129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Francis McDonald of the St. Walter Catholic Church in Roselle. Reverend McDonald is the guest of Representative Carole Pankau. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Reverend McDonald: "Let us pray. Lord, God, this is the day You have made for us. We thank You for it and the many opportunities that we have to serve You and our people. May we be mindful of this in our deliberations. Guide and direct these Representatives that by prudent legislation they may promote the well-being of all, the people of Give them the courage, the wisdom in their deliberations to make the decisions that will benefit all Give us the strength that we need to move forward and be with us as we try to make the path a happy one for all people. In these challenging days, certainly we need to be with You and Your wisdom and strength that You give We ask, too, Your blessing on our country and especially, our women and men in the armed services. the gift of peace come soon to all the entire world. We pray as always, in Your name, our loving God, forever and ever. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Pankau."
- Pankau 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."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that all the Democrats are here today and join me in welcoming back from her labors, Representative Mary K. O'Brien, who brings a beautiful new Democrat named Mason to the House Floor today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect, all Republicans are here 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."

Rossi: "Committee Representative Clerk Reports. Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, taken on Tuesday, May 7, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Resolution 668, House Resolution 703 and House Resolution 715. Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, May 7, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Senate Joint Resolution 58."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I talked with Senator Watson this morning and the field is unplayable. The Park District in Springfield cannot get it ready for the game. So, we are postponing the House-Senate softball game until next Tuesday at Lincoln Park at 5:00, same time. That's next Tuesday, we'll play the Senate at Lincoln Park. So, the game for tonight is postponed until Tuesday."

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

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wojcik."

- Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the Republicans that this evening is our steak fry. It's going to be made with tender loving care, so please come and bring your guests. They're all invited. Bye, bye."
- Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes Representative Klingler."
- Klingler: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've been asked to announce that tomorrow morning at 7 a.m. 'til 7:45 is the last meeting of the legislative bible discussion group which meets in the chapel in Room 122-B. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Biggins.

 For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my good fortune to introduce some guests in the gallery from Representative Durkin's House District today who are down. We welcome him to the floor. Missed you in the photo, pal. But I'm happy to introduce the and welcome along with Representative Yarbrough and the soon to be famous new 41st House District and whatever district Representative Yarbrough's number would be. But anyway the Westchester Chamber of Commerce is up in the gallery. Would you please give them a warm welcome to our State Capital."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes Representative Durkin."
- Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

 Speaker Hartke: "State your point."
- Durkin: "With all due respect, Representative Biggins and Representative Yarbrough, you still don't represent Westchester. I am still the existing State Representative in that area, so I would like to give a warm welcome to the Westchester Chamber of Commerce who's has joined us today.

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

My hometown. Thank you for coming down. So, next year you can talk to these guys, but you're still my friend this year. Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome, again. The Chair recognizes

 Representative Collins for House Resolution 825. Mr.

 Clerk, please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 825 offered by Representative Collins.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 825

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives wish to recognize milestone events in high school sports in the State of Illinois; and

WHEREAS, Westinghouse High School's Boy's Varsity Basketball Team, the Warriors, won the IHSA State Class AA Basketball Championship on March 16, 2002 at Carver Arena in Peoria, Illinois; and

WHEREAS, The Warriors met the challenge by first defeating the Panthers of Glenbard North High School in the quarterfinal game; they then went on to defeat the Trevians of New Trier High School in the semifinal game; finally, they faced Springfield's Lanphier High School in the final game; in the end, the Lions of Lanphier were defeated by a final score of 76 to 72, and the Warriors were going home with their first State Championship trophy, and the Chicago Public League's first championship since 1998; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Westinghouse Warriors include Parief Smith, Stephen Collum, Jamaal Brown, Cortney Thornton, Clide Crosby, Darren Gafford, Randon Williams, Richard Russell, Jamarcus Ellis, Johnny Collier, Anthony Bennett, Edward Whitaker, Byron Booker, DeAndre Billingsley, Aaron Moore, Darius Glover; the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

athletic director is Clark Morgan; the head coach is Chris S. Head; and the assistant coaches are Quitman Dillard, Henry Cotton, Ormon O'Quinn, and Michael Farmer; and

WHEREAS, The Warriors finished their season with 30 wins and 5 losses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Westinghouse Warriors on capturing its first ISHA State Class AA Boy Basketball Championship Trophy in its school's history; and be it further

RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to Dr. Lona C. Bibbs, the Principal of Westinghouse High School, athletic director Clark Morgan, head coach Chris S. Head, assistant coaches, Quitman Dillard, Henry Cotton, Ormon O'Quinn, and Michael Farmer, and to each member of the team as an expression of our esteem."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "To Members of the House, I would like to welcome Westinghouse High School. They're in our district. We're very proud to have them here and the coach and their staff, their principal, Dr. Bibbs. We also have in the gallery some of the young ladies from the 10th district. My daughter and nieces are also in the stands. Say 'hello' to everyone. And so we would like to thank them now, so you are to leave now and we're gonna go over to the Renaissance."

Speaker Hartke: "You've all heard the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations on your victories. The Chair recognizes Representative Parke."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative. I'd like to introduce to the Body a group of high school students from all over the State of Illinois, young adults who are interested in the political process. So, if they'd all rise, we'd like to welcome all of them that are here. Come on. Welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capital. On page 6 on the Regular Calendar appears, on Second Reading, Senate Bill 1545. Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1545, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy on Amendment #1."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill came out of committee about 16-2 to 3 'presents'. And the only concern was the number of visits that the fire inspector could make a year into our schools. The Amendment limited it to two for every calendar year. They also make an agreement that it has to be a mutually agreeable time that the inspection would be scheduled. So, it... while we still have strong support for the Bill without the Amendment, I'm happy that we were able to amend it and get the support of the few Members who were opposed to it in its former state. So, I would ask for the addition of the Amendment to the Bill."

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

The Chair recognizes... Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1545?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

129th Legislative Day

- May 8, 2002
- the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 6 of the Regular Calendar, on Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1565. Representative Novak. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1657, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1697, Representative Beaubien. Out of the record. Going back to page 6 on Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 16... 1565. Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1565, 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. On page 8 on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1880. Representative Holbrook. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1880 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Holbrook, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "On House Amendment #1, it makes a technical change for the farm equipment on the roads. It's a request of the Illinois Farm Bureau, Fertilizer and Chemical Association, Midwest Equipment Dealers, Equipment Manufacturers, John Deere and Caterpillar. It's just a update of the standards needed for farm equipment according to the American Society of Agricultural Engineers. I know of no opposition. I'd like to have the Amendment adopted."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1?

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1880?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1930, Representative Bassi. Representative Bassi. Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act concerning local funds. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. A Motion has been filed to table Amendment #2 and that Motion has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell."

- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We move to amend or move to remove or table Senate Amendment #2. Basically, this Amendment was to keep some legislation alive that has now passed in the Senate and is no longer needed. So, I would move to table Amendment #2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to Table. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. No further Motions have been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1947... 1949, excuse me. 1949, Representative Hultgren. Do you have an Amendment in Rules? You wanna hold it? Take that Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 2132, Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2214, Representative

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Hassert. Out of the record. That be all. On page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill... on Second Reading, Senate Bill 2067. Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Schoenberg, there's a note that hasn't been filed yet, so you want to hold it? Mr. Clerk, he's inquired which note."

Clerk Rossi: "A land conveyance appraisal note has been requested on the Bill as amended by House Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps there's some confusion on the part of the Member who filed that note. The next number in sequence, Senate Bill 2068, has to do with land conveyances and the tollway, not 2067, but rather 2068. So, that note wouldn't not really be... that note would be inapplicable. It's not relevant. So, I would like to ask... I belive, Mr. Cross filed the note. I believe that request was made in error. I would like to request that that be withdrawn. If he wishes to file that note for the correct Bill, that would be for 2068."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Well, maybe if he could take this out of the record, we could look. I... certainly..."

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record."

Cross: "... take a look at it."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross. He's declining. On page 3 of the Regular Calendar, on Senate Bills-Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1932. Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk..."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

House. Senate Bill 1932 amends the Property Tax Code and basically replaces the exemption for property used exclusively for burial purposes with an exemption for property used exclusively for cemetery purposes. provides that property used exclusively for include all real property of the including grounds and improvements such as maintenance buildings, mausoleums or other structures for crematoriums or shacks for equipment or those types of things. There was an issue on the language on... burial place versus a cemetery in the... at law as we're purposely trying to clarify this. We amended it here in the House to even give it more clarification. And it's been proposed by the Illinois Cemetery and Funeral Home Association, all the different funeral director's groups throughout the State of Illinois. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I would appreciate 'aye' votes. I'd be happy to answer any questions if anybody has any."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1932?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And the House does pass Senate this Bill, Bill 1932. And having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1953. page of Representative Garrett. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1953, a Bill for an Act regarding

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1953 which passed unanimously in the Senate and in the Education Committee has the goal of making sure that we have a higher quality teaching force. It has two parts to it. By 2002-2003, what we're saying is that a student cannot enroll in a teacher preparation program until he or she has passed the Basic Skills Test. And secondly, by 2004-2005, a teacher wouldn't be... could not student teach... a student teacher couldn't student teach until she or he would pass a subject-matter test in the discipline that she or he will student teach in. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Giles: "Representative Garrett, this piece of legislation, has the language changed? What are the changes in this legislation since it came from the House and went to the Senate? Is there any..."

Garrett: "This actually came from the Senate."

Giles: "I mean this came from the Senate. What is the difference between the Senate version and the House version?"

Garrett: "While this... there is no difference. This is the exact same Bill that was passed out of the Senate."

Giles: "This is the exact same Bill?"

Garrett: "Yes."

Giles: "Okay. And the... currently, the... in the university will administer this Basic Skills Test?"

Garrett: "They're actually fine with this. I've spoken with them. Some of these questions came up in the Education

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Committee and I have spoken... there were some questions, but as long as the part two 2004-2005, the student teaching, there is enough time for everybody to be prepared for that, they are okay on it. I haven't heard any opposition."

- Giles: "I know we discussed this piece of legislation at length in committee. However, the association, ED-RED, they still... do they still have some opposition with this piece of legislation? I have... I forgot the actual reason that they..."
- Garrett: "I think there was some technicalities that we were talking about in committee. Specifically, to the timing and would people be prepared and if it was fair and equitable. And after lengthy discussion, I think it was clear that it is fair and it is equitable and it also allows for the state to have a higher quality teaching force, which is what the Bill's main goal is."
- Giles: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. To the Bill. I think this is a excellent piece of legislation. I believe, in committee, I know out of the House we passed this out unanimously. And so, I ask all Members to support this piece of legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I've heard from many college students who reside in my district, one, in fact, this morning who will be doing his student teaching next fall. He will not have completed all of the courses in his area of concentration before he is sent out to student teach next fall. He feels that this is an inherent weakness in the legislation and I've heard from several other students

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

as well, because then they're faced with, as I understand it, they're faced with only two choices. They either take the test before they have completed all of the courses in their area of study and perhaps fail the test which creates a major roadblock in their desire to become a teacher or they delay their student teaching by a year, completing all of the courses in their area or their major and then they go on to student teach one year later than they were scheduled to do. And student teaching may be the only subject or the only course they have to take that year and what with tuition they don't particularly like that alternative. And I think they have a legitimate point. How would you want me to respond to the students in college that have contacted me about their concerns on this Bill?"

Garrett: "Representative, I would say that that's the part of the Bill that does not go into effect until 2004-2005. And so, if they are currently going to a teaching college, they wouldn't have to be required to go through this particular program. We have, for a good reason, a staggered approach to this piece of legislation to make sure that we can address it if there are any problems along the way. But this will be a two to three years from now that this part of the Bill will be addressed."

Black: "Well, yeah, and I appreciate you illuminating that point for me. I guess the other concern that I have, why are we mandating this? There are a number of colleges that are on the quarter system, some are on the old semester system, some are on a balanced calendar, some are on a year-round calendar. Why don't we let the universities decide when this test will be given? Why are we spelling this out in legislation?"

Garrett: "Well, Representative, what we wanted to do was to

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

condense this and make it so there aren't 57 different teaching universities in the state. So, this would make it all under one umbrella. It would make it much more manageable, make it much more effective and strengthen the teaching qualification requirements in the State of Illinois."

Black: "All right. In all due respect, Representative, I don't agree with that at all. If there are 57 teaching universities in this state, all of them have their own particular way of doing things, their own yearly academic calendar, some require community service of their students, some don't, some require a variety of one and two hundred level courses before you can pick up three and four hundred level courses and now the General Assembly, in its infinite wisdom, steps in and says, we know how to do this, you're gonna do it our way. Why do we wanna do that? Has there been a problem with having universities turn out teachers?"

Garrett: "Well, Representative Black, I happen to have a high regard for the teachers in this state, but there are some teachers who may be falling between the cracks and I think it's the state's responsibility to do everything we can to ensure that every teacher, every student teacher, is off to a good start from the very beginning. And this approach ensures that that happens and it is a way in which the state can step in and have oversight and accountability in this particular process."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I spent a number of years teaching school and if you look at this Bill very carefully... And this Bill's gonna fly out of here. It'll get 85 votes or more. I think it got out of the Senate unanimously and

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

that's fine. But this is the quintessential solution looking for a problem. I'm not convinced there is problem that needs this solution. It's part of what we do here that drives people crazy. Earlier in the Session we were giving all kinds of incentives to become teachers, recognizing the fact that we have a teacher shortage. can we do to entice people to go into teaching? come along with a Bill that says before you can student teach, you have to take a Basic Skills Test. Now, you may not have had all the curricula in your item or your area of concentration because of the way some classes are only offered one section a semester, but we're not changing We're not telling the university they have to six sections or they have to get everybody in their area of concentration before they student teach, we're leaving that up to the university. What we're telling the student who wants to teach is that you better pass the test in your Basic Skills Test in your area or you cannot student teach. And the college student's calling me says, I don't have a problem with that if you could just assure me that the university would schedule the classes so I could finish my course of study before I take the test. We're not doing We're leaving the scheduling and the classes up to the university, but telling the person who wants to be a teacher, you will pass this test or you will not do student teaching. And the college students that have called me are saying, wait a minute, why should I have to take the test if the university hasn't offered the classes that I need to complete my area of study? I'm at a disadvantage and if I don't pass the test, I may not only not student teach, I may have a mark against me so that I may never teach. not fair if I haven't had an opportunity to adequately

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

complete my area of concentration and then I'm ready to go. This... this thing has us, I think, just backwards. You wanna mandate the universities to do something, mandate that they have to offer these courses in a four-year sequential schedule so that everybody can get the classes their major that they need, then they can take the test the second semester of their senior year, they can go out and student teach second semester or summer school and that fall, perhaps, accept a teaching contract. So, on the one hand we encourage and wanna give incentives to become teachers and then on the other, we throw up an artificial roadblock that may sidetrack hundreds of teachers and delay their entry into the field for a year and many of them will become so frustrated they'll just say, I don't need this, I'm going to be a greeter at this store or that store or whatever. This Bill will fly out of here, but having been one who's gone through the certification process, having taught some 24 years, having had a wife who taught most of her life and retired last year, I'm gonna tell ya, this Bill creates a problem that I'm not sure is even there. This Bill is a solution looking for a problem that has not yet reared its head. And I intend to vote 'no', if I'm the only 'no' vote."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

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

 Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Garrett, your Bill actually is enacted in 2004-2005, correct?"
- Garrett: "Yes. The second part of it. The part that Representative Black is speaking to."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. And isn't the intention of the Bill to give

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

the universities time to make sure courses of study are in place so that prior to student teaching they do have the... either the majority or all of their... their subject area done before they take the test?"

- Garrett: "Yes, that's exactly the point of staggering these two
 parts of the Bill."
- Mitchell, J.: "So, basically, I view this as a message to the universities to say, stop delaying your subject-matter program until after the student teaching process where kids go out there student teaching not having all of the areas they need and then the kids they're teaching are lacking and at the same time, the university then sometimes can manage that program so that it's... a college student is there four and a half and maybe five years and delaying that four-year college program to a fifth year which then incurs more tuition, more costs to the students and their family. Is that the intention of this Bill?"

Garrett: "Yes, Representative. Thank you very much. It is."

- Mitchell, J.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted for this in committee and I still see this as a method by which... we're not mandating the curriculum for universities. All we're saying in this Bill is number one: get your act together and make sure these students have the necessary programs before they take the test and before they student teach. I think it's imperative that when they go out to student teach, they feel confident and they have the ability to do a good job. I intend to vote 'aye'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is for the point of personal privilege. I'm sorry to break the rule, but we

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

have a group from St. Peter's Lutheran Church in Schaumburg up in the balcony if we could welcome them. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in strong support of Senate Bill 1953. And my mission right now is Representative Bill Black's vote because Representative Black, for many of the reasons that you raised are actually the reasons to vote for this Bill. The Governor, earlier this year and at the ending of last year, had two education summits and many of your colleagues, Representative Black, were... attended that as did I. There was business leaders from downstate, labor leaders, IEA, school administrators from every nook and cranny in the state. And over several months... while there was not agreement on all points, there was agreement on enough important points for us to move the curve in trying to meet a growing teacher and educator shortage, but also a quality issue that everyone agreed on. And while it is true that sometimes when you make these changes you get ... it seems to not all go in absolute unison, there is virtually universal agreement need to make sure that people in teacher t.hat. preparation have a clinical experience earlier so that they can figure out whether or not they are really cut out to be a teacher. If we do student teaching as I did, the second semester of my senior year in college and you say, oh, my God, what have I done. It's too late. You're up and out. You're gone. You're in the classroom. If we have a... if we begin clinical experiences earlier in the college career and importantly, as this Bill mentions and was agreed to in one of the very consensual points out of the education summit, that we need to have a Basic Skills Test earlier to, in fact, help students so that we can find out where

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

deficits are and we can find out and there is, in fact, a lot of leeway in this. And so it is for the very points on trying to get the higher education system, trying to get all of the people involved in education, not the least of which are parents and taxpayers, all of whom represented at the education summit. We need to do this. We need to begin pushing the curve if we're going to meet the demands of a knowledge-based economy. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is nothing more important that we do as State Government than do ensure that we can deliver a quality education and the only way we do that is with investing in quality in our teachers and having... promoting our teachers and ensuring that we give them every opportunity. And so, I urge you to support Senate Bill 1953, which had nearly unanimous consent of the Governor's education summit."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition? You have already spoken in debate."

Black: "Yes, I fully realize that, Mr. Speaker, but the previous speaker mentioned my name in debate."

Speaker Hartke: "It was not in vain?"

Black: "Well, I'm not sure. I just..."

Speaker Hartke: "Proceed."

Black: "Thank you very much. In all due respect to the previous speaker, in fact the previous two speakers, the fact that it's extremely important that we produce the best teachers we can is not debatable, just look at this year's budget. It's all we have to say about that. Education is extremely important, but a previous speaker said, well, we're not mandating the curriculum. That's the problem with this Bill. You're telling people that they have to do something, but you're not telling the universities that

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

they have to put out a sequential series of classes so that they can get all of the courses in their major and courses in their area of concentration before they go out and student teach. That isn't gonna change anything. Most of the education teach... schools already do this. They already have the Basic Skills Test out of the road before they go out and student teach, but not all of them do that. if there is one college or two or three who for, And so whatever the reasons of economy or the way the universities come up with class schedules would defy examination and definition by most people, you cannot get the classes that you need. All of a sudden we mandate that you have to pass the Basic Skills Test that prospective teacher could say, in all due respect, I need 22 hours in my area of concentration and subject matter that I haven't had yet. don't think I'm ready to take the Basic Skills Test. it's a State Law. No, it's not our... it's not my problem that you didn't get all of the basic skills or subject matter curricula completed. What you really ought to do with this Bill is you ought to place certain mandates on the universities and the teaching universities on how they schedule a student's curricula, rather than the potpourri that many of us had to go through where you couldn't get into a 200 level class because they were all full. Thev might let you take a 300 class, but since you weren't junior, they would prefer you take an advanced really a freshman level class. So, you're ready to student teach and you're 22 hours short of your curricula or your subject matter. Nobody argues with this Bill except in the area of subject matter. What you have been able to take and what you have not been able to take because of the scheduling situations that most universities control, not us. But

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

we're gonna control the test and the entry into student teaching by State Law, but we're gonna let the universities determine how you go through the process. I think you're gonna find that in the long run and believe me, I'm too old to be Don Quixote. I'm not jousting with windmills. Bill'll fly out of here. But I'm just telling you, two or three years from now, you're gonna come back here you're gonna see what we've created is a logjam of people who are eligible to get their degree, but because they were not eligible to take the basic skills exam or didn't take it or couldn't take it or didn't pass it have to come back for a semester or more for student teaching and additional classwork. You've got this thing turned around. Most of ya just need to stop and think about what you went through when you were trying to create your class schedule every semester so that you would have all of the necessary requirements for graduation, all the necessary requirements for your major, all the necessary requirements for student teaching, if you were going to do that. This Bill doesn't address that and it leaves it ... it leaves it so open that, in my opinion, you will create a... you'll create a choke point in which you have... even if you have a dozen, that's a dozen too many who could be out looking for work, probably being good teachers, but because of this mandate will not be able to do so. Some of them will complete the work, some of them will get frustrated and find something else to do. And it's always the teachers that get away, I think, sometimes are the best ones. Because they get frustrated with the bureaucracy and they say, if this is what I'm getting into, I don't want any part of it. A11 we're doing here is creating an additional bureaucracy where as earlier in the year we were trying to create

129th Legislative Day

- May 8, 2002
- incentives to be a teacher, now we're creating additional bureaucracy that you have to get through. I still intend to vote 'no' and I may be the only one, but I still intend to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

 Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor indicates she will yield."
- Lang: "Representative, I wanna make sure I understand this Bill.

 So, this Bill would provide that these tests be taken before student teaching. Is that correct?"
- Garrett: "There are two parts to the Bill. The first part begins 2002-2003. That says, that a student cannot enroll in a teacher preparation program until he or she has passed the Basic Skills Test. The second part of the Bill begins in the years 2004-2005, saying that the student can't student teach until he or she passes the subject-matter test in the discipline that he or she will student teach in."
- Lang: "Is it not required today... I remember reading that long article in the newspaper about teachers failing tests. But isn't there some requirement today that a test be taken before someone gets their teaching degree?"
- Garrett: "Before they get their degree, but this is while they are in the program which is the first time the state has gone in this direction to ensure that the teachers are prepared... better prepared... and better qualified."
- Lang: "Well, isn't it the job of our fine universities to prepare these folks for teaching?"
- Garrett: "I think, Representative, that what this Bill does because it's in two stages. The first stage is pretty common sense. The second stage allows for the universities to have their curriculum in place and to make... this is a

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

jumpstart, really, to make sure that our teachers, our student teachers, have every opportunity to be able to be as qualified as possible before they get in the classrooms and teach. And we're asking for cooperation with the universities and the schools. The teaching universities are in favor of this and the reason they're in favor of it is because we have given them an extra three years to get their programs together."

Lang: "Well, let's assume for the sake of argument that one of your constituents wants to be a teacher and that constituent fails the test. But that same constituent at the same time that they failed the test has been accepted into the University of Illinois. If they're... You're telling us..."

Garrett: "That's..."

Lang: "... through this Bill, that this person might be bright enough and with it enough and sharp enough to get into the University of Illinois with whatever of level of skill they have but if they fail the test they gan't be a teacher."

have, but if they fail the test, they can't be a teacher." Garrett: "Well... They can't enter the program 'til they pass the But if that person is smart enough to get into the University of Illinois, chances are that person's going to I would be very surprised to see that pass the test. happen. I think we're being a little bit... we're being misguided by some of the discussion here. This is a fair Bill for teach... for student teachers, also, because it allows them the opportunity to make sure that they are properly trained and ready to go into the classroom and that they know full well what their discipline is going to be before they get into some of these teaching programs, instead of changing their mind and actually being in a position where they're teaching and not being

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

well-qualified and well-informed on that subject matter as

possible."

Lang: "Well, when you say disciplined, so let's assume someone wants to be an elementary school teacher. What discipline is that that they're gonna be tested on before they start college?"

Garrett: "That's the basic... Right. There are two different parts to this Bill. Again, the Basic Skills Test is what we're going to put into action right away and then the second part of the Bill is the subject matter test which is the specific area of the... where the student is interested in teaching. So, there are two different parts: basic skills, subject matter."

Lang: "Well, what if there is no subject matter?"

Garrett: "One is general, one is specific."

Lang: "What is someone wants to be a kindergarten teacher?"

Garrett: "Well, subject... Everybody... yeah, everybody takes the
 subject matter test, no matter what."

Lang: "All right. I know this question may have been asked earlier, but I don't think I heard the answer. There were some concerns by ED-RED in committee relative to the impact of this legislation on bilingual teachers, minority teachers. Have you resolved those issues?"

Garrett: "Well, we resolved those issues because first of all, I think they can take the test more than once if, in fact, they fail the test. But secondly, we did get testimony from that community people who have, you know, who are bilingual that this wouldn't be an issue. So, we haven't heard of any opposition, really, except some of the universities were questioning this and they're pleased with it now because it's not going to happen right away and it'll give them enough time to get their curriculum in

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

order, get their programs in order."

Lang: "Doesn't this legislation sort of fly in the face of our concern about teacher shortages? If these folks can be tested later, if the university experience will give them sufficient training to be teachers, why do we need to put more roadblocks in their way of becoming teachers?"

Garrett: "Representative Lang, this actually benefits teach...

students who are interested in becoming teachers will be
able to be the best qualified teachers this state can have.

And what we're doing is giving them an opportunity to do
that. It doesn't really relate to teacher shortages. For
those who are seriously interested in becoming teachers and
want to become experts in their field, we are making it
clear that this is important to the State of Illinois. The
teacher shortage issue is a different issue. This is
making sure that the State of Illinois has the most highly
qualified teachers that we can possibly have."

Lang: "Well, I agree that we're for that. I agree that we're for the State of Illinois having the best teachers we can have.

The question is though, if you end up deleting from the potential teacher pool, before they even start college, certain people that would like to be teachers, then aren't we making the pool smaller?"

Garrett: "You know, you're putting something out there that may or may not happen because of this. I think if, in fact, that did happen, which I highly doubt, we would make some changes. But what we're looking for are teachers, student teachers, students who are interested in becoming teachers because they have interest in the profession and when they get into the classroom, they will be qualified. There are different ways and you know there are Bills out there that look for incentives to attract new teachers. That would

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

work in tandem with this kind of legislation. It can't work in opposition, but those kinds of incentives would definitely work in tandem. For instance, signing bonuses or whatever the state would come up with."

- Lang: "Well, Representative, I thank you for answering my questions. I'm really not sure how I want to vote on your legislation, but I appreciate your honesty. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

 Representative Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell, you spoke in the

 debate already and your name was not mentioned in debate.

 Okay. You're declining recognition. Representative

 Garrett to close."
- Garrett: "Well, we've had a lot of debate here today and I just want to make sure that everybody knows that this Bill's main intent, its purpose, is to ensure that the teachers who are in the classrooms with our children are the most highly qualified teachers. This Bill also looks at fairness. It's fair for student teachers. It's fair for the universities that teach these students how to be teachers. And I applaud the Chief Sponsor who... in the Senate, for putting this Bill forward and for the people that attended the education summit where they drew this information from. This is a significant piece of legislation that will move the State of Illinois and its teaching force forward. And I hope you will vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1953?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Mitchell, the Gentleman from Macon. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Mitchell, B.: "I would like to... I believe, right behind me. If they could stand up, the Neoga High School Honor Society.

I'd like the Illinois House to give them a big welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield, your State Capital. The

Chair recognizes Representative Poe. For what reason do

you seek recognition?"

Poe: "Also, on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also have a school, Calvary Academy and their government class is with us today. So, we all ought to be on our good behavior and let's welcome them to Springfield. They're up here in the gallery. Stand up, guys."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes

Representative Mitchell from Whiteside. Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege, as well."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Mitchell, J.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like you to welcome four students from St. Anne's School in Dixon, Illinois, who are paging on the House Floor today. Two were over in the Senate for about 15 minutes, by the time they got there, of course, the Senate had already adjourned. Valerie Ackert, Camille Overcash, Hannah Nelson and Molly Demmer along with their sponsor-teacher, Nancy

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Henegar. Please give them a warm welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1934. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1936, Representative Bost. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1966, Representative Mathias. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1968, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1968 is the culmination of an agreement between the Illinois licensed geologists and the Illinois civil engineers which would allow the geologists to perform certain duties with the underground storage tank problems here. We've negotiated this and it's now an Agreed Bill. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1968?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting Members voting this Bill, 'present'. And having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Miller, the Gentleman Chicago, Cook."

Miller: "Cook. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Hartke: "For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Miller: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

- Miller: "Today, with us in the gallery, we have parents and teachers from my districts, Thornton School District 205 and also 148. I'd like the General Assembly to welcome them."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol. Enjoy your day.

 Senate Bill 1976, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1978, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr.

 Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1978, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1978 creates the Medicaid Hospital and Physician Payment Task Force within the Illinois Department of Public Aid. With the use of independent experts in health care finance, the task force plans on conducting a comprehensive study of the adequacy of hospital and physician payment rates under the Medicaid Program. And by January 1, 2003, this task force shall report to the Governor and the General Assembly. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

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

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

Parke: "Representative, it doesn't seem to be a very controversial Bill, but normally we do this by Resolution.

Why wouldn't you do this by Resolution rather than taking a Bill to do it? I said, why didn't you just do this by Resolution and not by actual Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "This is how it came over from the Senate. I believe that the Sponsor wanted it in statute."

Parke: "Okay. Was there any opposition to this that you're aware

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

of, Representative?"

Feigenholtz: "No, there was not."

Parke: "Is there any cost to the taxpayers of the state for this?"

Feigenholtz: "No, there is not."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion."

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

Speaker Hartke: "You're welcome."

Black: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, why does this need to be in statute? Why not a Resolution? Oh, I'm sorry. I was off the floor and Representative Parke said he just asked that. Okay. Well, let me back up then. I realize this came over from the Senate... Well, let me just speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I could. This is one of the items that when you're here for a while you recognize real quick it should be a Resolution. Once we put this in statute, this thing will in the statute books when all of us are dead and gone. It'll never go away. And it creates the Medicaid Hospital and Physician Payment Task Force. Well, whoopee do. I know the solution to that. I don't know... I don't need a Bill. Pay the bills. If you have to go out and borrow the money, pay the bills. Why in the world by statute do we have to create a task force on the payment of Medicaid bills? For cryin' out loud. My four-year old grandson could figure this out and he wouldn't need a law enacted by the General Assembly to do it. If you want to study the issue, fine, do a Resolution. But why in the world would you put something in the statute books that is

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

inherently simple? When a bill is due and payable and service has been rendered to a Medicaid patient, pay the Pay the bill. Pay the bill. And some of you won't join with us. We could borrow money, not to solve the budget crisis next year. Anybody in the media listening, pay attention. For cryin' out loud, you haven't been able to figure this out for three months. We'll worry about the FY03 budget later. The hole and the hardship that we're creating in this state right now is not the '03 budget. The pain that we're creating is at doctors and hospitals and pharmacists and independent contractors from all over the state have provided a service to the State of Illinois and we don't pay 'em. We balanced the budget hole for '02 on the backs of providers and that's not right. I don't need a Senate Bill to tell me that. Pay the bills."

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

Stephens: "An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering. Michelle Repaal is here with the Department of Military Affairs and she wanted me to ask you if Senate Bill 2204 was gonna be called today because she's worked tirelessly on the issue."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Stephens, let's go back to this. Right now, we're discussing Senate Bill 1978. I'll recognize you when we're finished."

Stephens: "I get to talk again?"

Speaker Hartke: "Well, sure. Further discussion on Senate Bill 1978? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do agree with Representative Bill Black's comments. And we are trying to

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

get accomplished those things to deal with hospital problems, provider payments, et cetera, with this task force. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Black, for what reason do you seek recognition? You've spoken in debate."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. But the Representative mentioned my name in her closing."

Speaker Hartke: "Favorably."

Black: "Yes, she did. But I have a right to respond, according to House Rules. She used my name in debate. Don't look to the parliamentarian, I know the rule book on this issue."

Speaker Hartke: "I'm not sure that the rule applies, but being c... courteous to you, I will allow you..."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Hartke: "... to respond."

Black: "In all due respect to you, Representative, let me just say this. I appreciate the fact that you said you agree with me. And, everyone of us in this chamber, in all seriousness, need to tell our Leadership and work together if we have to do short-term borrowing. Which we can do legally and constitutionally at a much cheaper rate than the independent pharmacist in my district. We need to sit down, not as Republicans and Democrats, but Representatives of the people who sent us here, we need to pay our bills. It is not fair. These bills are past due. Some of 'em haven't been paid for services rendered in January or December. That's not fair. It's not right. And I think before we get into lengthy meetings and caucuses about the '03 budget, we ought to take care of the unpaid, past due bills in fiscal 2002 and not try to balance this situation on the backs of well-meaning people

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

who provide a service and expect to be paid. That's a philosophy that I think most all of us in this chamber can agree with and I'm glad you agree with me and if nothing else, you and I will continue to meet and figure out how we can do this. And in closing, Representative, I just want to thank... I just want you to know... I asked the Speaker to remember the Cubs in his daily devotionals and I want to thank him for doing that because I said we needed help and he sent us the Saint Louis Cardinals. So, I owe him a great deal."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1978?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Yarbrough. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Yarbrough: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Yarbrough: "Visiting with us today is the Democratic nominee from the new 78th, otherwise known as the 'coin toss lady',

Dorothy Reid. Please give her a Springfield welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I would like to take the opportunity to welcome Miss Emily Jones of Kinmundy, Illinois, who's doing an excellent job representing the Girl Scouts of our area in southern Illinois. And welcome her to Springfield today."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes

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

Delgado: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking for a suspension of the posting requirements on House Resolution 527. And yes, that's already been... I've talked to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I understand we're in agreement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there leave? Leave is granted for the posting requirements. What was that Bill, again?"

Delgado: "... 27."

Speaker Hartke: "Resolution..."

Delgado: "Resolution 527."

Speaker Hartke: "... 527. Thank you."

Delgado: "House Reso..."

Speaker Hartke: "Leave is granted. Senate Bill 1982, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1982, a Bill for an Act concerning prisons. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1982 is a move to try and find some dollars for the Department of Corrections to cover the costs incurred for commissary, the dietary workers to try and make sure that we don't have to privatize these prisons. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. And we... well... and we did... I probably should explain, the Amendment that we put on in committee addressed to Representative Righter's concerns that the department currently gets 10%... has a 10% markup on commissary items and they will be held whole on that by 40% of the total as we move it to 25%. The department will be able to keep the dollars they use for prison services. The

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

additional money will be used to fund the workers in the commissaries throughout the prisons in Illinois. There's a hundred and twenty-two, I believe a hundred and twenty positions that we have in the state right now that are in jeopardy."

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

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

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

Black: "Representative, currently, what are some of the things that the Inmate Benefit Fund pays for in our correctional centers?"

Reitz: "The advancement of inmate payroll, special benefits for employees, the advancement and reimbursement for employee travel, and that's all that's listed here, but other items that they currently use for department use and mostly is to benefit the inmates."

Black: "In fact, and I'd like to read this into the record if I could, Mr. Speaker. Let's just look at what the Inmate Benefit Fund is used for in the Division of Women and Family Services. The Inmate Benefit Fund pays for children's games, crafts and learning materials to support the reunification program with their incarcerated mothers. It's used... The Inmate Benefit Fund is also used to buy yarn and other items so the female inmates can make blankets that they then donate to critically ill children through Project Linus. It's used to purchase curriculum material for parenting classes, bean bags, furniture, paint, and toys for the children's area in the visiting rooms at the female facilities where the female inmates' children may visit. Other items that the Inmate Benefit

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

pays for in our general population centers would be recreational equipment, washers and dryers for use of the inmates, personal hygiene items for those inmates who are indigent, furniture in day rooms, items that were used in religious services. Now, my fear is and I... and don't misunderstand me, I intend to vote for the Bill. But I've expressed my concern to some members of the union that represents correctional employees. If we raise the prices... I think you're raising it... there'll be a 35% markup on tobacco products, is that correct?"

Reitz: "Correct."

Black: "And a 25% markup for nontobacco products. Now, I don't have a problem with that, Representative, except the inmate pay for those who are working in correctional industries, that isn't going to go up. And so, if they can't buy the products at the commissary, less money will actually be taken in. Which means some of the expenses that we currently pay for out of the Inmate Benefit Fund, particularly in the female prisons, where you need to buy furniture and toys and games, so that if the female inmate is lucky enough to have her children able to visit, you certainly don't want the children, the young children, visiting their mother, in a sterile, waiting-room environment that's so prevalent in our general population facilities. My fear is that if we drain the Inmate Benefit Fund then the only way we're gonna buy those things is out of general revenue dollars, which creates an even worse strain on the dollars that we need to keep correctional officers on the job. Now, I know what the intent of your legislation is, if there are extra profits derived, extra profits will go towards making up a shortfall so we don't have to lay off a correctional officer or two. And

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

I'll speak for the people who work at the prison in Danville, we're grossly overcrowded, terribly understaffed. We can't afford another layoffs and keep security and safety. But I just hope that... what my fear is, Dan, we may have a very short-term gain by this Bill, but we may with a very painful long-term loss, because we'll have to make up the money somehow and the only way to do that'll be a general appropriation. I know it's... I know the genesis of the Bill because of the crisis that we're currently in, but I think if we look at what the Inmate Benefit Fund currently supports in our correctional system alter that tremendously, I don't think any correctional officer and certainly no one in this chamber would want to see a mother, an incarcerated mother who will be out in 18 months, have to visit with her children where the only furniture is a stainless steel bench and a stainless steel table and the mother can play with the young child, no toys, no comfortable chairs, no corner of... where there's carpet, where they can truly have some So, for a very parenting time with their children. short-term gain we may be creating more of a long-term problem, that's the only concern I have. I know you've done a lot of work on the Bill. I hope you can give me some assurance that isn't what's gonna happen here."

Reitz: "And I share your concerns and I hope that doesn't happen.

And if we're able to step up to the plate and do our part and make sure that we don't privatize these positions to start with, then for the Governor's part we probably don't need this Bill. I mean, the intent is just to try to help Corrections raise some dollars and this is a user fee on this and it's the only way that we saw to find additional dollars for the Department of Corrections. I'm hopeful

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

that the increased price on the commodities will not see the department's portion reduced in any form or fashion."

Black: "Well, I know you to be a man of your word and I would hope that if we see over the sumer whenever the effective Bill of this date is, if we really run into some problems that you wouldn't be adverse to coming back and repealing or making the prices back to what they were. I... ya know, I've told you personally, the correctional facility in Danville has gone through a private company who left literally in the middle of the night back in 1999 and still owes vendors in my community well over \$325 thousand. So, I've had personal experience with private contractors. I guess you can save money if you don't pay your Bills, but I'd be much more... much more likely to come to the table and discuss privatization if somebody would just step up to the table and pay my hospital who gave services to this health care provider in good faith and got stuck with about \$325 thousand in unpaid bills. So, a lot of times it isn't as simple as we batter about words here, privatization will save money. Well, it all depends on how you define saving money. My experience with a private company in health care at Danville was not very positive, in fact, it was very, very negative. But, if we find that this doesn't work, I would hope that you and I and others could get together and say, well this was an experiment just simply didn't pan out the way we wanted it to, 'cause this Inmate Benefit Fund is very important for day-to-day functioning of life for the inmates. And I'm not getting up here and saying that they... ya know, should put color TVs in the day rooms, that's not what this is about and you and I know that. But, it is a legitimate concern. I intend to vote 'yes', but if I find over the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

summer or next fall that things aren't working well at the facility in Danville, I hope I can call you and say, Dan, we need to revisit this issue and you'd be willing to do so."

Reitz: "I'd be glad to do so."

Black: "All right. Thank..."

Reitz: "And we'll track this through all our facilities."

Black: "Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, this is a fee increase, right?"

Reitz: "Correct, I guess. Yeah, it's the additional profits on the costs of the item. Right now, they currently get 10%..."

Davis, M.: "Well, they claim there's no profit, but you know we'd have to really look into that. Ya know, who would have things that they're selling and they're not making a profit? I mean, you don't tell me they are 5013c (sic-501(c)(3))."

Reitz: "No, what they do is, basically, whatever the cost of the item is, they currently have a 10% markup on that... on that product and that goes in the Inmate Benefit Fund and..."

Davis, M.: "Okay. To the... to the Bill."

Reitz: "... and this raises it to 25¢."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I think it's totally unwise, extremely unfair to increase the cost of items where people don't even have a choice of getting a different brand or going to another

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

location. They can only purchase from this one place and it's not just the inmates, it's the families of inmates. It's people who have very little disposable income. sometimes after waiting all day to see someone, wanting to feed the kids, those dollars add up, 15¢ may not sound like a lot to many people, but 15¢ times 3 or 4 can be an awful lot to some. I think it's a very unwise, unfair move and to place this kind of burden on people who really don't have the wherewithal to make another choice or to find another location, or maybe not get that particular bag of It will not accomplish what you think it might. chips. It'll just be another hardship on a group of people. think the State of Illinois should be above... should be above some things and this is truly one of them. It isn't something that's gonna help our budget at all... it's not gonna help our budget at all, it's a fee increase. what we're saying is the people that have to pay it are not meaningful to us, therefore it's not very important. But it should be very significantly important, because what we do here says to those children, said to those parents, people who are innocent, that we really don't care about That even though you don't have very much money, it doesn't mean very much to us and we're gonna... we're gonna increase those fees on you. Why, Representative, why? Vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Morrow: "Representative Reitz, I'm confused, has House Amendment #1... is that the only Amendment on this Bill?"

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Reitz: "House Amendment #3 was adopted."

Morrow: "House Amendment #3 is adopted. Let me get some clarification. You're wanting to raise commissary fees on inmates in order to pay the wages of dietary employees... of commissary employees?"

Reitz: "Of commissar... actually of commissary and if there's additional money then use the additional money for dietary employees."

Morrow: "All right. Now, how many... I thought most of the commissary employees were inmates?"

Reitz: "Most of that... well, they have staff that oversees the commissary."

Morrow: "Okay."

Reitz: "And then they also... the costs for the inmates that work in the commissary is above and beyond that."

"Well, that explanation clarifies and it basically gets Morrow: me to the Bill. I'm gonna rise to oppose Senate Bill 1982, 'cause first of all the inmates should not be responsible for paying the wages of state employees. If that was the case, DCF caseworkers ought to have a fee increase put on their clients in order to pay their lost wages for their possible layoffs. If that's the case, Medicaid patients should have to pay a higher fee in order to receive services in a hospital. That's the problem I have with fear and... and... and as Appropriation this Bill. I Chairman over DOC, my committee put the Amendment back in to... to put back the dollars so that they wouldn't have to privatize feeding inmates. So, I'm all in favor of the employees, but I don't feel that inmates should have to pay for their salary. 'Cause first of all, many of the inmates that are in there are in there for nonviolent crimes. should they be penalized because the state is in a budget

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

crisis? No. No more should they be penalized than a child under supervision by DCFS should no more have to pay more in order to be protected by this State of Illinois. I would urge, reluctantly urge, 'red' votes on Senate Bill 1982."

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

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the concerns. As I said, the impetus of this Bill is the privatization of the commissary and the dietary within our prison system. This markup reflect... is exactly the same as the federal markup on items that we have in federal prisons. So, I apprec... as I said, I appreciate the concerns, hopefully, we won't even need this if we're able to stop the privatization movement somewhere in our next budget, but I'd appreciate 'aye' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1982?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Cross. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 88 Members voting 'yes', 25 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1999, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1999, a Bill for an Act concerning ethanol. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1999 simply allows SIU to oversee the pilot project, ethanol project, research plant that's being

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

built currently at SIU. This would provide that the board would be established at 13 members, would... it indicates how they will be established and gives the board operating authority over the ethanol pilot plant. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Stephens: "Could you ask Representative Hoffman if it's okay with him to call 2204?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Stephens, you're not recognized for that.

We're talking about Senate Bill 1999."

Stephens: "Oh. Will you get back to me?"

Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to make a comment on Senate Bill 1999?"

Stephens: "Well, I'm not sure. Will you get back to me?"

Speaker Hartke: "I will certainly try."

Stephens: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 1999? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1999?' 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? Mr. Clerk... Mr. Turner, would you like to vote on this piece of legislation? Mr. Turner. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens. Mr. Stephens."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

- Stephens: "Which Bill would you like me to address?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Well, you had a question before and you asked if

 I could get back with you and I apologize, I forgot earlier

 and I'm glad you reminded me."
- Stephens: "Well, my last question was if you had any insight as to how Representative Hoffman felt about calling my Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Hoffman wouldn't call your Bill, you would call your Bill."
- Stephens: "Well, under the current rules that doesn't seem to be working. So, I was thinking maybe, Jay, since he used to be my State Representative and I was once his State Representative and that makes us kinda close that maybe he could aid you in deciding which Bill to... I was only five Bills off on the last one, five little Bills. What does the parliamentarian say? We're all in agreement, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Stephens, we are calling the Bills in order and by my count there's about 20 Bills before we get to yours. I..."
- Stephens: "I guess we weren't as close as I thought."
- Speaker Hartke: "I started today on... where we left off yesterday and if we get to it today, maybe Friday."
- Stephens: "Is it the parliamentarian's job to make sure that those go in progressive order or would that be Mr. Brown's job?"
- Speaker Hartke: "We're going down the Calendar and when we get to 2204, we will call your Bill."
- Stephens: "I've always enjoyed working with you, Mr. Speaker, and today is just like all those other days."
- Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes Representative Cross. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Cross: "Along the same lines of Representative Stephens. Can you

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

tell me what you intend to do about my Bill, 2118? It's on Third Reading. It's been there awhile. It's an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. I would... it's almost more than anything just a technical Bill. It's been there for a while. I would hope you're not sitting on that or putting a brick on it because it's the Attorney General's Bill. Any idea where... when I can expect that? I think it ought to go before Representative Stephen's. 2118, it's about children, the child advocacy youth center. Just want to make sure we're taking care of kids here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yeah. Well, we'll have to get back to you on that, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "You gonna do it... get back to me today. You gonna call it today?"

Speaker Hartke: "If not today, by Friday."

Cross: "You're gonna call it this week. Are you gonna call it this week? 'Cause it..."

Speaker Hartke: "I don't know that."

Cross: "... it deals with child advocacy centers. Deals with kids that are abused and neglected. And it's, as I said, it's an initiative of the Attorney General's... You're not... you're not holdin' that."

Speaker Hartke: "We'll get back to you on that."

Cross: "All right. Thanks."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Morrow, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would advise some of the... some of the colleagues of mine who've just gotten up to speak, if they hadn't gotten up to speak, we probably could have gone through two or three Bills on the Calendar. So, sit down and be quiet, marinate. We all got Bills. I got a Bill that I wanna have called."

129th Legislative Day May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Morrow: "So, let's do the work of the people. Be quiet, marinate."

Speaker Hartke: "With that, the Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The previous Representative took the time it would have called my Bill.

I have an inquiry of the Chair, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "In the last 60 seconds, you have said on two distinct occasions, we might get to that Bill on Friday. My Calendar shows that we are not here on Friday. Do you know something we don't? Do we need to make a change in our lodging accommodations?"

Speaker Hartke: "No."

Black: "So, we are not in on Friday?"

Speaker Hartke: "That is correct."

Black: "So... so, perhaps you have been less than truthful to some of the Members. Going to get back to us on Friday. Shame, shame, shame, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "No, I said by Friday."

Black: "It's just a good... it's a good thing you're blushing,

Mr. Speaker, or I'd really go after ya."

Speaker Hartke: "I was speaking in jest. Senate Bill 2001,

Representative Tenhouse. Out of the record. Senate Bill

2022, Representative Poe. Mr. Clerk, please read the

Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act concerning mental health and developmental disabilities confidentiality. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Poe."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 2022 would authorize law enforcement personnel upon showing of a forcible felony arrest warrant of a recipient to obtain information regarding the current presence of the recipient of a mental health facility and the date that they will be discharged. The problem in the past and the reason this technical change, is in the past that, they have a warrant and they go to a facility and they cannot tell them if that person's in the facility or not. What this would do is save law enforcement a lot of time and effort in pursuing criminals that decide that they would like to go to a mental institution and in that way they can't track 'em down. So, I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 2022? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2022?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2037, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2049, Representative Scully. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act concerning partnerships. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Scully."

Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Bill is to adopt the Revised Uniform Partnership Act which was created

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

in 1997. It brings the State of Illinois into synchronization with the most modern laws on the issues of partnerships. It greatly enhances our ability to do business on an interstate basis. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2049?' 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. Murphy and Representative Klingler like to vote on this? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2037, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2037 amends the Home Rule Act... the Sales Tax Act. Last year or the year before we passed a legislation that allowed non-Home Rule entities, municipalities, to pass a sales tax up to a half a percent. What this does is three things. It allows the Department of Revenue to impose the tax at quarter cent increments. In other words, you don't have to go the full one-half percent. In addition, what it does, it requires the Department of Revenue beginning October 1st, 2002 to begin collecting a tax on the first day of the month of January or July and it would allow the proceeds from the tax to be

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

used for property tax relief. This is not a tax increase, as a matter of fact, it gives municipalities more... the ability to provide property tax relief and could result in just the changing of how Home Rule municipalities... non-Home Rule municipalities tax their residents. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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, is there a... if it's in here I haven't found it. Is there any provision for a front door referenda, on whether the sales tax will be levied?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding the referendum is already in the current statute. So, what you'll do is... is you could... if you pass the referendum you can now, I believe, do the referendum by a quarter percent as opposed to a half percent and you can indicate that the proceeds from the tax can be used for property tax relief. We passed, I believe, a couple of years ago, Representative Black, the ability for non-Home Rule municipalities to pass this at a one-half percent level. This allows them to do it at a lesser level, at quarter percent and would allow them to provide property tax relief with some of the money."

Black: "All right. And you withdrew Committee Amendment #1 that added mass transit districts to this, is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yeah, it's my understanding... this... it's my understanding this has not been amended. It has not been amended, so this will go right to the Governor."

Black: "All right. So, at one time you had filed Committee

Amendment #1 dealing with mass transit..."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Hoffman: "Yes, I didn't... I didn't move forward... I didn't move forward with that."

Black: "Okay, all right. What guarantees are in the Bill that the sales tax revenue will, in fact, bring about property tax relief? Is it just... it is assumed that they will use the sales tax revenue for general operating expenses and thus be able to lower the property tax levy?"

Hoffman: "Well, what it does, it... this Bill... so, currently under current law, they cannot... there is no provision that would allow them to use this quarter percent for property tax relief. So, on the front door referendum, when it goes to the voters, the municipality would say we're asking for a quarter percent or a one-half percent and a quarter of... half of that's gonna be used for property tax relief. That would be on the front-end referendum and would allow the details of this tax to meet the needs of the individual communities. So, there's no... each municipality, each non-Home Rule municipality will make the determination as to how they will use the tax proceeds and how the referendum will look."

Black: "All right. So, it's, basically then, up to the elected officials of that community to determine how the sales tax revenue would be used in order for them to be able to reduce their property tax levy, that's up to them."

Hoffman: "Right, well... right. Well, up to the voters, ultimately..."

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "... because it's a front door referendum. And what this does is actually gives, I believe, the taxpayers a break because we're no longer saying you must impose a one-half percent. We're saying you can impose less and you can use it for property tax relief. So, we're giving more

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

flexibility to the taxpayers when they vote on these referendums."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

Righter: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Righter: "Representative Hoffman, the language in the Bill and in our analysis talks about the quarter percent increments. Is there... is there a... and I'm not sure I'm clear on what that means. Does that mean that the increases, if this were passed, can only... you can only go up at a quarter percent a time and what's this amount of time between those quarter percent increments?"

Hoffman: "Well, what it allows... so, right now, we say currently under the current statute that we passed for non-Home Rule municipalities that have front door referendums and they have to do it at one-half percent. So, this would allow that non-Home Rule municipality to have a referendum that would say a quarter percent instead of a half percent or it would also... they could say we're going to do one-half percent and half of that, or a quarter percent, is gonna be used for property tax relief. This gives them that flexibility. In order... if they wanted to change that or any changes it would have to go on, my understanding, for another referendum."

Righter: "Okay. So, on a referendum question they could split the question and say we want to raise it a half percent; a quarter for public safety infrastructure and another quarter for property tax relief. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "Yes, yes..."

Righter: "Okay, let me ask you..."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Righter: "... can... can... if this were passed and become law would municipalities be able to in one year pass it with referendum approval, get a one-half percent increase in the sales tax for public safety infrastructure and then three years later come back and add another half percent for property tax relief?"

Hoffman: "No."

Righter: "Would they be able to come back three years later and change what they want to use the money for?"

Hoffman: "I think that... it's my understanding that the front door referendum... they would have to live by the wording of the front door referendum. Now, I think it'd probably be our intent and for... it's a good question, if they pass a half percent and they only want to impose a quarter percent, it's my intent to allow them... they could impose less than what they pass. I don't think there's anything that requires them to do it, but this gives them the flexibility to ask the voters for less than a half percent."

Righter: "Under this... under this Bill could a municipality run a referendum and pass that half percent increase for property tax relief and then come back two years later and ask the voters for permission to use that extra money from that extra half percent for something other than property tax relief?"

Hoffman: "No."

Righter: "Okay, so they wouldn't be allowed to do that?"

Hoffman: "No, it's... it's our... it's the intent that we're allowing them if a municipality... let me just back up a little bit. When we passed this originally, the use

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

could only be for public infrastructure purposes and it had to be a front door referendum. That's still the case unless you also want to utilize the money for property tax relief. It's my understanding you have to tell the voters on the front end what you're going to do."

Righter: "Right, I understand that. But then at a later period can the municipality come back and run a referendum asking for permission to change the purpose for which they want to use that money?"

Hoffman: "Yes, and that would be up to the voters then. I mean they could all... I think if... I don't want to preclude a municipality who may have... have last year passed a half percent sales tax to be used for infrastructure improvements to not be able to go back and provide property tax relief for their citizens if the citizens want it."

Righter: "Okay, sure."

Hoffman: "So, I don't want to preclude that from happening, if that's your question. I think we should leave that option open."

Righter: "Following up on a question that Representative Black asked, if they intend to use the half percent sales tax increase to offset property taxes, what wording is in the referendum that if I'm a voter in that kind of municipality that I can read and rely on that I know there's going to be a dollar for dollar reduction in property taxes? I mean:

(a) is there that kind of wording in the referendum, and (b) even if there is and they violate that, what's my remedy?"

Hoffman: "Well, I mean, like anything else if the... if the...

the referendum would speak for itself and the referendum would have to indicate the uses of this tax. Okay.

Currently... current law allows them only to use them for

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

public infrastructure purposes. This referendum, if the municipality so chooses to put this before the voters, would have to say that a portion of it, a quarter percent or all of it, is going to be used for property tax relief. If they violate that, it's like any other time that a municipality or a governmental entity violates our statute, there could be a taxpayers' lawsuit to enforce it. So, the reason for this Bill or my intent is to provide taxpayers the ability to not have to raise their taxes one-half percent and provide them the ability to have another way to reduce property taxes."

Righter: "Is the wording of the referendum dictated by the Bill?"

Hoffman: "I apologize, I was talking to the staff."

Righter: "Is the... is the wording of the referendum dictated by State Law under this?"

Hoffman: "Well, existing law provides for, I believe, wording however, I don't believe in this law there is specific wording in the... of the referendum in the proposed Bill."

Righter: "So, you don't think that it's... the referendum's exact language is dictated under the Bill. Because there are other areas in the Municipal Code, such as when a municipality is trying to change its form of government where State Law dictates exactly what the referendum says."

Hoffman: "What has to said. I don't... I was looking through the... in looking through the Bill, I don't see that we did that initially, when we passed this a couple of years ago, put the specific wording in here. And we didn't change that. All we did in this Bill is we indicated the uses, the expenditures, we added to expenditure, that it could be used for expenditures for public infrastructure or for property tax relief or both. So, the referendum that goes before the voters would have to obviously reflect the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

uses."

- Righter: "Is it your understanding under the Bill that each... ya know, if a referendum were passed by a community approving a half cent... I'm sorry, a half percent sales tax increase that was to go for property tax relief that there would have to be an accounting each year of to what exactly revenues were made on that extra half percent and then that'd be applied toward property tax bills? I mean, how would... how would that work?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I mean, the municipality... the tax relief would obviously go and provide tax relief of the municipal property tax. So, every year what would happen is you would collect a given amount and the next year... the next year that amount that you collect would be reduced from the individual's property tax."
- Righter: "As a... as a voter in a community, if this referendum is presented to me, do I have any assurances, based on the language in the Bill, that this is not a situation where the sales tax referendum is passed. The first year or two I see a break on my property taxes assessed by the municipality and then the municipality just goes... assesses right back up and in three years out I'm not only paying as much or more in property tax as I was paying three years ago, I am now also paying an extra half percent on my sales tax?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I would suggest if... I guess, you could say we do that here in the General Assembly in some form, but the intent of the Bill and I think that the... ultimately, if that happens and it's used as a subterfuge in order to just get more money to the coffers of the municipality, ultimately there could be a taxpayers' lawsuit that could stop that from happening. But the intent here, is to allow

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

taxpayers to choose on their own, by referendum, by front door referendum, how they wish to be taxed and allow them to have less of a tax burden than we initially did when we passed this two years ago."

Righter: "Right, but as a voter in that community, I don't... I don't have any guarantee that my total tax burden to the community is gonna... is going to not go up even if I pass this. All this means that... is that the community's gonna take some extra money in sales tax money and then three years later I'm gonna wind up paying the same in property tax, which is nothing but a net tax increase to me."

Hoffman: "Well, I mean... so the people who do that should be voted out of office, okay? I mean, that ultimately that's... that's what you can do. But you know this, it's my feeling that and it's the Municipal League's feeling and the reason the Municipal League is pushing this is they would like to provide that option to their citizens. The intent of this legislation is to allow more flexibility to taxpayers, to municipalities, to not force those municipalities to raise it up a quarter ... on the taxpayers one-half a percent and if the taxpayers so choose, by front door referendum to provide real property tax relief by changing the way that they pay taxes. they don't want to do that and they're concerned about what you're saying... you're talking about, Representative, they would vote 'no' on the referendum and they would probably vote against the people who proposed it. But they can vote 'no' on the referendum. Now, currently, I guarantee you... I guarantee you under current law and the way the current law is that your underlying tax burden will go up if the referendum is voted in. There's no option to use this money for property tax relief. This provides the local

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

municipalities that option."

Righter: "Okay. Representative, thank you for your time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill for the reason that it is almost identical to House Bill 1921, which I sponsored over a year ago. The purpose of this Bill, as the Sponsor has very ably described it, is to provide some flexibility for the municipalities and the taxpayers within this municipalities. The largest community in my current district has a state university in it. That state university's property does not pay property taxes. Many of the taxpayers within that municipality feel an undue or a very large property tax burden because they have to continue to provide the services not only for the university but for the students enrolled and therefore feel that there ought to be ways that... could they... could possibly spread out that tax burden and at the same time provide them some property tax relief. I think the flexibility described in this Bill is very appropriate. does provide a front door referendum to the taxpayers of that municipality. If they choose to add an additional level of propert... of sales taxes onto the residents of the community and the college students and the parents that for weekend visits, then that assists them in providing additional revenue for infrastructure purposes, as well as property tax relief. I think that it does provide another option for the people of these communities that feel that their property tax burden to go to provide the services... the infrastructure services within the community is unfair to them, whereas they are still

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

providing services to those who don't pay taxes. I think this certainly offers another avenue to collect some additional revenue, provide property tax relief, and still fund the very necessary infrastructure improvements."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As was indicated in the debate and was so eloquently just stated by the previous speaker, this really provides municipalities and taxpayers with an option when it comes to building infrastructure and providing property tax relief. Don't... this... we already, two years ago, I believe, made the decision that we're gonna allow front door referendums for this purpose. This just gives the municipality and the taxpayer more flexibility in making decisions how they would like to be taxed and where they're going to provide property tax relief. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2037?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 79 Members voting 'yes', 37 Members 'no'... 37 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we can just have a moment of your attention to recognize an outstanding charity. Yesterday, you passed a Resolution, House Resolution 872, honoring the Ronald McDonald House Charities on their anniversary of 25 years of service. As

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

a reminder, today, Ronald McDonald Houses are open in 216 locations, over 20 countries with more than 5 thousand bedrooms available for families every night. On April 28th, 2002, the Ronald McDonald House near Children's Memorial Hospital in Chicago will celebrate its anniversary. This house was the second Ronald McDonald House to open in the world. Over 35 thousand families of pediatric patients have been accommodated in Illinois through Ronald McDonald House in Chicago and their charities. And you might be interested to know that in the Ronald McDonald House charities nearly... have awarded nearly \$60 million in grants. Since 1974, having served over 2 million families whose children are receiving medical care throughout the world. We recognize the efforts of Ronald McDonald House charities by passing the Resolution and we recognize them who have rendered a service of tremendous compassion for millions of children and their families not only in Illinois but across the nation. So, it's my honor and I know it is yours too to welcome them to Springfield to congratulate them on their 25th anniversary. Please recognize the Ronald McDonald House charities. They're up here in the gallery. Please stand up and say 'hello'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hoffman: "Yes, a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Hoffman: "I would just like to echo what Leader Daniels indicated regarding the McDonald... Ronald McDonald House. I'd also like to point out in the gallery is a former individual who lived on the same dorm floor as me, Patrick Theisen, who now represents McDonald's. And he was more affectionately

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

known at that time as 'the dancing bear'. Patrick Theisen."

- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the... back to the General Assembly,
 Mr. Theisen. On page 2 of the Calendar, on House Bills or
 Senate Bills-Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1552.
 Representative O'Brien. Mary K. O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1552 addresses issues related to damage of new cars. A lot of times when new vehicles are being transported from the factory to the dealership they may sustain some damage. The law requires that a damage report be filed on these except with... very limited exceptions, scratches to the paint and maybe cracked windshields. dealer would not have to certify that the vehicle is damaged under that circumstance. Oh, no, I'm sorry. was not the Bill that I thought it was gonna be. This is an easier Bill, even easier. 1552 just establishes the Route 66 license plate Bill. It would establish a fund and the money would go to the Illinois Route 66 Heritage Fund for that. Mr. Speaker, I know that you guys are getting a big kick out of this."
- Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to start over again,

 Representative O'Brien?"

O'Brien: "No. I think that's funny for the..."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to do it all again?"

O'Brien: "It's been a big day..."

Speaker Hartke: "Yeah, I know."

O'Brien: "... for somebody that hasn't been out of the house in a couple weeks, you know."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Well, why don't you start over and do Senate Bill..."

O'Brien: "1552."

Speaker Hartke: "... 1552."

O'Brien: "Establishes the Route 66 license plate fund. And what it does is it ... would establish a new fund for Route 66 license plates. The proceeds would go into the fund for tourism, for Route 66 promotion and development along that corridor. And I'd be happy to answer any questions about that or any other Bill. Thank you."

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

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor has me thoroughly confused. Will she yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "She... she will yield."

Black: "Now, Representative, you said something about if you scratch the license plate it can't be held against you or the value of the car won't diminish?"

O'Brien: "That's right."

Black: "Or is that on another Bill? All right."

O'Brien: "It could be..."

Black: "The only question that I have Representative, since you've got me in trouble since you've been gone, if I see one of these Route 66 plates on a real nice car, will I be able to take a picture of it?"

O'Brien: "You will, as long as you're not trying to do that...

you are trying to damage anyone's property."

Black: "All right."

O'Brien: "If you stand away from the vehicle, you can take a picture of the license plate."

Black: "But if there's a pig driving the car, I can't take a picture of the plate then, right?"

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

O'Brien: "If there's just one pig in the car, but two would be considered that they would be a confinement and then you would run into some problems."

Black: "Well, I recognize a 'pork' Bill when I see it."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Bill. I'm a cosponsor. And I don't know what Mary K. said, but I'm all for her. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Representative O'Brien, I... this is not of respect to your specific Bill, but I just would note that if the Secretary of State would promulgate the rules on legislation that we've already enacted to become law, that all of these special plates, albeit the right reasons: Route 66, I think it was a black sorority that had a plate, there's been the hospice plates. All of these... we have found that many have not had the opportunity to have the numbers to actually put them into the marketplace and help those charities that we're trying to benefit. There is a law on the books that this General Assembly passed unanimously or overwhelmingly and the Governor signed into law. I would encourage those in earshot to encourage the Secretary of State to promulgate the rules so that all of these speciality plates can go into effect still utilizing a degree of visibility that law enforcement supports and allow many of these charities to receive the funds that they are pursuing. So, Representative O'Brien, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to use your Bill as a chance to try to encourage the Secretary of State to start moving on it."

O'Brien: "Thank you."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

- Holbrook: "... is gonna be... hopefully, you'll be seeing a trailer Bill in a few days with Representative Bost and Representative Davis and I have put together to address the exact issue that Representative Rutherford brought up here. We're gonna try to get this process under control on these speciality plates. And I'm all for this Bill. It's the exact type of Bill we need to help raise money for these type of programs, but no taxpayer should be paying the expense for it. We're gonna be handling that before the end of this Session, Representative Rutherford. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to add to what the previous speaker said and that is, that that... that those Amendments should be called within the next couple days. We will be able to pass those and then these plates will, hopefully, move without controversy from hereon out."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative O'Brien to close on this Bill."
- O'Brien: "I would just urge my colleagues to cast an 'aye' vote.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1552?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 Members voting 'yes', 15 Members

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2050, Representative Currie, Barb Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2050, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Stroke is the number one cause of disability in this country, the number three killer. This legislation would create a task force under the Department of Public Health. There are new medications available which when taken early at the onset of stroke symptoms can make an enormous difference both in the development of disability and the likelihood of an individual, in fact, dying. This task force would have to be charged with the responsibility to assess best practices in the field and to promulgate and develop public education pieces as well as work with the emergency medical technicians and the emergency medical room specialists in order to see to it that the public has a clearer idea of what to do in the event of stroke and medical professionals have a better response to stroke symptoms. I know of no I'd be happy to answer your questions. opposition. And I'd be appreciative of your support for passage of the Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2050?' 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

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2052, Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, please 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. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2052 does officially repeal Illinois Wine and Spirits Industry Fair Dealing Act of 1999, commonly known as the Wirtz law. This is a law that has been found unconstitutional. It actually has never gone into practice due to a preliminary injunction that was brought almost immediately after its effective date. District Court of the Northern District of Illinois has enjoined the law. The Liquor Control Commission is not enforcing the law and the Governor's Office has withdrawn any support for trying to override the appeal. So, I think it's a cleanup measure, that we can take this off the statute books. We're talking about putting unnecessary things on the statute books earlier today and this will help clean up the book a little bit and remove something that's never going to come into practice. I'm very grateful for the bipartisan support I've gotten on this. You can see it from our five Sponsors and also, this Bill passed the Senate by a score of 54-0-2. Thank you."

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

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

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

Cross: "Representative, I'm a bit puzzled as to why you're doing

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

this if the court... you said that federal court or the US District Court, I assume, in northern Illinois, the northern district, found this Act unconstitutional?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Cross: "Why are... so, the law's not in effect as we stand here today, is it?"

McCarthy: "The repeal will basically take it out of the statute books."

Cross: "Right."

McCarthy: "I think... I think it was wrong-headed measure to start off with and I think that we can say that this was probably a law that we never should have an enacted and so, let's take it out of the books. It seems like the opinions of almost anyone involved, at least anyone I've spoken to, has said that this Bill will... should be repealed and I'm..."

Cross: "Well..."

McCarthy: "... proud to be the Sponsor of it."

Cross: "My point is, it almost seems like we're doing this purely for political motive... purely political reasons. The courts have said that the Bill we passed, signed by the Governor, is unconstitutional. So, what's the point of us repealing an unconstitutional piece of legislation?"

McCarthy: "Well, I believe we have a duty to keep the statute book as clean as we possible can. I don't think it's a political thing whatsoever. I didn't mention one person that voted for this Bill or one person who voted against the Bill. I just simply said that this is a cleanup measure. This is a statute that's not going to be enforced. Why should it be in the statute books? We can remove it from the statute books by officially repealing it."

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Cross: "Well, Representative, again I... and I... this is gonna get a lot of votes, everybody wants to say they're the ones... they're the pe... they repealed the Wine and Spirits Fair Dealing Act. But, correct me if I'm wrong, but I've been here ten years and every time a Bill's been ruled unconstitutional and unfortunately there have been quite a few, I have yet to see us, once the courts rule it unconstitutional, repeal it. Have you filed any Bills to repeal those Bills that have been found unconstitutional, other than this one?"

McCarthy: "Other than this one, no."

Cross: "All right."

McCarthy: "But if you'll alert me to those, I'd be happy to file them."

Cross: "Have you filed a Bill to repeal the liquor tax that was just ruled unconstitutional a couple weeks ago?"

McCarthy: "I think... I think that... that Bill is still in litigation and there's still further appeals on that Bill that are being pursued. So, I think it would be..."

Cross: "Well, this is potentially appealable, so I guess I'm concerned about... seems to be some contradiction there.

There was a Bill... the Supreme Court, in the Illinois Supreme Court about two weeks ago ruled the 15, 20 and life unconstitutional, Representative, have you filed a Bill to repeal that section of the statute?"

McCarthy: "No, I haven't."

Cross: "All right."

McCarthy: "This is the... the Bill I filed."

Cross: "Truth in sentencing was thrown out as unconstitutional.

Has anybody in this chamber filed a Bill to repeal that?"

McCarthy: "I can only speak for myself. I have not."

Cross: "All right, Representative. I, again, I just question the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

need for this other than the political motivation. So, thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Representative."

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

McCarthy: "Thank you. I think this is a measure worthy of support. And I would appreciate your affirmative vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2052?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 on the Calendar, on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1975. Representative Mendoza. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1975, a Bill for an Act concerning day labor. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Amendment #2 amends the Prevailing Wage Act. The Amendment is identical to the final version of House Bill 5996 which passed the House without any opposition. The Amendment contains the following provisions: it authorizes the Department of Labor to inspect the records of out-of-state businesses. Under the Amendment, an out-of-state business will be obligated to provide the

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

department the names, occupations, and wages of employees working on projects that are subject to the Prevailing Wage Act requirement. An out-of-state employer may provide the department with either the original wage records or accurate copy thereof. This portion of the Amendment is an initiative of the Department of Labor. The Amendment also requires the Department of Labor to consolidate two or more investigatory hearings on the issue of establishing a new prevailing wage rate classification for a particular craft or type of worker. Under current law, the Department of Labor has the authority to consolidate the hearings, but it's not required to do so by law. A party requesting a consolidating hearing will also have the burden of showing that there are no existing prevailing wage classifications for the category of work in question within any of the localities under consideration in the proposed consolidating hearing. Automatic consolidation of hearings will make it more feasible for unions to establish new prevailing wage classification on a statewide basis without having ... without being forced to litigate this issue on a county by county basis. The portion of this Amendment was originally requested by local #6 of the Bricklayer's International Union which is seeking to establish a new wage classification of tile finisher throughout the region in northern and central Illinois. And I would just ask the adop... Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Floor Amendment #2? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1975?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 2 of the Calendar, on Third Reading-Senate Bills appears Senate Bill 1851.

Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act in relation to business transactions. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

O'Brien: "... Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I did speak with most of the Members briefly about this Bill a littler earlier today. What this Bill would do is it would amend the freight carriers like for new vehicles. Currently, under Illinois law, new vehicles when they're transported from the factory to the dealership if there's any damage that's incurred they have to report that as damage to the vehicle. They have to notify prospective buyers, with very limited exceptions, one of them being, if the paint is scratched or if the windshield is broken, something of that nature. Well, what happens because of the increase in technology, CD players, cell phones, and televisions are often put into the vehicle at the factory and then transported. If they're damaged or stolen, right now they have to report that as a damage to the vehicle and this legislation would say, if they're gonna be replaced with factory stock equipment, the same exact equipment, that they would also be exempt from the damage language. It's not that they wouldn't be replaced, if they're just gonna tear it out and replace it then they would fall under the exemption. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 1851?

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

'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1851?' All those in
favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

'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 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Resolution 725, Mr. Dart. Mr. Clerk... or Mr. Dart on the Resolution."

- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This merely would allow us to designate April as the Child Prevention... Abuse Prevention Month. We're a little late on this, but the different groups that work in this area asked if we could pass this. And I'd appreciate a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on the Resolution?

 Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 725?' All those in
 favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the
 opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the
 Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, for a committee
 schedule."
- Clerk Bolin: "The Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will meet immediately after Session in Room 114 and the State Government Administration Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 in Room 118."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black for an announcement."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of Governor George Ryan and First Lady, Lura Lynn Ryan, want to extend, on their behalf, an invitation to any of you to a reception tonight in honor of the Hellenic Community of Illinois, 7 to 9 p.m. at the Illinois Executive Mansion, business attire or national dress. So, there is a reception tonight

129th Legislative Day

May 8, 2002

that the Governor and First Lady are inviting us to from 7 to 9 p.m."

Speaker Hartke: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 11 a.m. on Thursday, May the 9th. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow."