutely. I think we still have a lot of mi..."

Black: "...drivers licenses that we..."

Bugielski: "...we have a lot of minors in the State of Illinois."

Black: "Okay. A year from now, you're not gonna come back and have to explain to me why there's a hundred thousand of these different license plates for these 18-year-olds on the shelf somewhere? I mean, I want 'em to get out there, okay?"

Bugielski: "They're not license plates. They're licenses that you carry in your wallet."

Black: "Oh, I know. I know, but I mean if..."

Bugielski: "No. We're not gonna have... No, we're not gonna have..."

Black: "If the kid doesn't go in..."

Bugielski: "We're not gonna have an extra amount. No, they're not gonna be in abundance. I guarantee you of that."

Black: "So, to borrow a quote from somebody on your side of the aisle earlier today, this only affects underage minors. Go back and check the transcript, that's what one of your Members said, this'll only impacts underage minors. I thought a minor was underage."

Bugielski: "Well, we're breaking it down into two categories now, under 18 and under 21."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Black: "So, now... let me get this right, Representative. If you're not 21, you're gonna have a license that's different from yours, because you're certainly over 21. But now, if you're under 18..."

Bugielski: "You have another..."

Black: "...or 18 or under, is your license gonna be different from the one who's under 21?"

Bugielski: "Yes."

Black: "Well, I can see right now we're just gonna have a plethora of drivers licenses and how will... how will we know which one is real? How many colors are we gonna have?"

Bugielski: "Well, we know that you really like all these different plates we have. So..."

Black: "Love'em all."

Bugielski: "...that's why we're coming out with the different licenses, also."

Black: "This may be an entirely new thing that we can look into, affinity drivers licenses."

Bugielski: "Well, it may be new for Illinois, but it's in existence in 19... that I know of, 19 other states."

Black: "What, the different colored license... drivers license?"

Bugielski: "Well, different licenses and different configuration of that license."

Black: "All right. If you, if you're behind this,

Representative, I know you've given it a great deal of

thought and that you are convinced that this will work.

Right?"

Bugielski: "Absolutely."

Black: "All right. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate your, your patience and your hard work and..."

Bugielski: "And I'll be more than happy to share this brochure

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

with you afterwards."

Black: "Oh, and by the way, we may want to share something with the Secretary of State. Our licenses, we can renew by mail and we get a little sticker that we put on the back of the license..."

Bugielski: "Correct."

Black: "...that says it's been renewed."

Bugielski: "Renewed."

Black: "The last time I went through airport security they would not accept that as a valid license."

Bugielski: "Well, that's because you've had... you're such a safe driver that they will take you by telephone and they'll just renew it, because I know you're a very cautious and safe driver on the street. And that's probably when you first got married and from your wedding day and, you know, when you were 21 years old."

Black: "Oh, I was much younger than that."

Bugielski: "So, I know... I think it's about time that we do get you a new license, Representative."

Black: "I was much younger than that, I come from a rural area.

Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, now you said how many other states are already doing this?"

Bugielski: "19."

Parke: "And, and the purpose is, is that a bartender or a wait staff looking at a drivers license will see that there's some kind of a different color on this drivers license and immediately know that they're under age..."

Bugielski: "Yes."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Parke: "...to buy liquor?"

Bugielski: "It would give the indication that they are under the age of either 18 or 21. Now, we're not saying that once they reach the age of 18, it'll say on there the date. So, it's not where they're gonna be able to refuse them, because then the person will be able to say, well, it's after this date, but it would absolutely indicate. It'd be a warning sign to the wait staff or the clerk in the store that this person may be under the age of either buying tobacco or liquor products."

Parke: "Will you have any stipulation in there that if someone...

I remember the right of turning 21 for my youngest daughter, which was a big deal for her. Can she go to the Secretary of State's Office or can she go to the state fair or can go to the car show where the Secretary of State have drivers license renewal places and just simply say 'I'm over 21, I want a drivers license that reflects no color differences. Can they just automatically change, even though it might be midterm in their drivers license?"

Bugielski: "Right. They would be able to change it, but then they would just have to pay for the fee. That it's at... Well, it's not free... you'd have to pay for the service charge."

Parke: "How much is that to change it?"

Bugielski: "I believe it's just... I'm not sure, but it's just several dollars."

Parke: "Ten dollars? Okay."

Bugielski: "\$5 or something like that to get a new license."

Parke: "All right. So they could change it. And it also indicates to the, to the sales clerks that they can see that there's another coloration that says they're under 18."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Bugielski: "Right. And this is... it's a protection for the retailers. Because right now the retailers, you know, can get fined for selling tobacco products or alcohol to... and that's the owner, the retailer. This is a protection for them. It's helping them out, so that's why the retailers are all for this too."

Parke: "All right. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Parke: "...I believe that the, the Sponsor has a piece of legislation that is reasonable. It sounds to me like it has a... It's an idea that, I'm surprised, we didn't think of earlier. Other states have recognized the value of it. It simply says, is that if they're under 21, they'll have one coloration or stamped on the drivers license will be an indication that they're under 21. If it's cigarettes, it's... will be marked on there, that they're under 18. It think this is common sense piece of legislation. And I rise in support of it."

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

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is a very good piece of legislation. It's a protection for our retailers out there and the staff that works for the retailers. It would simply point out the people that are under the age of 18, so they cannot buy tobacco products and those students... or those people that are under the age of 21, where they are not able to buy alcohol products. It's a great piece of legislation, and I ask your support."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass, Senate Bill 1926?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed, vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

- 122nd Legislative Day

 voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Daily Calendar appears Senate Bill 2269, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "No... Would you like to correct that, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2269, the Bill's been... a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2241, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2068, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2068, a Bill for an Act concerning toll highways. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Commit... No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 6 of the Calendar, on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1880, Representative Holbrook. Out of the record. Back on page 3, on Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1953, Representative Garrett.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Out of the record. Out of the record. Senate

 Bill 1976, Representative Brunsvold. Representative

 Brunsvold, out of the record. Senate Bill 1996,

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

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1996, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This legislation clarifies several issues regarding fees charged by producers or a business entity that arose from the rewrite of the Illinois Producer Licensing Act last year. The Bill in a clear and concise manner describes exactly what is required when a producer or business entity charges a fee or compensation, separate from premiums."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass, Senate Bill 1996?' All in favor, signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner, would you like to vote on this Bill? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 1 person 'present'. And this Bill, having received a voting Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 16... 2160, Representative Garrett. Representative the record. Garrett. Out of Senate Bill 2161, Representative Poe. Reitz... Representative Reitz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2161, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I look like Representative Poe, sometimes. Senate Bill 2161 deals with abandoned vehicles. It sets up a mechanism for the Secretary of State to withhold the license from people that... that abandon their vehicles along side of the road. We have a tremendous

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

problem probably all throughout the state, but especially in southern Illinois. I know with some of the smaller towing dealerships that have abandoned vehicles that sit on their lots and this Bill should fix that. It's exactly the same Bill that Representative Poe passed out earlier and we'd appreciate your support."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2161?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2164, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Introduction of Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution #71, offered by Speaker Madigan; and House Resolution 835, offered by Speaker Madigan are assigned to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Giles for announcement."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Elementary and Secondary Education Committee will be canceled for this afternoon. Also, Thursday we will convene the Committee and the Committee will start at 9:00 a.m. in Room 114, 9:00 a.m. in Room 114. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Osmond: "I'd like to introduce many of the colleagues of mine,

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

that are down here today with the Professional Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois. I see a lot of them spread out in the gallery. I'm sure that they're gonna try to talk to all of us here at one point or another, and I'd like the General Assembly to give them a warm welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly. Chair recognizes Representative Burke. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege..."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Burke: "...I'd just take a... like to take a moment, to remind my colleagues that tomorrow is Secretaries Day in our country.

And for all those wonderful people that take good care of us and watch our daily activities and take care of our constituents, just to remind my colleagues, don't forget those wonderful assistants that we have, our secretaries in the Capitol. They do a marvelous job and I'm sure everyone here would like to acknowledge them."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Burke, to be politically correct, I believe it's Professional Assistants' Day. Mr. Clerk, for announcement."

Clerk Rossi: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hartke: "Rules Report, when you get it. Now."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 23, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1795."

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

- Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Moffitt for a Motion."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that we suspend the posting requirements for House Resolution 835 and House Joint Resolution 71 for State Government Administration Committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion is passed, adopted, carried. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Rossi: "The following committees will meet immediately after Session. The Children & Youth Committee in Room D-1, the Computer Technology Committee in Room 122-B, the Public Utilities Committee in Room C-1 and the State Government Administration Committee in Room 118."
- Speaker Hartke: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned 'til the hour of 12:00 noon, April 24th, Wednesday. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 822, offered by Representative Parke; House Resolution 824, offered by Representative McKeon; House Resolution 826, offered by Representative Reitz; House Resolution 827, offered by Representative Hoffman; House Resolution 829, offered by Representative Franks; Senate Joint Resolution #58, offered by Representative Feigenholtz; Senate Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative Coulson, are assigned to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House

122nd Legislative Day

April 23, 2002

Bills. House Bill 6282, offered by Representative Dan Reitz, a Bill for an Act in relation to public utilities. First Reading of this House Bill. Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session now stands adjourned."