60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Bob Herath of the First United Methodist Church in Decatur. Pastor Herath is the guest of Representative Bill Mitchell. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Herath: "Let us pray. Almighty God, You have given us the responsibility of caring for the people we are elected to govern. It is a humbling task which we do not take lightly. And so, we ask for Your grace to lead, Your wisdom to make the decisions necessary, Your concern for the least of these, and for Your forgiveness when we fail. This is a great state. We give You thanks for the bounty of our fields, the productivity of our factories and our offices, and for the safety and health of our citizens. Help us to see not only what exists today, but grant us a vision for what we may become. Grant us not only the resources to continue to build our future, but give us the patience and the fortitude to make sure that no one is left behind. Pour out Your spirit on those who have been called to govern, watch over them, give them the strength and the wisdom they need to be faithful leaders. And that those whose lives are touched by their actions, that they may be Bless our Governor, bless our Senators, bless our blessed. Representatives, and most of all, may God bless our great State of Illinois. Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Giles."

Giles - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

for all."

- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Shirley Jones is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Sommer and Representative Stephens are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' House Joint Resolution 34; 'recommends be adopted as amended' House Resolution 122. Representative Steve Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Constitutional Officers, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 263. Representative Slone, Chairperson from the Committee on Conservation & Land Use, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution adopted as amended' House Resolution 200. 264; 'be Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Computer Technology, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001,

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 207. Representative Crotty, Chairperson from the Committee on Children & Youth, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 265. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Child Support Enforcement, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 284. Representative McGuire, Chairperson from the Committee Aging, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 16, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Joint Resolution 33. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 17, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Joint Resolution 24. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 17, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 240. Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 17, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 258. Representative Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 17, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 233, House Resolution 288, House Joint Resolution 32, and House Joint Resolution 40. Representative Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 17, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 417."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 1032. Representative O'Brien on Senate Bill 1032. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1032, a Bill for an Act concerning labor relations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Senate Bill 1032 establishes, by statute, the zero tolerance policy for both the Illinois Department of Corrections employees and for the Illinois State Police. It would require for employees to submit to drug testing. And if they fail that drug test or if they refuse to take the drug test, they would automatically be terminated because failure or refusal to take the test would be the same as a positive drop or a positive test result. This has been negotiated and there is no opposition to the Bill. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Durkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, could you tell me just a little bit how this drug testing policy's gonna work? Is it gonna be

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

just... We're giving rules to the Department of Corrections to set up their own guidelines about when the employees are gonna be tested or is this something which is already in the statute which is gonna set the parameters on the testing?"

O'Brien: "The Department, my understanding, will be setting up their rules. The Department will be setting up their rules..."

Durkin: "Okay."

O'Brien: " ... for the testing of their employees. And the State

Police would have their own, you know, random..."

Durkin: "Is this... Do we know if it's gonna be done on a yearly basis or is there any time frame which we're talking about?

Or are we just giving them the discretion to test at whatever they think is the appropriate time?"

O'Brien: "They already have testing procedures in place. This would not change those procedures. So, that we're not making any statutory changes to when a test would have to occur or their procedures under which they notify an employee regarding a test."

Durkin: "Okay. Now this is the... this has been agreed upon with AFSCME, correct?"

O'Brien: "Correct."

Durkin: "Great. Thank you very much."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Representative Durkin."

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I have followed this with some interest.

I have two correct... well, one correctional facility in my district. I had two until the last remap. Heaven knows

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

what this remap will do. In your opinion, have we abrogated the rights of collective bargaining by running this Bill?"

O'Brien: "Well, I think that the... there were intense negotiations, part of which, you know, AFSCME participated in. And that this does reflect some of what is in their current contract. And I don't imagine it would ever come out. So, because they have participated in this and agreed to it, I don't think that we have, you know, overthrown their collective bargaining rights. Certainly, I wouldn't be here as a Sponsor if that were the case."

Black: "I understand that. But does this then codify a base line which would not be subject to collective bargaining in the next contract? If the AFSCME union wanted to change this policy, it would appear that it would not be subject to negotiation because it is now, in fact, part of a statute."

O'Brien: "Correct."

Black: "All right. But AFSCME has agreed to this?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Now, in the current scheme of things, this Bill, I know, will pass and, I assume, will be signed into law. Where is the pension plan that also has already been approved by this Body? Is it on the Governor's desk or is it pending approval of this Bill, their pension enhancement plan that at one time became linked to this Bill?"

O'Brien: "I believe that this Bill stands alone. Now, whether or not the pension enhancement Bill that was tied to it, whether or not that continues to be tied is something that I'm not aware of. And I think that..."

Black: "Okay."

O'Brien: "...this has been agreed to and that that sort of, you know, untied these two Bills together. Since this has been

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

agreed and negotiated and we're moving forward with it, I think that there is an agreement that that measure will also move forward but that they are not now tied that one has to reach the Governor's desk..."

Black: "Right."

O'Brien: "...at the same time."

Black: "Well, the reason I ask you, like most of us, I don't like surprises. And I don't want to go home this weekend and get a phone call from my correctional officers' union president or bargaining chairman and say, wait a minute, the pension plan was supposed to move concurrently. So, is it safe to assume that if AFSCME has agreed to 1032, there is also somewhere an agreement on the pension plan that was hung up earlier this year?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tom Johnson."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Johnson: "Yes, Representative O'Brien, as I understand this Bill now, it really goes when we talk about zero tolerance of drugs, we're really talking about one bite at the apple instead of the current two or three bites if, in fact, drugs are found in somebody's system, a correctional officer's system or whatever, right?"

O'Brien: "Correct."

Johnson: "Okay. And this, I also understand that the compromise on this is that we're still doing about 20% random testing, is that correct? And that's not really changing here?"

O'Brien: "No."

Johnson: "Okay. All right. To the Bill. I strong... I stand, of course, in very strong support of this piece of

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

legislation. As you know, through prison reform in the past years where we had high incidence of inmates testing positive of drugs within the institution, we also had very high incidence of correctional officers testing positive. And, you know, it's pretty difficult if correctional officer and, in fact, you're using drugs to sit and oversee an inmate who is charged and, in fact, serving time within the Department of Corrections for that precisely of which your guard now is using. So, I believe that this is a very fair and a very appropriate way to go. I think that the procedures are in there in terms of correctional officers' rights. You know, I would like to see this cover all of the nonunion personnel, as well, management right up to the director in terms of the random testing and I believe we've started that. But I think that Corrections has been on the right track, as has AFSCME. And I applaud this piece of legislation and urge your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative O'Brien to close."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge an 'aye' vote. This is a measure that has been agreed upon and will help keep our correctional officers safe in their workplace. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading... For what purpose does Mr. Delgado seek recognition?"

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a personal privilege."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Delgado: "I just wanted to recognize some of my good friends from the Logan Square Neighborhood Association here visiting from Logan Square from my district. We have Deborah McCoy up in the audience. I want to give her a nice Springfield welcome. So... people of Logan Square. Welcome to the chamber, Deborah."

Speaker Madigan: " ... that Bill's... On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 28, Mr. Brosnahan. Do you wish to call the Bill? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Moffitt on Senate Bill 42. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act relating to genetic testing information. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 42 came over to the House as a shell Bill and we put an Amendment on it. Just a brief history. The Genetic Privacy Information Act was passed in '97. that time, really, Illinois was on the cutting edge of this It said that for insurance coverage or new legislation. employment you could not require a genetic test without the person's approval. We'd like to take it a step further And this Amendment says, in the case of insurance, regardless of where you get genetic information you cannot use it to discriminate against the person that's applying or it cannot be used for discriminatory purposes. other states have added this clause. We feel this just closes the loophole in the law. And there's no opposition to this now with this second Amendment that we put on here. Be happy to entertain any questions."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is a Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Arthur Turner on Senate Bill 78. Is Mr. Arthur Turner in the chamber? Representative Kurtz on Senate Bill 101. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 101, a Bill for an Act concerning public funds. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kurtz."

Kurtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 101 is identical to my Bill, 1810, that was passed unanimously. It has to do with municipal reporting by the treasurer. It adds new categories. It raises those categories. In fact, it actually saves very small villages from some of the expenses. It was offered to me by the Illinois Press Association in conjunction with the municipal league. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

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

There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: " ... Bill 163, Representative Moore. Andrea

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Moore. Out of the record. Senate Bill 326, Representative May. Representative May. Out of the record. Senate Bill 371, Representative Daniels... and Coulson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 371, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Amendment... Committee Amendment #1 replaces the original language with House Bill 3192 and House Bill 3392. Both of these passed out of the initiatives House unanimously. They are  $\circ$ f t.he Developmental Disabilities Council. One of them, the 3192, regarding transition planning and services for children who are leaving the secondary schools. And the other creates a workforce task force to identify and address employment barriers for persons with disabilities. Both of these Bills, as I said, passed out unanimously out of the House. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 371?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May, would you like to vote? Representative Wojcik. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 371, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 373, Representative Mendoza. Out of the record. Senate Bill 461, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 504, Representative Beaubien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 396,

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Representative Coulson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 598, Representative Hassert. Out of the record. Senate Bill 627, Representative Daniels. Cross. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know there's some Members that want to join me as cosponsors on this Bill. I... It means a lot to me and Representative Turner'd like to do that. So, I may take a little bit of time to explain this. This is a very simple Bill in concept and actually, it's simple its text, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. creates a pilot program. It's a Bill that was sponsored by President Philip over in the Senate. And it's a Bill that came to his attention because some parents realized that when their children ages 18 and under get traffic tickets, they're oftentimes they're never notif... not oftentimes, they're never notified and oftentimes, kids don't tell their parents about traffic tickets. So, this Bill simply says that we're gonna try a pilot program in this state and we're gonna limit it, it's very specific, we're gonna limit it to Kendall County, Sangamon County, and DuPage County. And we're gonna require that the clerk's office, starting in January 1 of the year 2002 and running through December 31 of 2003, in those particular counties, that parents be notified when a violation is issued to a person who is under the age of 18 and who is a resident of these three respective counties notify the registered owner of the vehicles. It makes sense in this day and age when we talk about responsibility and communication between parents and children that parents know when their juvenile kids, their

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

16- and 17-year-olds, get traffic tickets. It's an opportunity for them to have discussion at home, perhaps some discipline, however they want to handle it, but it's imperative that they know about it. This Bill, we think, accomplishes it. And I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

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

Saviano: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Saviano: "Is this an Agreed Bill? Is everybody onboard?"

Cross: "You know, Representative, unfortunately, I don't have the gift of negotiating that you do. I would like... I hope that everybody's onboard. I don't think the 16- and 17-year-old kids are onboard, but hopefully, the others are. But you ask a very valid question."

Saviano: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Lang: "Representative, how did you pick these three counties for the pilot project."

Cross: "Senator Philip... Representative Lang, it's a good question and one I asked... picked 'em on his own. My guess is, he obviously picked his own county 'cause he lives there and represents that area. I know he has a very good relationship with a former state's attorney in Kendall County, which happens to be my home county, an area I represent. And then I guess... I don't know how he got to Sangamon, but I believe it was in President Philip's explanation. Apparently, the diversity of those three counties is why he picked 'em."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Lang: "Perhaps you could comment on this for me. I find it unusual in the Bill that the State Police is the entity that's going to report to the General Assembly on the effectiveness of these pilot projects. But it's not the State Police that's doing the reporting, you have the county clerks doing the reporting. Now, I know that originally the county clerks were opposed to the Bill because they didn't feel it was their responsibility or should be their responsibility to do this work, they thought the State Police should do it. And then you have the State Police doing the reporting to us. I'm wondering why the State Police aren't doing the whole project."

"Well, I... Why would the State Police not be doing Cross: whole project is your question, Lou? In most... And I don't want to speak for Sangamon or Dupage, but I suspect they would be similar to what goes on in Kendall. Very few traffic violations or traffic tickets are written by State Police, certainly on perhaps the tollway or on major highways, but by and large, local traffic violations are written by either, you know, municipal police officers or county police officers. Certainly, the State Police can write them, but as a general rule, I don't think they write the types of tickets we're talking about. And I... That's why I would suggest that the State Police shouldn't be in charge of the program. You ask a very good question, make a good point about why under the last paragraph... why they would report to the General Assembly. I'm not sure that there's consistency in that part of the Bill. But the meat and potatoes of the Bill really is the reporting to the parents and because it's a pilot program, perhaps we can clean up the State Police language. I hope I have been responsive to your question, but I'm not so sure that they

- 60th Legislative Day

  May 17, 2001

  should be doing that. It's a good point."
- Lang: "And I just want to make sure I understand. So, is it when the traffic stop takes place in one of these three counties and the driver of the vehicle is a resident of that county where this kicks in?"
- Cross: "It... When the ticket is issued for a violation to a person who's under the age of 18 who is a resident of the county in which the traffic citation was issued. So, the answer is 'yes'."
- Lang: "So, if someone from your county, Kendall, is driving in DuPage, who's also going to have this pilot project, and they get stopped, do they get reported?"
- Cross: "I would... I read it that they would not be reported."
- Lang: "So, it has to be the same county that you're driving in has to be your residency? If it's a different county, they're not reporting?"
- Cross: "Lou, that's how I read the Bill. I believe we're on the same page on that, at least our interpretation of the Bill."
- Lang: "Just one more question. And maybe it's... it might be the most important one. Why do we want to put the onus on circuit clerks to report something that's really within the province of law enforcement?"
- Cross: "I'm not sure... Lou, another good question. I'm not sure the thought process of deciding why the police or why the clerk's office. I would... From a recordkeeping standpoint, from a notice standpoint, from an information gathering standpoint, I would suggest to you that perhaps the clerk's office has more information, would have access to more information. I think they're gonna have to work with law enforcement on this to accomplish what they're required to do in the Bill. But I think it's easier for a

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

clerk's office to send out information as opposed to a law enforcement office. They have the mechanism in place to do it."

Lang: "One other question, I'm sorry. It will not be the same people administering this in DuPage that administered the child support enforcement program, will it?"

Cross: "No."

Lang: "Thank you."

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

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "Representative, I believe that Representative Lang touched on it a bit. So, our concern, I believe, is whether or not the circuit clerks have access to this information. I've heard from our local circuit clerks, I've heard from clerks throughout the state. They're very concerned about this because they don't have this information; therefore, we're asking them to do something which they have no access to the information. So, are you providing any funding for them to obtain the information? Is there anything in this Bill that will give them that information? And finally, what is the position of the local circuit clerks of this pilot project?"

Cross: "Well, Jay, I think if you'll look at this specific language, most everything in the notice that goes out from the clerk they will have access to if they utilize the ticket. The date and time the violation which alleged to have been committed, that will be on the ticket. The location where the violation was alleged to have been committed again on the ticket, the name of the person cited again on the ticket, and the violation alleged to have been

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

committed will all be on the ticket, as well as number five, the date and time of any required court appearance by the person cited for committing is all on the ticket, as you know, Jay. I think what they could do is simply send a copy of the ticket to the registered owner. Now, to your point, the one thing they probably don't have is registered owner of the vehicle and I think that's been the crux of their concern and a valid concern, a valid question. I think in these three counties where, again, this is and I stress, it's a pilot program. And remember, we're talking about a limited number of people. We're just talking about 16- and 17-year-olds. They're gonna have to work with local law enforcement to get that information. So... Everything will be available to them on the ticket with the exception of the registered owner and if they can get that from law enforcement, I think law enforcement and circuit clerks are gonna have to work together. And I've heard from the clerks, I know they have some concerns. Senator Philip, pretty insistent on passing this. I think it's his belief that because it's a pilot program, we can work out those... that concern 'cause I think that's really the only concern, the registered owner issue. Everything else is on the ticket."

Hoffman: "Well, and I think it is. But that's the crux of the Bill. The whole crux of the Bill is you have to give notice to the registered owner and if you don't know the registered owner, somehow you have to figure that out. And I don't know... I guess my question, that is not on... generally, is not on the ticket, it's my understanding."

Cross: "Well, that's something that... That's something... I mean, we do things all the time in this General Assembly, Jay, of putting... you know, requiring people to do things.

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

That's something that law enforcement and the clerks will have to... will be able to work out. Again, I stress, this is a pilot program. We may find out in two years that this doesn't work. We may find out this in two years that the parents of the state think it's great and we may have to make some changes. I don't know that we're gonna expand it. I think it's gonna require the cooperation of law enforcement with clerks probably to supply that information. I don't quarrel with that concern, but I think that's how we address it as law enforcement will work with clerks."

Hoffman: "Well, wouldn't it be easier... I mean, it's my understanding that law enforcement... If the State Police stops somebody, at that point, they have the information 'cause they'll call it up on their computer of who the registered owner is. It would seem to me rather than putting this mandate on local circuit clerks, it would be easier if a copy of the ticket were sent by the police department as opposed to the local circuit clerks. Because the circuit clerks don't have access to this information, that's their opposition. We're not giving 'em any money. We're not saying how they're gonna get the information. And finally, it's my understanding that they don't want this duty."

Cross: "They what?"

Hoffman: "They do not want this duty. The circuit clerks that I've talked to don't want to do thi... don't believe that they have access to the information and they don't have the funding to do this."

Cross: "Well..."

Hoffman: "So, why don't we just say that the law enforcement community shall do it?"

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Cross: "Well, that would certainly be one way to do it. again, when you start... remember, Jay, you look at all the other criteria of the... or the things that need to be sent to the parent, the clerk's office will have access to all of that other information. The law enforcement might not have access to or know the court date, for instance. may not know the location. I mean, sometimes you'll write that on a ticket. I think oftentimes, you probably do. think what's gonna have to happen to address this is law enforcement will have to write on the ticket the registered owner. I don't know that it's on the ticket right now. I'm not sure... I remember when I was in the State's Attorneys Office and I know... I see you're shaking your head no. I'm not sure that there's a place on the ticket for it. But I think that's what... If they do that, if law enforcement simply writes on here, registered owner Tom Cross, Sr. or Tom Cross, Jr., then the circuit clerk will have all the information. And... Jay, I'm not quarreling with your concern. And I realize... I've heard from the clerks too. I would be a little more concerned if we were dealing... if this was a statewide process. The fact that we're limiting it to three and that we can attempt to address their one big concern and I think we can do it with the law enforcement writing on the ticket, I think we can overcome it. If this was a statewide issue, I think we would... you would have... there'd be more of a concern and more merit to this issue for your concern or their concern."

Hoffman: "Finally, have you heard... I understand that this is gonna only affect three counties, it's a pilot program for three counties. What's the position of those local circuit clerks? Have you talked to them?"

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Cross: "I have not heard... I'm not sure about Sangamon. I don't I guess they probably don't like it. I don't know that for a fact. My circuit clerk has some concerns. talked to her about trying to address 'em. I don't know that if I... that I have addressed all of her concerns. But again, I... and we've talked. She's gonna have to come and work out an arrangement with law enforcement. And I think, again, hopefully, we're talkin' about a limited number of tickets. I mean, we're talkin' about kids. And I think, I share Senator Philip's thought process that... or rationale behind this Bill is that parents ought to know when their 16- or 17-year-olds get tickets. And I know in my house the rule was if I told my parents that I got trouble, the punishment at home was a lot less severe if they found out on the street, which they usually would in a small town. So, I don't know if... think there's anything wrong with parents knowin'."

Hoffman: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Hoffman: "Let me just say, first of all, I agree with the concept of the Bill. I agree that there should be... I have no problem with giving the parents of young people, who get tickets, notice that they actually got a ticket. The problem is... And I stand in reluctant opposition. I think everybody on this side of the aisle needs to know this, the Circuit Clerk's Association is totally against this. The reason they're against it is we're requiring them to send notice to parents to obtain information they don't currently have. The concept is good. The problem is the carrying out of the concept is the problem. So, we're doing this and we're fostering this on circuit clerks with no funding, with no information, and we're making sure that

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

they are given a mandate to the local counties that they cannot carry out. So, I... Although I agree with the concept, I stand reluctantly opposed to the Bill. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "This Bill is on Short Debate. There are still three.... four people seeking recognition. Before we go to that, Representative Poe has a very important announcement.

We normally do not interrupt debate, but Mr. Poe insisted."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today's the day that I fry chicken. I just want to let everybody know that the IMA paid for the food, I fixed it. Corinne Wood is furnishing ice cream. And the first half hour, we're gonna let Legislators go. And then after the first half hour, there's plenty of food for the staff. We cooked for about 300, so there's plenty out there. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Poe. Further discussion? Mr. Biggins, would you like to move this to Standard Debate?"

Biggins: "Yes."

Speaker Hartke: "The Bill will be on Standard Debate."

Biggins: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "You have five minutes."

Biggins: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Biggins: "Yes. Now, isn't there a possibility that after this notice is given to the parent, the parent may take action against the child that got the citation and physically harm them?"

Cross: "I hope not, but I guess that could happen."

Biggins: "Well, then, could there be somebody else besides the parent that gets the notification of the citation being issued? For instance, a grandparent."

Cross: "I guess if the grandparents are nearby, you might want

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

to..."

Biggins: "So, is the circuit clerk supposed to find the grandparent then..."

Cross: "No."

Biggins: " ... or the parent?"

Cross: "Just the registered owner."

Biggins: "How about a minister in town?"

Cross: "If their minister's the registered owner, then they could send it to the minister."

Biggins: "School counselor?"

Cross: "If the school counselor's the registered owner, then the school counselor would get that notice."

Biggins: "It's a serious ramifications by these notices being granted and I hate to put the child in any kind of risky situation just because they happen to have the unfortunate occurrence of receiving a traffic citation. Thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Turner, John Turner."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Turner, J.: "Representative, I have heard some of the concerns raised and I have some of those too. But my understanding is, this is just a pilot program, correct?"

Cross: "You, Sir, are correct."

Turner, J.: "And it is only in three different counties?"

Cross: "You again, Representative Turner, are correct."

Turner, J.: "Also, in looking at what is required by way of notification, it would seem to me that simply sending a copy of the uniform traffic citation would comply with the provisions under the statute. Do you agree with that?"

Cross: "Wholeheartedly, Representative. Again, you have gone to

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

the core of this Bill and understand it as fully as anyone could and you're right. It's amazing."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Cross to close."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Turner could. Everything that's said it about as well as I required in this notice is contained in the traffic citation. This is simply a pilot program and it is an experiment in three counties. Those of you that may have some concerns or if your clerks have concerns in other counties, I don't have a... don't think, at this point, have anything to worry about. I know you don't have anything to worry about. We're talking about three counties. There's nothing wrong with a parent knowing that their 16- or 17-year-old has received a traffic ticket. fact, they should know. They should know when their child's been charged with reckless driving or speeding or driving improperly... the wrong lane or not using a traffic signal. Then they can have some discussion at home. We talk day in and day out around this place about responsibility and communication by parents and children. This gives them an opportunity. It's a good Bill. President of the Senate thinks it's a good Bill, he's very serious about it. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 627?' All those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 627, there are 87 Members voting 'yes', 27 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

what reason does Representative Morrow seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

- Morrow: "Yes, in the gallery to the right here, we have the student council from Marquette Elementary School in my district. We want to give them a nice warm of applause.

  Kids, stand up so they can recognize you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly and your State Capitol. Senate Bill 698, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 835, Representative Mautino. Senate Bill 837, Representative Hannig. Representative Poe. Representative Poe. Senate Bill 837. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 837, a Bill for an Act amending the Sick Leave Bank Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Poe."

- Poe: "This is really cleanup language. And what it does, amends the sick leave bank to allow participating employees to retain his or her own account for at least five days and that's now 10 days. And what this is is an initiative and it's supported by AFSCME. And it's something that's in the AFSCME contract. And this would make it across the board for all state employees."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, in honor of lunch, could we have leave for Attendance Roll Call?"
- Speaker Hartke: "No. Do you have any questions of the Sponsor?

  Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

  'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 837?' All those in favor

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

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 837, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 890, Representative Stroger. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Cross. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1305, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1305, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1305 amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. Basically, what this Bill does, it provides that a child shall not be considered neglected or abused for the sole reason that the child's parent or other person responsible for that child's welfare failed to vaccinate or refused vaccination for the child based on what's already currently in law, which is a religious waiver or a medical waiver. And nothing beyond that. Thank you."

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

Representative Monique Davis. Representative Davis. She

declines recognition."

Davis, M.: "I rise on a point of personal privilege. I can wait."

Speaker Hartke: "I'll come back later."

Davis, M.: "I'll wait. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cowlishaw.

Representative..."

60th Legislative Day May 17, 2001

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: " ... Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cowlishaw: "I shared with you a while back, three questions that I was asked to ask of you on this Bill, simply for the purposes of legislative intent. So, I know that you already have a copy of these questions and have had time to think about them. So, I'm assuming that will not be a burden for you to just briefly answer these three questions. The first one, for purposes of legislative intent is, is the intent of this Bill that vaccination delay or failure to vaccinate for developmental reasons such as Down syndrome or illnesses, does that constitute medical neglect on the part of parents or guardians?"

Feigenholtz: "No. No, it does not."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you. Second question, is this Bill's intent to prohibit physicians from advocating different vaccination schedules than those recommended by medical societies for developmental issues or minor illnesses?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you. The final question. Is this Bill's intent to have physicians write a medical exemption for vaccination delays or failure to vaccinate with approval of the Department of Public Health?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Cowlishaw: "I thank you very much for answering those questions.

I think this Bill deserves to be supported. Thank you very much."

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

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, current Illinois law clearly states that by a certain day of the school term, if the parents do not bring in proof of inoculation, that student cannot continue to attend school. Does this Bill change that underlying law in any way?"

Feigenholtz: "Unless there is a medical waiver for a delayed vaccine that's prescribed by a physician which is already in current statute..."

Black: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...no, it does not."

Black: "So, there's nothing in this Bill... If a parent just chooses for lack of time, lack of interest, or lack of concern not to have their children inoculated with no religious or medical reason, you're not excusing them from the..."

you asked that, Feigenholtz: "No. I'm very glad that Representative Black, because I think it's very, very important that we clarify what this is all about. Last year, there was a Bill in Human Services Committee that would have made a... included a consciousness waiver in... for vaccinations, which would have add a third waiver, not just medical, but simply a religious, not consciousness waiver. That Bill died on a vote of 1 'aye' vote and 11 'no' votes in committee. So, clearly the intent of this legislation is not to expand what we... what is currently in law. It is simply to reinforce what is in law under the Abused Child Act so that people who are adopting children, if they have reason for a delayed vaccine, are not threatened with termination of parental

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

rights..."

Black: "All right."

Feigenholtz: " ... et cetera."

Black: "Thank you very much for that answer, Representative."

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

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1305?' 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. Murphy, would you care to vote? Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1305, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a note of personal privilege again."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Morrow: "I missed a school. We also have the student council of Sherwood Elementary. Will they stand up and be recognized also."

Speaker Hartke: "All right."

Morrow: "And are there any more schools in my district in the gallery?"

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly. The Chair recognizes Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to recognize the two teachers who brought them down who are excellent friends of mine, Wendy Christian and Tess Hi, girl. Oh, there she is. Wonderful to see Bradford. you."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you very much. Welcome to the General Assembly. The Chair recognizes... Senate Bill 835, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 835, a Bill for an Act concerning state finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 835 is the administration Bill from CMS. One, actually, of a series of Bills which will be coming up. This amends the State Finance Act to provide the reimbursement rate for lodging and for state travel in Cook County in the District of Columbia shall be set at the maximum rate in effect under federal regulations. What this is for is, there are ten current travel boards and each time there's a change in the federal rate structure, then they must go back to JCAR and get those changes made. This leaves it... It is permissive and it leaves it in the hands of the local travel boards, allows them to then set it at a lower rate or whatever they feel is appropriate for their budget. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 835?' 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 Senate Bill 835, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 836, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 836, a Bill for an Act amending the

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

State Finance Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."

second Mautino: "Thank you. This is the of the CMS administrative Bills. It amends the State Finance Act and labeled the appropriations payable from Communications Basically, Revolving Fund. this takes telecommunications line item, makes it communications, allows for in addition to telecommunications, but video and messenger to be paid for from those lines. And ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? ... no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 836?' 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 Senate Bill 836, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 326, Representative May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative May."

"Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May: This amends the School Code to allow a tax-equivalent grant for school districts that have military bases. There are 10 districts that are affected; Glenview District 34 with Representative Coulson, North Chicago Representative Garrett, North Shore 112, which I represent, Granite City 9 with Representative Holbrook, Mascoutah 19 with Representative Stephens, O'Fallon 90 with Representative Stephens, Pontiac Holiday 106,

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Representative Stephens, Shiloh Village 85, Representative Stephens, Whiteside 115, Representative Younge, and Wolf Branch 113, Representative Hoffman. I think this is a very important Bill that we've discussed thoroughly. The House Bill we passed was locked in Senate Rules. This is the Senate version. It is exactly the same. It is supported by Lake County. It's the top initiative for Lake County because of the huge impact of the base there by ED-RED and the Large Unit District Association. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
May: "Yes."

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative May, is there federal impact aid given to those school districts that have the military bases within their districts?"

May: "The federal impact aid covers one fraction of what it costs to educate these students. North Chicago spends between 5 and \$6 million a year. And they are suffering. And the state will be worse off if they have to declare bankruptcy. School districts get several hundred dollars. And as we all know, it costs thousands to educate each student. These students are citizens of this state and it's our responsibility to educate them."

Mitchell, J.: "The answer to that question is 'yes'?"

May: "A pittance. Yes."

Mitchell, J.: "Has any be... any attempt been made to contact federal Legislators in order to work on this problem?"

May: "Absolutely. I have contacted our former congressman many times. Dr. Pickles, Superintendent of North Chicago, goes

60th Legislative Day

- May 17, 2001
- to Washington twice a year to beg for money, has been doing it for ten years to no avail. Not only is the money not there, the little bit that they do get is two, three, and four years late, Representative."
- Mitchell, J.: "The money's not there, is that what you say?"
- May: "The Federal Government, the small amount that they do give, the several hundred dollars, is held up for years."
- Mitchell, J.: "And so, you would think the State of Illinois has that same money that really is a problem of the Federal Government, not the State Government."
- May: "I know that educating our students is a priority and that the... this we have created a line item in the budget.

  This is coming from General Revenue Funds. This will have to be funded. It is not out of the school funding pot."
- Mitchell, J.: "And what do you mean it'll have to be funded?"
- May: "I'm sorry, it is the general... it comes out of General Revenue Funds. We've created a line item. This Bill creates a line item. It is not com... you know, coming out of the school funds. No more than any other Bill we pass."
- Mitchell, J.: "Where's the money going to come from, out of General Revenue Funds?"
- May: "Yes. The fiscal note that was requested shows that it's \$600 thousand."
- Mitchell, J.: "Disbursed by whom? What department will disburse that money?"
- May: "State Board of Education."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. So, it comes out of State Board of Education's budget, which is general state aid?"
- May: "No. No, General Revenue Funds."
- Mitchell, J.: "That's all they have. The money from the General Revenue Fund that flows into the State Board of Education is considered general state aid, which can then be

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

disbursed to any or all schools."

May: "It's separate from the formula."

Mitchell, J.: "Except for what?"

May: "Separate from the state aid formula."

Mitchell, J.: "There won't be separate funding once it's in the State Board of Education's budget. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

- Mitchell, J.: "... I rise in opposition to this particular Bill, not because I don't think that the students deserve it, but these districts are spending \$8 thousand a student. Some of you folks downstate, think about how much money you've got per student. And there's no question about it, there's only so much money. And quite frankly, it's got to come from someone, you can decide who. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? This Bill is on Short Debate. Would someone care to move it off... Standard Debate, excuse me. Representative Mitchell has spoken in opposition to the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to the appropriate House Rule, I'm joined by seven Members from my side of the aisle, request this Bill be removed from Short Debate."

Speaker Hartke: "It is on Standard Debate."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, of the school districts that you noted, do you have a financial sheet that shows the federal aid that goes to each of those school districts under the impact aid?"

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

May: "The fiscal note showed \$600 thousand. I don't think the one that I saw... Oh, you know what, I do, yes. The acreage, yes. The price, yes, I do have this from the fiscal note. Oh, no, I don't... I'm sorry, I don't have from the Federal Government, no."

Black: "So, you can't tell me, at this time, what each school district does receive from federal impact aid? I mean, it would... would a school district get \$500..."

May: "It was..."

Black: " ... would they get \$5 thousand?"

May: "It was my understanding from North Chicago when Dr. Pickles was down here testifying for this that they got... one of the superintendents told me they got \$500 per student."

Black: "Five hundred dollars per student?"

May: "Per student, yes."

Black: "And how many military dependent students does he claim?"

May: "We believe the number is about 1500."

Black: "I'm sorry, 1500..."

May: "Yes."

Black: " ... students..."

May: "Yes."

Black: " ... times \$500 per student?"

May: "In North Chicago."

Black: "Can you do the math and tell me then what the Federal Government gives North Chicago? Five hundred dollars per student, 1500 students. That is not an insignificant amount of money, is it?"

May: "Five hundred dollars per student is one small portion of what it costs to educate the students."

Black: "No, I'm not arguing that point."

May: "Okay."

Black: "I'm just saying, what is the total federal impact aid?

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Five hundred dollars per student and they're claiming 1500 students, so how much money does the Federal Government send North Chicago, then?"

May: "I don't have that exact figure."

Black: "Well, you can multiply 500 times 1500, can't you? Not an insignificant amount of money, Representative. Fifteen hundred students and the Federal Government gives the school district \$500 per student. That's not chunk change."

May: "What is significant, I believe, is the fact that ea... the local districts are funded by our property taxes and they get no property taxes and yet, on that same property, there are hundreds of students that need to be educated."

Black: "Representative, I used to have a major military installation that bordered my legislative district. It was Chanute Air Force Base, was closed in the early 90s. And I know that the Rantoul school system... as best I can recall, the Rantoul school system never came to the General Assembly and asked for additional aid over and above their federal impact aid. I think this is probably the first time I've ever heard this. North Chicago is getting \$750 thousand in federal impact aid to educate dependent children of United States' military personnel. Now, one could make... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "One could make an argument that the Federal Government could do more and should do more and I would stand in support if that were the issue in front of us. Illinois ranks historically low, I think we're a 47th, in the amount of money that we get back from Washington in the taxes that we send to Washington. The Governor made reference to that in his budget address and that he hoped to change that

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

figure. We are not getting back the dollars that we to our Federal Government in Washington, D.C. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Representative Mitchell so clearly pointed out, I don't have the state aid figures in front of me for the school districts t.hat. well-intentioned Sponsor of this legislation is talking about, but I daresay, none of these school districts are at the bare minimum per pupil or the foundation grant of 4400 plus dollars. I would be surprised if any of the districts she mentioned are trying to educate children at the foundation level, the minimum amount of money that can be spent per pupil in this state. Most of the school districts in my legislative district..."

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

Black: " ... do work day after day after day for the minimum foundation level. I cannot, in good conscience, add state money to the federal impact money when there are schools hurting just as bad as any of those districts she mentioned who aren't even in the ballpark for federal aid. If you want to go to Washington and increase federal aid, I'll go with you, I'll help you. I'll personally write the Speaker of the House. I'll ask the Speaker of the House to visit with you and with me and with anybody else in this chamber. But I cannot vote to take general revenue money away from school districts in my part of the state who struggle to make it on the bare minimum foundation to shift almost \$3 million of state aid to school districts who are already receiving \$500 per pupil federal..."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to talk to
the Bill if I could."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Garrett: "In our district, our Congressman, Mark Kirk, has recently introduced legislation in Washington that would go toward solving this particular issue. This is a huge issue in the State of Illinois. It's a huge issue throughout the country. I was with him at his press conference when he talked about this legislation. It was in North Chicago. And he basically admitted that getting these funds would be almost impossible, that's it's going to be a long road, that trying to convince the Federal Government to bring more money toward the military dependent schools for whatever reason will be a huge, huge challenge. And so, I say to this General Assembly that it's incumbent upon us to do what we can for these schools. These schools are not rich schools, most of them are located in low-income areas. And they are struggling to get by because their personal property taxes do not cover thousands of the students that are currently enrolled. What the Sponsor is asking for is a line item above and beyond what the State Board of Education has already allocated in their budget. What this Bill asks for is \$600 thousand to be used toward helping educate these students who are family members of military think the State of Illinois could benefit dependents. I from this. I think our local school districts could benefit. I think it's going to be very difficult to get Washington to move in this direction even though we have heard rhetoric that they will. I would suggest that you give this vote an 'aye' vote... you give this Bill an 'aye' vote because it will help students in schools throughout the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft. Do you stand in opposition to this Bill?"

60th Legislative Day May 17, 2001

Hoeft: "I do."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay."

Hoeft: "Does that mean we're married?"

Speaker Hartke: "Proceed."

Hoeft: "I have two major points that I would like to make. First is the question. The 51% that the Governor has promised from newfound monies or new monies in the State of Illinois for... he will dedicate to education, is this going to be part of that 51%?"

May: "It's not currently and I don't think that it would be."

Hoeft: "This is not part of the education budget, 51%?"

May: "Until this Bill is passed, it's... you know, it's not funded. If there is not a separate line item, this will not be funded."

Hoeft: "If it is funded, will it be considered part of the 51% education funds?"

May: "Yes."

Hoeft: "Yes, that's correct. And the Governor right now is struggling, we are struggling in the State of Illinois with all of the educational needs to keep the recommendation to all the school districts in the State of Illinois at our promised level. This will be added. it again will be another impetus to make sure that we are not able to meet our needs. Right or wrong, this will have to have to be amortized over all of the funds, whether it the state aid formula or the categoricals. My second point is, the Federal Government has been irresponsible to these school districts in these communities. If we, as a legislative Body, become responsible for irresponsibility of another group, then that irresponsible group will have no reason in the future to participate in any way. It will cut the legs out of the Legislators in

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Washington if they can say, hey, the state's taken this burden from us, thank you, state. We pass this legislation, folks, we're gonna get a letter back from Washington saying, thank you for taking our responsibility, we are irresponsible and you bailed us out. This will have a negative impact not only on the present budget, but also future budgets in the state 'cause there'll be no incentive for the Federal Government to do anything towards these school districts."

Speaker Hartke: "There are still six people seeking recognition.

This Bill is on Standard Debate. We've heard three people stand in opposition. Representative Garrett spoke for the Bill. Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise very reluctantly in opposition to this Bill. I'd just like to mention that know that over the years we have frequently done special things with state funds to address special situations that occur in school districts throughout the state. In fact, I remember when now State Senator Larry Woolard was a Member of this chamber. There was a most unusual failure of building in his district because of mine subsidence. State of Illinois helped to provide the funds to replace that school building. It is not unusual for us to do that because that is our responsibility. However, this is entirely different from that kind of a situation. This is not a responsibility of the State of Illinois, this falls within the federal jurisdiction and when we begin using state funds to do things that are rightfully the function of the Federal Government, we set a terrible precedent. Not only do we set a very bad precedent, but knowing how government works, as all of us in this chamber

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

do, you can be sure that once we start doing this, the Federal Government never will have the motivation to do what it is obligated to do to help these school districts. It would seem to me that the appropriate action on the part of those Legislators who represent school districts that have these bases in them would be to introduce a Resolution urging the Congress of the United States and all of the leaders of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., to accept their rightful responsibilities and provide the money that would be adequate to help these school districts. In that, I think you would find you would have every Member of this House more than willing to be added as Sponsor of that legislation and many of us would be willing to join with you in trying to lobby our Members of Congress and the Speaker of the U.S. House to try to assure that while there is a lot of interest in education in Washington, as there is right now, that we would strike while the iron is hot. This is the time, it seems to me, a particularly timely sort of proposal would be just such a Resolution. If there is such a Resolution, I will gladly be a cosponsor. I will gladly help in any way that I can. There is a problem and it needs to be solved. This is not the way to solve the problem."

Speaker Hartke: "This Bill is on Standard Debate. We have listened to four individuals speak in opposition to the Bill. We are going to recognize Representative Erwin to speak for the Bill and then we're going to go to Representative May to close. Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Erwin: "I am, I must confess, somewhat amazed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as I listen to the debate on

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

this Bill. I more frequently, as you know, end up agreeing with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, which also gets me in a lot of trouble on my side of the aisle. But listening to this debate, I am somewhat amazed. talking about children and families that live in the State Illinois whose parents work for the Defense Department. If this same family lived in Germany, as many of them probably have, or in other parts of the world, the Defense Department of the United States has schools in those military installations and, in fact, hire the teachers, many of whom are hired here. I've actually helped the Defense Department recruit at Chicago and Illinois state universities for teachers for the families that military families that are abroad. They are here in our state, they are working in our state, they are sitting in our classrooms. The sons and daughters of the military that more times than not my respected colleague, Bill Black, is telling us to do everything we can do for veterans and the families of military. I am shocked that today we are saying we don't care about the children of the military, we don't care that we send these very same families all over the world to defend our nation in whatever our military program is. And Representative Black, let me add that when we have, in this state, recognized special circumstances when it comes to school funding like a depressed farm economy, we have responded. Our predecessors in this General... in these General Assemblies change the way we fund public education because we were told that family farms were going through difficult times and so, we now assess farmland in this state for the purposes of the school aid formula differently than my condominium or anybody else's home is assessed. So, let me

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

suggest to you that opposition to this Bill is opposition to families and school districts in need that are not wealthy districts. From those of us in Chicago and, in fact, wealthy suburbs who have assisted school districts in downstate Illinois in rural districts where we understand that those funding issues are serious and, indeed, voted for income tax increases that would benefit your districts, not mine very much, let me just suggest to you that an 'aye' vote is supporting the military families whether they live in my district, your district, or are stationed in Germany and that to try and be political about this at this point is just a silly thing and shortsighted. And I urge your strong support for all of the children in this state, whether they be military children, or the children in Representative Black's district, the children where I used to teach in the Elgin Public Schools that Representative Doug Hoeft represents, or any of our children. This deserves your support. And I think you all know it."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative May to close. Excuse me,

Representative Black. For what reason do you seek

recognition?"

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker used my name in debate six times. I intend to respond."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I not only respect the previous speaker, I like her. And I agree with her more than I disagree with her. But on occasion, she, as well as I and others in this chamber, tend to get so wrapped up in debate that we wax eloquently on things we truly don't understand. To say that the Farmland Assessment Law was passed to help the poor farmer is an

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

abject distortion of fact. If the Lady's condominium sits 2,600 acres, then she'd know something about the Farmland Assessment Law. We were being taxed on the number of acres and the potential value of those acres were to be condominiums built on them. All we asked for was that it be taxed on what the land produced and what the value of the crop was that was produced on that land. didn't come down here crying and begging and saying that the family farm was dying. And you know better. And how dare you, how dare you even for one moment insult my integrity that I somehow would turn my back on the United States military. Shame on you, you know better than that, too. But it has been said not only by me, but by what both sides of the aisle, responsibility of the Federal Government should be responsibility of the Federal Government and not the State of Illinois. You wanna go visit Denny Hastert, I'll go with you. But by God, the Federal Government should take care of this issue, not the State of Illinois, not at the expense of every other child in this State of Illinois who does not live with a military district in it. exaggerated my position. And I'm ashamed of you for doing so. And I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative May to close."

May: "Thank you. Yes, thank you all for the questions. I care passionately about educating our students and educating them fairly. I've also introduced a House Resolution which passed out of Education Committee today. And I'm so glad that there are many people who are willing to sponsor that. But saying we should do something and doing something are two different things. And the time has come to put our names on the line that we will support educating the

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

military students in this state. The education is the responsibility of the state. And Representative... oh, I shouldn't say your name because you'll want to something again, but when you got the funding downstate, that was 10 years ago and the Federal Government has steadily declined in it. People have worked hard. We all have worked hard trying to use our power to get money from the Federal Government. It's not going to happen. time to do something now. The precedent is set with Chaney-Monge. We are doing the same precedent that was set. One hundred and eighty five thousand dollars are given to one school district in this state. We are using the same precedent to give it to the school districts that are burdened by educating students and getting no property tax. Round Lake Beach is looking for a bailout of North Chicago is going to need a bailout. Let's million. do something. Let's do something that is right for the military dependents. It is the duty of the state to educate these students. Thank you. I ask for an 'aye' vote for this important Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 326?' 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 Bill, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 51 Members voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 873, Representative Winters. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 873, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

60th Legislative Day May 17, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 873 is the agency Bill that removes from underlying provisions that are no longer necessary.

And I would be happy to answer any of the questions that may come forward."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 873?' 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 Senate Bill 873, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 930, Representative Hoffman. Senate Bill 1011, Hoffman. Out of the record. Representative Cross. Senate Bill 1011. Out of t.he record. Senate Bill 1102, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1109, Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act concerning the circulation of election petitions. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Two court cases last year struck down the requirements in Illinois law that petition circulators must be registered voters. Senate Bill 1109 responds to the problems of there currently being no enforceable requirement for petition circulators in Illinois. The language in the court decision suggested that having an age requirement and a

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

U.S. citizen requirement is constitutionally possible. Senate Bill 1109 amends the Election Code to provide that persons circulating petitions for nomination and public questions must be 18 years of age or older and citizens of the United States. The Bill also requires petitions to include a circulator's name and address and provides an affidavit that the person signing the petition sign in the circulator's presence. The certification requirement is already a requirement in one part of the Election Code and is being carried through to the rest of the petition circulator requirement sections. So, the State Board of Elections has brought us this Bill and suggests need to have at least some basic requirements in the statute on who may circulate petitions. Based on the court... the Federal Court's ruling, it is their opinion, and I share their opinion, that this is the best course action that we can take to provide at least some elementary level of requirements for people who are passing petitions. Without this Bill, basically anyone, whether they're 2 or 20, can pass petitions; whether they're citizens or not petitions. So, this is not a citizens, can pass restrictive... this is not a very restrictive effort on those who can pass petitions, but I think it is something that is needed. And that's why we are proceeding with this proposal, which passed the Senate in a bipartisan manner. So, I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? This Bill's on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Giles."

Giles: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Giles: "Representative Hannig, I've sort of been following this legislation a little bit and I'm just trying to... I just

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

want to get a clear understanding here. This is to ensure that a circulator... this individual is at least 18 years of age and this individual is a registered voter, is that correct?"

Hannig: "Not a registered voter."

Giles: "Not a registered voter?"

Hannig: "A U.S. citizen."

Giles: "A U.S. citizen."

Hannig: "We would hope that they're a registered voter, but this would not require that."

Giles: "So, this individual do not have to be a registered voter
to be a circulator?"

Hannig: "Representative, that was the existing law in Illinois, that was the old law. And the court struck that down. The Federal Court said that that was too restrictive for us to require people to be registered voters to circulate say, your petitions or mine, or a congressman's petitions, or just a question of public policy. So, we looked at what the courts said that they would allow. And they would allow, we believe, that you be a U.S. citizen and that you be 18 years of age, which basically is the requirements to become a registered voter, but we're not saying that you have to be one."

Giles: "I know, but we're talking about... But also, we taking it a step further, we talking about circulating nominatin' petitions. Now, is there any residential requirements in this piece of legislation?"

Hannig: "No, Representative. So, anyone that you or I or anyone who wants you to... ask for help can circulate petitions.

Under the current law now, there are... you know, with the court decision, there's absolutely no prohibitions. You could bring people in from out of the country to circulate

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

petitions. This requirement will say that you have to be 18 years of age and a U.S. citizen."

Giles: "Okay."

Hannig: "But you don't have to live in the district."

Giles: "Okay. So, this individual... as long as this individual lives in the U.S. of A. or have the U.S. status, then this individual can circulate petition. Did not have to live in a respective district, or ward, or any boundaries, restriction, can circulate a petition. But that individual must be 18 years of age, but that individual do not have to be a registered voter?"

Hannig: "That's correct. I think, Representative, that the court case actually dealt with citizens who were asking people from outside of a political subdivision to circulate petitions. They had supporters who didn't live in their proposed district. And the court said that they should be free to allow those people to circulate petitions."

Giles: "Representative, just one more last question. Who else is a proponent of this piece of legislation other than the State Board? Have you talked to any of the local municipalities about this piece of legislation or have there been any other groups of interest have came to you and say that we're onboard with this piece of legislation?"

Hannig: "Representative, there... I can tell you that no one has filed in opposition. And the Bill did pass the Senate 56-0. So, at least on that side of the ledger, I'm not aware of anyone who's come forward and said that they have a problem with the proposal. And as I said earlier, if we don't enact this Bill, the effect of the court case is that we have no requirements on the books. So, we're trying to enact what we believe the courts will allow as constitutional."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Giles: "And, of course, this legislation is a result of what the court struck down."

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Giles: "And I know one of the main parts of that ruling is that that individual should be a registered voter. And that's something I feel strongly about. But, of course, you know, that's what our judicial system's all about."

Hannig: "That's exactly right, Representative."

Giles: "They interpret..."

Hannig: "I mean..."

Giles: "the law."

Hannig: "... that was the law, that's what the majority of the Members of the Legislature thought should be the requirement. The courts have their place in our system of government and they've ruled that unconstitutional. So, we have to accept that."

Giles: "And, of course, the other part of it is that they left out the requirements for residential; how many years that they must live in a particular area or that they must have lived in that respective area before they can circulate those petitions. I think they took that out of the..."

Hannig: "Yeah. And then that was part of the case. So... It was a case where someone had supporters outside of the district who wished to circulate petitions and under our old law, we're really prohibited from doing so. The court said we could not prohibit that. So, it will make it easier for everyone to find volunteers because... to circulate petitions because the requirements to do so will be less. But if we don't pass this law, there will be absolutely no requirements."

Giles: "All right. Thank you, Representative. Thank you for answering the questions forthright."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, Representative Hannig to close."
- Hannig: "Well, I just ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1109?' 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 Senate Bill 1109, there are 115 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 Acevedo. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Acevedo: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, on a previous Bill, Senate Bill 326, my vote was recorded as 'present'. I'd like it to be known it should have been a 'yes'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes.

  Representative Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to add to the record that it should reflect on Senate Bill 326 a 'yes' vote from myself, as well."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes. Senate Bill 1304, Representative Mulligan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1329, Representative Parke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act regarding emergency medical services. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1329 amends the medical... emergency medical service system. Provides that a person may not

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

smoke while inside an ambulance or specified emergency medical service vehicle. In addition, we amended onto the Bill that this Bill provides the Department of Public Health prescribed educational training requirements that include training in the use of epinephrine in all levels of Provides a personal current license as an EMT-B, EMT-I, and EMT-P who have successfully completed Department approved course in the administration of epinephrine. Ladies and Gentlemen, this drug is also called adrenaline. And we had a lot of people come to committee and testify that their children, especially the children, but anybody... that this drug could make a difference in whether or not they're having an asthma attack or some kind of an allergy reaction. And children had lost their lives 'cause these EMTs did not have it in the ambulance. So, this now requires it. No one is... at the hearing was in And everybody that was concerned about it opposition. either supported it or stayed neutral. I would ask the Body to support this legislation."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1329?' 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 Senate Bill 1329, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a personal point of privilege to introduce today... we're fortunate to have in the gallery

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

the Illinois Four Wheel Drive Association. They're here today. They've had a display downstairs and have a large group. I think some of you see jeeps and others out around the Capitol. We want to welcome them today and certainly hope you enjoy your visit to Springfield."

- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol here in Springfield, Illinois. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 163?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 163 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. On page 12 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 10. Out of the record. Senate Bill 20, Representative Coulson. These Bills are on Second Reading and we're hoping to move a bunch to Third of Reading. Out the record. Senate Bill Representative Daniels... Jones, Shirley Jones. Out of the record. Senate Bill 75, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 95, Representative Mathias. Out of the record. Senate Bill 103, Representative Bost. the record. Senate Bill 11... no, excuse me, 113, Representative Moore, Andrea Moore. Out of the record. Senate Bill 117, Representative Hamos. Out of the record. Senate Bill 118, Representative Madigan... Beaubien. Senate Bill 129, Representative Black. Out the record. Senate Bill 184. of the record. Out of the record. Senate Bill 285, Representative Franks, Jack Franks. of the record. Senate Bill 397, Representative Mathias. of the record. Senate Bill 400, Representative Mitchell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 406, Representative Wirsing. Out of the record. Senate Bill 449, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Senate

60th Legislative Day

- May 17, 2001
- Bill 489, Representative Dart. Out of the record. Senate Bill 493, Representative Reitz. Representative Reitz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 518, Representative Hamos. Out of the record. Senate Bill 616, Representative Beaubien. Out of the record. Senate Bill 629, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 629, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. ... Bill 699, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 725, Representative Dart. Out of the record. Senate Bill 730, Representative Moore. Amendment is not out of Rules. Out of the record. Senate Bill 754, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 789, Representative Dart. Out of the record. Senate Bill 795, Representative Madigan... Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 796, Madigan... Hoffman. Senate Bill 833, Representative Righter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 833, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 834, Representative Mautino, Frank Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 834, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 846, Representative O'Connor. Out of the record. Senate Bill 852, Representative Moore. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 852, the Bill has been read a second

- 60th Legislative Day May 17, 2001 time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 858, Representative Beaubien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 858, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 880, Representative Persico. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 880, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 884, Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 884, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 898, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 898, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 899, Representative Crotty. Out of the record. Senate Bill 89... excuse me, 915, Representative Slone. Representative Slone. Out of the record. Senate Bill 926, Representative Erwin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 933, Representative Smith. Out of the record. Senate Bill 945, Representative Madigan... Boland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 975, Representative Meyer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 984, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 984, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 989, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 991. Out of the record. Senate Bill 994, Representative Poe. Clerk, read the Bill. Your Amendment is still in Rules, Yes. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1033, Mr. Poe. Representative Curry. Representative Curry, Julie Curry. Out of the record. Representative Curry, are you aware that Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration Senate Bill 1039, on the floor? Out of the record. Representative Curry. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1069. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1089, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Senate  ${\tt Bill}$ Representative Novak. Representative Novak in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1128, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1176, Representative Amendments are in Rules. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1177, Representative Moore. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1259, Representative Burke. Madigan... Burke. Senate Bill 1262, Representative Out of the record. Johnson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1276, Representative Coulson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1283, Representative May. Karen May. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1284, Representative Wait. Ron Wait. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1309, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1493, Representative Daniels... Moore. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1504,

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Representative Bellock. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1522, Representative Mathias. Representative Mathias. Out of the record. ... recognizes Representative Cross. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell us when Rules is gonna meet to consider all those Amendments you just went through?"

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me, I couldn't hear you."

Cross: "Can you tell us when Rules is gonna meet? You were gonna... You went through a lot of Bills that have Amendments in Rules, when can we anticipate a Rules Committee... I assume you're gonna kick all those Amendments out?"

Speaker Hartke: "At some point in time, Rules will meet."

Cross: "It'll meet today?"

Speaker Hartke: "I'm not sure about that."

Cross: "Okay. Thanks a lot."

Speaker Hartke: "On Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 11 appears Senate Bill 868, Representative Parke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 868, a Bill for an Act in relation to workers' compensation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 868 attaches civil penalties, personal and individual, to corporate officers, directors, partners, and members of LLCs who knowingly and willfully fail to carry workers' compensation insurance. This prevents using bankruptcy, shifting of assets, and the use of new corporation or business entities to avoid prior fines. Senate Bill 868 is good public policy because it prevents businesses from avoiding liability for their unlawful acts.

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

It benefits both employers and employees. Workers will receive compensation for their injuries and employers will operate in a fair, competitive environment. And it benefits the public because the victims of uninsured employers typically seek public welfare when they're not receiving workers' compensation benefits. I stand ready 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 868?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Younge, would you like to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 868, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 629?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 629 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 629 is a Bill that's been worked on for about two or three years. It's an attempt to deal with the problems with animal hoarding and some of the problems that have been caused to..."

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me, Mr. Dart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 629, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an attempt to deal with the problems that have caused to numerous humane societies when

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

they take in large numbers of animals. There's also some provisions in here dealing with increasing penalties for aggravated torture of animals and cruelty to animals. There are a couple of issues in here which we have worked on. I had two or three Amendments in Rules Committees that we're gonna correct some... a drafting error but the Rules Committee did not kick 'em out. And I've been made aware that it might be troublesome to get the Senate to listen to Bills next week that aren't over there already. So, I've got a commitment from the Senator over there that we will end up putting this in a Conference Committee to work out those differences. But that's the heart of the Bill. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? This Bill is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank the Sponsor of the Bill. He was very accommodating to some of us who would like to have had Amendments added to the Bill. Unfortunately, he has Amendments to the Bill that he can't get out of Rules. And those of us that also had Amendments to the Bill can't get our Amendments out of the Bill... out of Rules Committee. So, I guess... I think the Sponsor's right, at this point, we have no choice but to send it to the Senate and hope we can wrap up things in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 629?' 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? Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 629, there are 108 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no',

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar appears House Bill 859 on Third Reading, Mr. Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 859, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 859 is a shell Bill. What previously was in the Bill was the language that we were gonna use to address the staffing problems with nurses in hospitals. We've come to an agreement to leave this as shell, send it over to the Senate. And we're gonna have hearings over the summer on this subject and report back to the full House hopefully in November. And hopefully, we'll have a resolution of this situation. This is agreed... agreement between the Illinois nurses, the Illinois hospitals. And I want to commend our staffs for putting this together. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Cross: "You said everybody's gonna meet over the summer, Representative. Is it your anticipation that at the end of the summer everybody will be onboard?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 859? All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 859, there are 84 Members voting 'yes', 29 Members voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10, on Third Reading on House Bills is House Bill 1815, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1815 is the culmination of four or five months of negotiation to create the Petroleum Equipment Contractors Licensing Act. We worked with the Illinois Petroleum Marketers. The Illinois State Fire Marshal has agreed to oversee this licensure. It's been a problem for their agency to get a handle on these different contractors working across the state. Now they will have to register with them. It's a good Bill. I think it's a Bill that preserves the integrity of work being done in our gas stations and service stations and other places where we dispense gas or diesel. And I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1815?' 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 Senate... On House Bill 1815, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', O

60th Legislative Day

- May 17, 2001
- voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 417, Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill 417."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 417, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquor. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. Fiscal notes have been requested on the Bill as amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading. For what reason does Representative Osmond seek recognition?"
- Osmond: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 859, I inadvertently voted 'yes' and intended to vote 'no'. And I wish the record to reflect that."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes. The Chair recognizes Representative Saviano for a Motion."
- Saviano: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 859, we had a Motion to Table the Amendment pending. I would ask that we reconsider the vote... make a Motion to Reconsider."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor will signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is granted. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 859?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 859 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 859, the Bill's been read a second time,

60th Legislative Day

- May 17, 2001
- previously. A Motion has been filed by Representative Saviano to table Floor Amendment #1."
- Speaker Hartke: "All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is tabled. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 859, the Bill's been read a third time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the indulgence of the Members. Again, this now is a shell Bill. And we need the Bill to continue our negotiations. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass again House Bill 859?' All those in favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 859, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Democrat Steak Fry that was postponed last week will be Tuesday night at the Petroleum Marketers at 5:00 or directly after Session if we go longer than 5:00. And with that, I'd like to yield the floor to Representative Wojcik."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "And on the Republican side, we're going to have our Steak Fry on Tuesday night over at the Petroleum Marketers.

  You've been e-mailed and some of you have responded

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

already. So, put that down on your calendar. We got steak and a wonderful event and camaraderie. And join us over at the Petroleum Marketers immediately after Session."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. Mr. Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Well, thank you. We thought and in a bipartisan effort to have the Steak Fry together to try to make a smooth ending to this year's Session we'd all sit down on Tuesday night and eat steaks prepared by Mr. Novak's coal program, I think. Whatever. So, let's have a good time Tuesday night and we'll all have steaks over at the Petroleum Marketer building. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Brunsvold. Page 11 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 838, Representative Klingler. Representative Klingler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 838, a Bill for an Act in relation to child care. Third Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Klingler."

- Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Department of Children and Family Services. And it would provide for a classification of adoption-only homes instead of simply foster care-only homes. Children who would be placed there would be children whose legal rights to their parents have already been terminated. And the thought is that this would lead to quicker adoptions of these children rather than to have to go possibly through a series of foster homes. This designation would also allow for additional training of the parents of the potential adoptive-only families in caring for their children. And again, the goal is to speed up adoption. And I would urge support for this Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Senate Bill 838?' 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 Senate Bill 838, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 840, Representative Klingler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 840, a Bill for an Act concerning minors. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Klingler."

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is again an agency Bill. And the goal is to encourage adoption of older children. And the way... the Bill works by changing the age of the goal of independence for child from 13 to age 16 because, I think, all of us would agree that a 13-year-old is in no way positioned to have an independent life. And yet, the fact of the goal would be independence and not part of a family unit would discourage people from adopting older children. And I would urge passage of this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 840?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 840, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 842, Representative Wirsing. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 842, a Bill for an Act concerning

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

children and family services. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wirsing."

- Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 842 provides that royalties earned from the publication of materials owned by or licensed to DCFS shall be of one of the funding sources for foster parent training programs. This Bill is a DCFS initiative. But it amends the Children and Family Service Act, provides that royalties earned from the publication of materials owned by or licensed by the Department of Children and Family Services shall be, as I said, one of the funding sources for foster parent training programs. Would 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 842?' 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 Senate Bill 842, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair is preparing to adjourn. At this time, the Chair would like to recognize the caucus chairman, Representative Acevedo, for an announcement."
- Acevedo: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. The Democratic Caucus will be caucusing immediately after adjournment in Room 114."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Democrats have asked for a caucus in Room 114 immediately upon adjournment. The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would also like to ask for a caucus in Room 118."

60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "You're not very popular. The Republicans will have a caucus in Room 118. Representative Lang now moves that the House... Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution #43, offered by Representative Currie.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 43

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, May 17, 2001, it stands adjourned until Friday, May 18, 2001 in Perfunctory Session, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2001; and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 18, 2001 it stands adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2001."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative Mendoza now moves that the House stand... Representative Crotty, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Crotty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please repeat the time on Monday? Many of us did not hear that. Monday..."

Speaker Hartke: "I haven't said it yet."

Crotty: " ... what time, Session?"

Speaker Hartke: "I haven't said it yet. Representative Mendoza now moves that the House stand adjourned allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk 'til the hour of 4 p.m. Monday, 4 p.m. Monday. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

#### 60th Legislative Day

May 17, 2001

the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Senate Bills-Second Reading to be held on the Order of
Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 385, a Bill for
an Act concerning counties. Second Reading of this Senate
Bill. There being no further business, the House
Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."