135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "May we pray. Most precious God we come humbly before You. We honor and love You, for it is You that is sovereign. We stand before You not holding or hiding anything from You. For it is You that knoweth us and have searched us and have been acquainted with all of our ways for You understand our thoughts from afar off. For yet it is You that know our hearts. Create in us a clean heart and renew in us a right spirit, prepare it to be pure, honest and just, free from any hatred, envy and malice. This we kindly ask You, Father, in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Osterman is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Tenhouse is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 114 people responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 23, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' referred to the Order of Senate Bills or House Bills-Second Reading Bill 4787 and House Bill 4788; 'approved for consideration' Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 687; 'referred to the Order of Third Reading Short Debate' Senate Bill 698. Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1635 and a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5577. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Commerce & Business Development, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 23, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3212. Representative Shirley Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, May 23, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4667. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 22, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1436 and a

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 4117. Representative Erwin, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 892 and House Resolution 914. Representative Mautino, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5596. Representative Dart, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 22, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' House Resolution 910. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 22, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2058, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4179, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4354, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 5002 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2023."

Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 950, offered by Representative Feigenholtz... Representative Monique Davis; House Resolution 954, offered by Representative Feigenholtz; House Joint Resolution 79, offered by Representative Stephens. Senate Joint Resolution 65 and Senate Joint Resolution 72 are assigned

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention. This relates to our plan for today and next So, we shall leave today, we shall return Monday, Memorial Day at 6 p.m. to hear a special address by the Governor to a Joint Session of the House and the Senate for the purpose of introducing a new budget. The Governor plans to introduce that budget before the Senate. Senate plans to pass the budget on Tuesday. The House will conduct a subject matter Committee of the Whole on Tuesday concerning the Governor's budget proposal. We will vote on Amendments to that budget on Wednesday and we will consider that budget on Third Reading on Thursday. So, again, shall return Monday, 6 p.m., special address by the Governor before a Joint Session of the House and the Senate for the purpose of introducing a new budget. The Senate plans to pass that budget on Tuesday, we plan to conduct a Committee of the Whole on that budget on Tuesday, we plan to consider Amendments on Wednesday and consider the Bill on Third Reading on Thursday. So, that is our plan. For what purpose does Mr. Stephens seek recognition?"

Stephens: "We appreciate you shedding a little light on this process. I wonder if you can tell us the process by which we will make Amendments to this budget and do... have you struck a personal agreement with the President of the Senate? You suggested, you know, that he's going to pass this out on Tuesday. Is that irregardless of the facts in the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "Irregardless of the what in the Bill?"

Stephens: "Of the facts."

Speaker Madigan: "The content?"

Stephens: "You can call it content, I'll call it facts."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

- Speaker Madigan: "I'm just repeating to you what was stated to me."
- Stephens: "Would you let the Body know what the Amendment procedure will be? Will we be... Will those Amendments come right here to the floor? Should we bring them with copies for both sides of the aisle or do they have to go through Rules first?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Well... they'll be filed and as always referred to the Rules Committee and consi.... and if the Rules Committee approves, they'll be considered on the floor."
- Stephens: "Perhaps the Majority Leader could tell us how she's inclined. If she doesn't like an Amendment, it won't get out here to the floor. Is that what you're saying?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Stephens, let me speak for myself and say that I think that you'll find that the Rules Committee will be reasonable in terms of the Amendments approved and not approved. I think you'll find that at the end."
- Stephens: "It's the... That's the way it is, it sounds fair and we appreciate that."
- Speaker Madigan: "Sure. Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of points of information. When we come back on Tuesday, to meet as a Committee of the Whole, I presume it will be on the House Floor to discuss that budget. As a Committee of the Whole, will we just discuss it amongst ourselves or will we be allowed to call witnesses such as people from the department to ask about impacts of certain provisions of that budget?"

Speaker Madigan: "The answer is 'yes' on #2."

- Mulligan: "So, we would be able to call witnesses to come in and discuss certain parts of that budget for information?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Correct. Representative, I would expect that

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

the Representative Hannig and Mr. Tenhouse would meet, develop a schedule for consideration of different agencies, different aspects of the budget."

Mulligan: "Okay. And then the second question is, if we're going home today and not going to be here tomorrow, normally when we start getting into the budget, that leaves all of the remaining Bills that are hanging out there kind of up for grabs and since we're not gonna be here tomorrow to pass them, are we going to stay late tonight and address all those Bills or do you think we're gonna do them after we actually look at the budget when things are more contentious?"

Speaker Madigan: "Do you mean the nonappropriation Bills?"

Mulligan: "Right."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, I think that in terms of the nonappropriation Bills remaining on the Calendar, we'll have plenty of time to consider those Bills."

Mulligan: "Thank you for the information."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Black, you've got your wish.

Congratulations."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I think it's long, long overdue that we meet as a Committee of the Whole to discuss a budget. Better late than never. I would prefer to stay here, however, and do that business tomorrow and over the weekend rather than come back on a state holiday, that being Memorial Day. I generally, in all sincerity, spend some time at my mother's grave on Memorial Day and I would much rather do that than come back to Springfield. But be that as it may, let me ask you a question and it's about the process, I don't understand, I'm not familiar with the Senate Rules. The Supreme Court recently ruled that a liquor tax that we enacted to pay for some capital

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

projects... capital infrastructure at the trial court level ruled that unconstitutional because we did not allow sufficient time for public input, et cetera, et cetera. I'm not a lawyer, I leave that to you and those who are. What I don't understand about what you have said about the process, will the budget, as a package, be introduced in the Senate today or will it not be introduced in the Senate until Monday?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, I believe, that it would be introduced probably after the Governor finishes his remarks."

Black: "All right. So, the budget would be introduced to the Senate Monday evening, which is a state holiday, according to your schedule they will act on it on Tuesday, it will come to this chamber on Wednesday and we will act on it Thursday. I'm trying to figure out, under the House Rules, how all of that will be read the... excuse me... how all of that will be requisite three times and I, for the life of me, I can't figure out how the Senate is going to be able to give adequate public notice to a package that will impact every citizen of this state. But I don't know their Rules. I..."

Speaker Madigan: "And neither do I, but I've been told that the Bill in question has already been read twice in the Senate."

Black: "But the Bill in question, I'm sure, is a shell Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "I don't know the answer to that question."

Black: "All right. Well, again, I do appreciate the fact that we will meet as a Committee of the Whole. I would again just reiterate, I think most of us, I don't speak for anybody but myself, but I get a sense that most of us would be more than willing to stay here, conduct some business, meet as

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Committee of the Whole. I realize the Governor's schedule. He may not be ready to make his announcement until Monday, but I again think it is a poor use of our time and a poor use of our resources to continue going home and come back here and if we meet on Memorial Day, so be it, but that is a very special observance to many, many people in this chamber. But if that's what it takes to get our business done, then I will be here. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tom Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions.

And again, I think they deal with procedure. Do you or does anybody at this point currently have a copy of this budget?"

Speaker Madigan: "No. Mr. Johnson, could I hasten to add that It will resemble in great part the budget that the Governor introduced."

Johnson: "Well, obviously, but there's \$2 billion that it doesn't or 1.1 or depending on whose numbers you want to do, that is not reflected in the budget I've seen because that's the hole or whatever we have to cover. Now, I guess the question I have is, if it... nobody has a copy of a budget yet. You're saying that nobody will probably have a copy of this budget until after the Governor addresses us on Monday night and yet you have an assurance that the Senate going to pass that budget on Tuesday. We've been accused of being mushrooms in here. In other words, voting on something because we've been told to vote on it. Isn't that the ultimate mushroom, that you can predict right now that the Senate will pass a budget that nobody has any idea what it says yet? And I guess that's a question and if, in fact, the Senate does not act like mushrooms and pass that budget, does that mean on Wednesday

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

we will be adjourning or will we be doing our own budget?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Johnson, two things: #1, if I said I was predicting what the Senate would do, I didn't mean that. I said..."

Johnson: "You said they were going to pass the budget on Tuesday and we will consider it on Wednesday."

Speaker Madigan: "I thought I was repeating what had been represented to me, that's all. So..."

Johnson: "Well, is there a plan..."

Speaker Madigan: "... I'm not a Member, I don't..."

Johnson: "... that in the event they do not pass the budget on Tuesday? Do you have a suggestion as to what we will do then?"

Speaker Madigan: "We will be working on the budget. I can assure you of that."

Johnson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of... On page 10 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence there appears House Bill 4344.

Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The Amendment is a request from the Secretary of State, removes from the Bill a provision allows one of the vehicles to be registered based upon the year it was manufactured to resemble. According to the Secretary of State, they must register a vehicle based upon the year it was actually manufactured. In addition, the Bill provides that the Secretary of State may issue special plates for custom vehicles and street rods. I would move for the adoption of... a concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4344."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4344. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' 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 113 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4344. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4255, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4255. The Amendment has been offered by the Department Professional Regulation. There is no opposition. The Electrology Association is neutral on the Amendment. basically cleanup. It provides that this is an Act concerning the Regulation of Professions which is now electrology. Replaces a current section providing for fees with t.he following: the Department of Professional Regulations shall provide by rule for a schedule of for the administration and enforcement of this Act. provides for grounds for disciplinary action and provides that it shall be gross negligence in his or her practice as an electrologist which is now gross malpractice. It also adds model language allowing the department to compel applicant or a licensee to submit to a mental and/or physical examination. It deletes a section providing for penalties resulting from dishonored checks, little alte... provisions being included above. It also creates a section for providing for penalties for unlicensed practice. Tt. amends the Medical Practice Act, the Nursing and Advanced Practice Nursing Act, the Illinois Optometric Practice Act

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

and a Podiatric Medical Practice Act. I move for its favorable adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4255. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm looking at the analysis here and talk... in Section 80, deals with dishonored checks imposing a \$50 penalty for any bad checks sent to the department for the initial licensor and then the fine is a hundred dollars if it's a renewal?"

Wojcik: "Yes."

Franks: "How does this coincide with other people that are licensed? Do they have bad check fees?"

Wojcik: "Representative, all the other professions have fines for bad checks."

Franks: "What I'm worried about is under the UCC, I think it's Section 3806, if I recall, there is a \$25 fine statutorily plus attorneys fees and I want to know how this would coincide with the criminal aspect under that, as well as, under the civil procedure code there are fines of trebled up... treble damages up to \$1500 plus attorneys fees. And I'm wondering why we'd be giving someone a break on writing bad checks to the department."

Wojcik: "Actually, this is the department's language."

Franks: "And I think they're wrong."

Wojcik: "No."

Franks: "That's what I wanted to point that... I mean, I'm saying this is something they might want to look at at veto time, to amendatorily veto that, because what the department has done here has taken away the ability to collect the proper

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

amount of fines of actually underselling themselves pursuant to the laws that we have presently, both criminally and civilly. So, I would ask that that be looked at once this passes out of the... out of this Body when the Governor looks at it. I'd like for legislative intent, I wanted to have that on the record that I think there was a mistake in the drafting."

Wojcik: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. 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 98 'ayes', 14 'noes'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar House Bill 4023. Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4023. And Senate Amendment 1 is simply a small change that was made to accommodate the telecommunications industry. They had some security concerns about the way those requirements were phrased and we changed that to accommodate those concerns in the Senate. That's the only change to the Bill. And I would appreciate 'aye' votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, if the county or municipality in question

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

does not have a planning department, can they still seek assistance through this Act should it become law?"

Slone: "I believe so, Mr. Black."

Black: "What about counties that do have a regional planning commission..."

Slone: "They could..."

Black: "... will this supplant what they do or..."

Slone: "No."

Black: "... enhance what they do?"

Slone: "This would allow them to... if the planning fund is indeed funded, it would allow them to apply for grants from that fund which would operate... be operated by the Department of Commerce & Community Affairs."

Black: "Then... Let me make sure I understand this. This is purely voluntary."

Slone: "Oh, yeah."

Black: "It has no... it has no force of law on its own. It cannot make a recommendation and subsequently, somehow by Resolution or Act, you know this... for lack of a better word, this local planning technical assistance board... commission... whatever it's ended up... whatever we end up calling it, would have no stand-alone authority to do anything other than offer assistance."

Slone: "It would offer assistance... The only thing that the statute says is that if you're going to present a plan, pursuant to the legislation, you have to have these certain elements in your plan. In other words, it says it requires some consistency in how the plan is... would be presented, but that's all. You can..."

Black: "Let me give you a hypothetical and maybe you can help me out. My county no longer has a regional planning commission, very few communities in my county have a zoning

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

ordinance. So, if a community, a small community in the County of Vermilion, intends to create a subdivision or a new sewage treatment plant or a water treatment facility and they are doing this on their own and proceeding and an individual citizen says, 'I don't like where you have it, I don't like the way it looks. I'm going to this committee and somehow we're gonna put a stop to this. You're just not making any sense to me. You're putting it in the wrong place. I don't like the design.' What I want to make sure of is that you're not creating another layer of bureaucracy that would come into a local community and say, 'one of your residents has complained and we're here to advise you about the shortsightedness of your plan. We don't think you ought to put that here.'"

Slone: "I don't think that this would create any additional authority of that type, but if the citizen had a problem, obviously, I suppose they'd have recourse to the courts or whatever, but it wouldn't create a new layer at the state level that they could go to, to try and get around the local plan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. 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 110 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5803. Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 is a cleanup language to a Bill that we passed

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

out earlier. It deals with the auctioneer... the auto auctioneers' profession. It allows, in addition to those named, people who by participating in a auctioneers... or in the auto auctions to also add salvaged dealers and makes some grammatical changes in it. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on the concurrence."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, the Auctioneers' Association, of course, sponsored the original Bill. Are they... are they on board on this?"

Meyer: "Yes. There is no disagreement by any party on... to the... Bill."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' 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 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill... The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Meyer, can you handle two in a row? House Bill 5961. Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5961."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor signify by voting

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution #80 offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 80

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 23, 2002, it stands adjourned until Monday, May 27, 2002 at 5:30 p.m.; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, May 23, 2002, it stands adjourned until Monday, May 27, 2002 at 5:00 p.m."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Adjournment Resolution.

Representative Currie moves that the House adopt the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does adopt the Adjournment Resolution. On page 13 of the Calendar appears House Bill 6004. Mr. Scully. Is Mr. Scully in the chamber? Mr. Brady. House Bill 5654."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for concurrence of Amendment #1 to House Bill 5654 which was an Act concerning protocol in death investigations. And the Amendment just simply states that anything within the protocol developed by the agencies responsible would not in any way, shape or form hamper life resuscitation efforts by emergency personnel.

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

And I so ask the House and my colleagues to concur."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 698?" Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 698, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 5002. Representative Lyons."
- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is very timely legislation. House Bill 5002, includes the clergy in the group of professionals who are required to report child sexual abuse. This legislation keeps intact the clergy privilege protecting information received in a spiritual confession which safeguards the legislation from any Constitutional challenge. House Bill 5002 is aimed at who would protect their own, rather than the those victimized. I would ask for your support. This Bill is a result of a myriad of religious organizations at the table wanting to address a grievous problem of our time. The Catholic Conference, the Agudath Israel of America, Episcopal, Presbyterian, African Methodist, Baptist, and so on. I wanted to rec... commend Senator Dan Cronin for his work on this is... issue and I ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Amendment #3. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dart."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dart."

Dart: "The provisions in the Bill dealing with the exemption, is it for confidentiality between a priest and his members?

Can you explain to me how that confidentiality will work?"

Lyons, E.: "I'm sorry. Can... can I explain what?"

Dart: "How the confidentiality would work."

Lyons, E.: "If a person disclosed in the confessional, or to someone a... in a spiritual advisory capacity of sexual child abuse, that could be exempted in that role. But I would hasten to add that we have not learned of the... these cases through that method. Most of the cases that we've learned about has been through victims coming forward and letting the... those above... what would you say, that those people responsible for others, letting them know that there were people under them that are committing these crimes. So, although we do keep intact that confessional privilege, as I said, I want to let you know that the cases we've learned about has not been through those means."

Dart: "Now, when... when you talk about the privilege, though you referenced things they may hear through the confessional and things like that. But you also talked through... about... through counseling, as well. How do we define that then? So, if somebody who has sexually assaulted a child comes to a priest one day on the street and says, you know, I feel really bad about this and I did this to a child, is... is that confidential or is..."

Lyons, E.: "No, it would depend on the setting if that was not considered a confessional, then the... the clergy would be required to report that."

Dart: "So... so we're talking about then the exemption is only

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

for statements made in the confessional?"

Lyons, E.: "Or in the capacity of a spiritual advisor, covering other religions."

Dart: "Now, this spiritual advisor section of it, how is that defined? Where, I mean, when is someone giving spiritual advice? Is that something they can do on the street or do they have to do it in a physical location?"

Lyons, E.: "There is... there's no environment that is defined.

It is the role that is defined, a spiritual advisor. If someone comes to them seeking spiritual advice they would have the discretion of withholding that information, if it came to them in that vein. But as I said, I really want to hasten to add that's not how we've learned about these cases."

Dart: "Yeah, but I mean, these cases though,... we don't hear a lot about a lot of cases to be honest with you, as someone who tried a lot of these cases. So, that doesn't give me a lot of reason to be excited. I just would like to make this as clear as we can ... just so we know ... with what you're getting at, I couldn't agree with you more. Fully behind the idea and the concept. I'm just trying to figure out what the niche is that we're excluding. It seems to me that ... definitely anything that happens within the confessional is definitely excluded. And then we have this other area, as well, that is a little bit more nebulous."

Lyons, E.: "I'm sorry."

Dart: "Oh, that's okay. So... it seems clear then from what you're saying is definitely the things that may be said within the confessional, definitely that is privileged information. And now this other area, when you talk about the... the counseling side of it, there's a little bit more room for discretion. Is that accurate?"

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Lyons, E.: "There is."

Dart: "Okay. And... are there... so then the reporting requirements then would be similar to other than mandated reporters, with the exemption for the confidentiality?"

Lyons, E.: "Correct."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Lyons. There are penalties in here for not reporting and for a second offense it appears that it's a Class IV felony. What's the penalty of a Class IV felony?"

Lyons, E.: "Well, first of all, the first offense is a Class A misdemeanor. The second, the subsequent not reporting, would be a Class IV felony. And the... are you asking for the penalty...? The penalties for a Class IV felony is one to three years."

Mulligan: "Okay. I'd like to commend you for sponsoring this Bill. Representative, then Representative Ronen and I sponsored a similar measure in 1993 for then Cook County State's Attorney Jack O'Malley, which did not pass this Body. I think although the Bill is not quite as strong as I would I like it to be, I think it makes a clear-cut statement that clergy should be mandatory reporters. And I think that that's been lacking and I think it defines both for the clergy involved that they have a clear path as to what they're supposed to do in these kinds of issues. And many other people are mandatory reporters now, teachers, social workers, doctors. I think that this is really an important issue, particularly with the current climate of what's happening in this country. And I commend you for

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

passing this Bill. And I would certainly recommend an 'aye' vote."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I, of course, want to support the notion of this Bill, but I have some concern about the language and I'd like you to walk this through with me. So, there are certain circumstances under which the clergyperson would not have to report because it would be considered part of the confession or part of the... the confidentiality that we all know about between a clergyman and a congregant, correct?"

Lyons, E.: "Correct."

Lang: "And then there are situations where it's not perhaps a confessional or perhaps directly in the clergyperson's office, but are nevertheless, counseling services that that person is giving. Is that exempt under this Bill, as well?"

Lyons, E.: "It is. And as I said, what this Bill is aimed to do is to address those who would be more concerned about image and protecting their own than protecting victims. So, that... that's what this Bill is trying to do. I know there ... there is concern about the confidentiality clause. But that's really not what this Bill is aimed to do. What this Bill is aimed to do is address those who have been guilty of covering up, those who would protect others so that the abuse continues or there are potential victims."

Lang: "Well, we've all agreed that that's the goal of the Bill, but I'm looking at the language of the Bill and it's unclear to me. So, let me ask a couple of other questions.

If the privilege applies in a confessional or in a

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

situation where a congregant sits in the office of the clergyperson and 'fesses up to something or tells that clergyperson that they were the victim and so and so did it. If those are exempt, then under what circumstances would that clergyperson get the information that would not be exempt? How else would they get the information?"

Lyons, E.: "As they are now, when victims go to someone in the clergy to say that there has been another person in the clergy that has been guilty of violations. So, just as they are receiving the information now, when victims come forward to report to somebody in the clergy that this has happened to them, they would report it. As opposed to covering it up or sending the person on to someplace else, or whatever. That's what would happen."

Lang: "Well, how do you separate a congregant that reports abuse in the context of trying to get... trying to report it to somebody because a crime has been committed? How do you separate that out from the person that goes to their clergyperson to report that a different person has committed this crime but they don't report it in the context of a crime? They report it in the context of, maybe they think they have sinned. Maybe they think they are going to report it in the context of a confessional or some other meeting with their clergyperson. You understand, that I see that there's... I see a slight problem here, maybe you don't, maybe you can enlighten me."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lyons to close."

Lang: "What... Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've completed our points here. If we might continue, just briefly."

Speaker Madigan: "Sorry for not... sorry for not following your dialog."

Lang: "Thank you."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

- Lyons, E.: "The confidentiality portion of this Bill refers to the perpetrator, not the victim. Do you follow me? The confidentiality..."
- Lang: "Well, but nevertheless, a victim of abuse could go to his or her clergyperson within the confines of the clergyperson-congregant privilege and say this happened to me. Maybe they're not going to that person for purposes of reporting a crime. And what does your Bill say about this issue?"
- Lyons, E.: "That could happen. I mean, that the confidentiality the... clergy privilege does allow for that exemption."
- Lang: "And so, it's... there's an exemption for that, as well."
- Lyons, E.: "What I'm trying to explain is that... there's not an exemption for the perpetrator. There's an exemption for the role the clergy is trying to play."
- Lang: "So, there's not, so, well... I was talking about the victim, but let's talk about..."

Lyons: "Okay."

- Lang: "... the perpetrator for a second. So the perpetrator, who let's say, is another clergyperson, comes to the second clergyperson and even if it's in the confines of the confessional, they say, 'I did A, B and C.' Under this Bill, this... the clergyperson to whom that was reported, even if it's in the confessional, has to report it to law enforcement."
- Lyons, E.: "No, if it's within the confessional confines, no, it would not be mandated."
- Lang: "All right. So, why would the perpetrator ever go to see the other clergyperson if talking to the other clergyperson about it outside the confines of the confessional would cause it to be reported, but within the confines of the confessional not allow it to be reported? Why would that

135th Legislative Day

ever happen?"

May 23, 2002

- Lyons, E.: "Well, well, that... that could be a problem. But what we're... again, I have to reiterate what the purpose of this Bill is, is we're trying to focus on what's been happening currently. And that is, those people who know about child abuse and do not report it, they have learned about it through victims and they cover it up, or they're more concerned about image, or they're more concerned about the potential of victims. That's who we're trying to focus on this Bill. There are..."
- Lang: "Representative, that's what... that's of course what we're trying to do with the Bill. But I'm not sure your Bill does exactly that. Because when would the perpetrator, if they could report it to another clergyperson within the confines of the confessional and be sure that it would not be reported to law enforcement, why would they ever tell them outside the confines?"
- Lyons, E.: "Well, they might not, Representative Lang. And that's going to happen. That's not what we're trying to... we can't cover everybody in this Bill. It does not get everybody. There are those occasions that... that with this Bill there are people... that are gonna fall through the cracks. But that's not... you know, that's a more ambitious Bill."
- Lang: "All right. One other, one additional question. If the victim, within the confines of a confessional, goes to their clergyperson and says this happened to me but I really don't want you to report it, this is a confessional. But my privilege applies. I don't want my name used. I don't want this discussed. What happens then?"
- Lyons, E.: "It's not reported. It's within the confines of the confessional. That would not be reported."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Lang: "All right. To the Bill. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I'm gonna vote for the Bill because I think it's a... it's something we have to address. But I'm not at all certain this Bill addresses the problem. We've all read about the problems. We all know what we're trying to address. I don't think the Bill addresses it. sure it needs to go farther, but I'm not sure it addresses the specific issue because if we're going to continue to allow the privilege, which we should, and if either the perpetrator or the victim goes to the second clergyperson and says, now, this is within the confines of confessional. It's privileged. I don't want it talked about. Then it's still privileged. And law enforcement still won't get the information. So, the only time this Bill's going to apply, when it becomes law and I'm sure it will, become law. only time it's gonna apply is if the clergyperson... the ... happens to hear this information someplace, not within the confines of privilege. So, I think we've got a problem here, but I don't think we're really addressing it in the way that most of us would like. I'm not sure what the answer is. I don't have better language for you. Representative, I just don't think you're getting where you want to be. I'm gonna vote for it 'cause I think we need to address this in some way. But I'm hoping that you won't let this end here and that we'll look for better language as we move forward."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to commend Representative Lyons on this Bill and Senator Cronin for what they've done. And in respect to what Representative Lang was saying, I think in the majority of these cases, in the present situation, these cases are

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

reported not in the confessional, not in the light of a spiritual advisor, but especially with regard to child abuse and sexual abuse, they are reported to school members, teachers, other people such as that. And then reported maybe to their religious in that area. But certainly, not in the matter of a spiritual advisor, but in a reporting attitude, sometimes with a lawyer on hand. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lyons to close."

- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, I think is a... as I said earlier, is a timely piece of legislation that is going to address a problem we have these days. And although it won't cover everybody, I think it is... it does address a major problem. And I would ask for your full support."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #3. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6004, Mr. Scully."
- Scully: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6004, which added some very appropriate Amendments regarding the details of the implementation of the Illinois Panhellenic Trust Fund for license plates for African-American Fraternal Organizations. I'd like to thank Senator Emil Jones for being the Sponsor of this Bill in the Senate and for making these very appropriate Amendments. They add specific details regarding the distribution of the

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

scholarship funds, which should be created by this license plate. And I ask for your support in the Motion to Concur."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. The Chair recognizes Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I know I express the sentiments of thousands of members of Black Greek sororities and fraternities across the state when I commend Representative Scully for sponsorship of this legislation that will create the Panhellenic license plate. Of course, this license plate not only honors our sororities and fraternities for a history of service to mankind, but also provides an opportunity to make educational scholarships available to deserving individuals across this state. I am hopeful that all of the Members of this Body will agree with me and vote accordingly. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rutherford."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rutherford: "Representative Scully, just a couple of days ago there was accolades paid on the floor for a group that had helped put together procedures for a bond surety and a minimum number to be ordered if not, then it would be covered. Is that part of the language now in this Bill?"

Scully: "The Bill that was passed..."

Rutherford: "A couple days ago."

Scully: "... earlier this week imposes minimum requirements on all special license plates. The language is... imposing those requirements is not in this Bill, but the language of the Bill we passed earlier this week is applicable to this special license plate as well... as well as all special

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

license plates. So, it is my opinion that language in this Bill is not necessary for this license plate to be subject to those new requirements."

Rutherford: "Okay. Let me just... if I may, and it just happens to be your Bill that's the first one up since that has had the chance to go. I, once again, remind Secretary of State Jesse White that if he would promulgate rules to be able to allow other groups that may not be able to meet that minimum number of plates, that may not be able to set up the surety bond for it, that they could still have a unique, designated plate with their decal on it, with the ability to raise the funds for their organization. If they could not meet those minimum standards under the Bill we just spoke of, Representative Scully, they would not be able to have that plate. So, I would encourage that the Secretary of State do go forward and do promulgate the rules to allow other groups that opportunity."

Scully: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Scully, which one of these groups do you belong to?"

Scully: "Could you repeat your question?"

Davis, M.: "Which one of these groups do you belong to?"

Scully: "I do not belong to any of these fraternal organizations.

I am a member of the Sigma Pi Fraternity."

Davis, M.: "And they're not included in the Bill?"

Scully: "Well, actually, they might be included in the Bill if the Sigma Pi Fraternity chose to participate."

Davis, M.: "Representative Scully, do you think that this might in any way enhance or promote or increase racial

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

profiling?"

Scully: "Absolutely not."

Davis, M.: "Why not, Representative?"

Scully: "Because, in fact, it is going to be structured as the Illinois Panhellenic Trust Fund."

Davis, M.: "Excuse me?"

Scully: "Mr. Speaker, could we remove the Bill from the record?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record.

And House Bill 6041, Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am seeking to concur...

moving to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill
6041. Amendment #1 creates rights for hospitals to seek
waivers of rules and standards in construction projects.
This is a very similar process to the one already in place
for nursing homes. Amendment #2 creates a dispute
resolution mechanism on hospital billing issues, one of
which is an informal process whereby the parties could
appeal before... be it an advisory committee in the
Department of Public Health and the second and more formal
appeal would be before the Public Building Commission.
This Bill, as well as the Amendments, have passed
unanimously throughout... through the Senate committee.
And I would ask for their adoption."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "David, can you tell me, does this eliminate the health facilities planning board..."

Leitch: "No, I don't think so."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Black: "... from doing a review."

Leitch: "This has nothing to do with the..."

Black: "Okay."

Leitch: "Health facilities planning board..."

Black: "For my own edification, in your work on this Bill... it references Homeland Security. You and I have talked many times about the difficulty of the helicopter in a hospital in my trauma region. We were the last trauma region to get a helicopter, and funding has always been shaky and I think we only have funding now through the end of the fiscal year in Trauma Region 6. Has any discussion been entered into with perhaps using some federal funds for Homeland Security to help defray the costs of these emergency trauma helicopters where those of us in rural areas don't have a hospital that can pick up that cost?"

Leitch: "Not that I'm aware of, but frankly, that is a totally different subject..."

Black: "Okay."

Leitch: "... then I... than what this... these Amendments are addressing."

Black: "Hopefully, by the Veto Session and I hope funding will stay intact, but it's something that some of us have wondered about, if maybe... because I can't think of anymore vital service in a terrorist attack or a bioterrorism attack where a trauma region would have access to a helicopter and it seems like we're gonna have to find another way to fund it. And I... I was gonna ask if I could amend it on its face, but those days are long gone. So, I won't..."

Leitch: "Not these days."

Black: "I won't put you through that. I appreciate your indulgence."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitu... The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McAuliffe on House Bill 5941."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill... I'd like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 5941. This would amend the Liquor Control Act and would provide that the local liquor commissioners would have the duty to report to the Secretary of State any conviction of a violation of the Act in this provision. And I'd be happy to answer any questions that anyone would have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise to thank the Sponsor for taking this Bill out of the record several days ago and letting some of us have a chance to review a Supreme Court decision. I intend to vote for the Bill. I think it's a reasonable Bill, certainly has wide spread support, but I do think there are constitutional issues with this Bill. But obviously, I don't sit on the Supreme Court and that is the judicial branch responsibility. They'll have to make the ultimate decision on the Bill. But until they make that decision I commend the Sponsor for working with all of us that had some concerns about it, thank him for doing that and intend to vote 'aye' on the Bill."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Speaker Madigan: "Question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Jerry Mitchell voted? Has Jerry Mitchell voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received... the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Second Reading, what is the status of Senate Bill 1657?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1657 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Floor Amendment #1 simply would... Floor Amendment #1 simply would indicate that vehicles of union representatives except for the... will be allowed to use certain oscillating lights when they are parked at a construction zone. What happens is the union officials will come in official business and it's a safety precaution to make sure that they can safely park at the construction sites."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, this is... I didn't hear you. This is only in the course of their official duties while visiting a construction site. It can't be used under any other conditions, right?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "And that's specifically in the law."

Black: "All right. I..."

Hoffman: "Or in the Amendment."

Black: "Again, I have no specific objection, but... and you...
you've come up through law enforcement. You know, over the
years, we've created about 23 categories of peace officers
or people with full police powers in the state and if we're
not careful, Legislators are gonna be the only one that
don't have wig-wag headlights or something on their car.
So, I don't have any problem with the Bill, but I think it
is something we're gonna have to be careful of because in
the last two or three years we have allowed any number of
people for any number of reasons to have amber lights, blue
lights, oscillating lights, wig-wag headlights. Maybe
someday we'll even have 'em on our cars, who knows."

- Hoffman: "And the way that some of the Representatives here drive, they should. It'd be safer."
- Black: "Well, I wouldn't mention any names, but one sits rather close to you. But that's another story."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendments. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 simply indicates that the law that we passed, I believe it was two Sessions ago, called Scott's Law would apply to construction zones also. It's a safety mechanism for workers who work in construction zones."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1949, Mr. Hultgren.

 Mr. Hultgren. Hultgren. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of
 the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1949 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hultgren, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hultgren."

- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a very simple Amendment that exempts out... This Bill has to do with the guardianship office... the guardian's office and Cook County has its own stat... or own part of the statute that deals with how their guardian office is set up, public guardian. So, what this is is agreed to by all the parties to exempt them out of one section of the change that we're making, so I'd ask for your approval."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1760, Dale Righter.

 1760. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1760 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1936. What is the

- 135th Legislative Day May 23, 2002 status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1936 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor
 Amendment #1 simply allows those out-of-state guards at our
 nuclear plants to use their driver's license to get their
 FOID card."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 simply... and Members of the House... simply clears up some language requested by the State Police on the FOID card."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1936, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. Senate Bill 1936, as amended, besides the two Amendments that were just brought up, amends the Firearms Owner Identification

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

card. Basically what it does, is it allows for our local hunt clubs and local facilities, if we have someone visiting from upstate that wants to come in and use the facility, they don't have to actually have the FOID cards, but what they do have to have... the owner itself has to have a FOID card. It does not allow them to remove anything from the facility. They can't go out and use guns away from the hunt clubs. They can't buy ammunition. There's no other stipulations other than the fact it allows for safety training and allows people to experience the opportunity to go to these clubs and try using, for sport purposes, the weapons. Be glad to answer any questions."

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

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman yields."

Miller: "Representative, my analysis here, at least on our side... I'm a little... I'm unclear on what this legislation actually does."

Bost: "Okay."

Miller: "And could you... can you... I just want to make sure that I'm on the same page as far as issuing out firearm cards... firearm owners' cards."

Bost: "Okay. Now, you're talking about the Amendment that we brought up a while ago. And that would be the issuing of FOID cards for people that guard our nuclear power plants, some of them are contracted, they might be across state lines there. They are... The State Police want the opportunity and they need to be... have this opportunity and this simply allows them to do that."

Miller: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. Basically, what does this legislation do?"

135th Legislative Day May 23, 2002

Bost: "Okay."

Miller: "Okay. I mean this..."

Bost: "It actually... it actually does three things."

Miller: "Okay."

Bost: "After we've had the two Amendments on it, it does three things. The first thing it does, it allows for at hunting clubs, skeet ranges, those type of facilities that are small businesses around that are doing training classes and safety classes for young children and adults. What it does is it allows these people to come there. They don't have to purchase a FOID card to use the guns on-site or to purchase the ammunition. They go up there they're not allowed to purchase ammunition. They're only allowed to go ahead and have their safety course and then if they decide that they would want to go ahead and become sportsmen, then they would apply for a FOID card. But this wouldn't allow them to have any guns off the premises."

Miller: "Okay. On that point, let's say... On that point you just said, so, let's say I'm interested in learning how to shoot a rabbit or something, okay?"

Bost: "Right."

Miller: "Correct? I would go to a course and they would issue me a... a big..."

Bost: "No."

Miller: "They would not issue..."

Bost: "No, they would not issue you a FOID card."

Miller: "I would not need a card..."

Bost: "To use... to use their weapons and their shells or their ammunition on-site, only on-site. You cannot leave that site."

Miller: "Okay and how many of these facilities exist in Illinois?"

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Bost: "I don't have that answer for you because there are a lot of facilities whether they're skeet ranges, whether they're trap ranges, whether they're... they might be open hunting ranges to the public and safety course ranges, firing ranges. All of these would qualify under this, however, like I said, they would never be able to allow them to taking the weapon or ammunition off the site."

Miller: "Okay. Now, number two... you said num... point number two."

Bost: "Point number two is what I was talking about. We have... have guards that are located at our nuclear power plants: Zion and Quad Cities. And they have a problem because they're... they live out of state, but we... they are a staff member of the guard company that is providing that and this simply allows them to carry their weapons on-site to guard those facilities."

Miller: "Okay. And point... what... How many individuals... You said there were two nuclear power plants that would... Is that correct? That this would apply to. So, how many individuals are we talkin' about here?"

Bost: "Thirty percent of their workforce, is the information we have. Exactly... exact amount of employees, I have no..."

Miller: "Estimate a number, two hundred, one hundred, a thousand,

I don't know."

Bost: "Two hundred, I think."

Miller: "Two hundred. And... Okay, 'cause I couldn't quite hear.

You're saying they would be... Now, would that allow them
to be able to purchase a gun somewhere else or..."

Bost: "No."

Miller: "... how would this..."

Bost: "No. It simply allows them to carry their weapon on-site where they are active as guards for the nuclear power

- 135th Legislative Day May 23, 2002 plant."
- Miller: "Okay. Well, then I'm a little confused, 'cause in our... analysis it says they're employed as an armed guard.

 I assume the armed guard means they're already carrying a gun, so why would they..."
- Bost: "That's correct, but they live out of state, so they do not... they're not permitted to have a FOID card. You see, they... in Illinois because they live out of state."

Miller: "Okay."

- Bost: "You can't... if you live out of state, you can't get a FOID card in the State of Illinois. And this..."
- Miller: "So, this would just allow... they still would not get the card, they would just be allowed to carry... this Amendment... clear on this."
- Bost: "They would get... they would be the only... we drafted this very closely so they would be the only ones that would get a card."
- Miller: "Okay. So, that means they can purchase a gun in Chuck's

 Gun Shop in Riverdale. Is that correct, if they're issued
 a card?"
- Bost: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the..."
- Miller: "You said they're issued a card. Okay. If they live out of state, that they're issued a card. My concern is that with that card, they could card, they could come up to Chuck's Gun Shop in Riverdale and purchase guns. That's the..."
- Bost: "No. Because the card is, according to the way we're drafting it, the card would be flagged or marked that it is a special card."
- Miller: "Saying only, 'no good at'... Is there any way that this card can be forged? I've never... I haven't seen one."
- Bost: "Oh, it would be carded... it would be flagged only for the

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

use of their job and their position and it would be a very clear marking. And that's' ya know, that's the intent."

Miller: "But that would just simply allow them to carry the gun as opposed to purchase."

Bost: "That is correct."

Miller: "Would that... Is there any..."

Bost: "It'll allow them to carry the gun on... in Illinois while doing their job."

Miller: "Okay. And your third point, not to belabor."

Bost: "Okay. The third point... Sets... It's procedures requested for the State Police to issue the FOID card.

There's a request that they needed and we put that in there."

Miller: "Okay. The State Police would issue these cards? Is that what you just said?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "The State Police are called upon from time to time to transmit records to courts and administrative bodies. And this language would permit them to facilitate that a little easier than they do now."

Miller: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Bost: "See, he understands it. He understands it very well. I appreciate that."

Speaker Madigan: "You're welcome. Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, under current Illinois law, am I allowed to carry a gun?"

Bost: "You are if you have a FOID card."

Stephens: "Am I allowed to shoot someone with that gun?"

Bost: "No."

Stephens: "Is there anything..."

Bost: "Not under the existing law. I mean, in self defense

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

or..."

Stephens: "Is there anything in your Bill that would lead you to believe that that changes? That I wou..."

Bost: "No. It changes nothing in the law. None of this language changes anything at all from that standpoint."

Stephens: "Then we agree that this is probably about more about safety and more about the proper use of weapons and less about whether there's going to be someone injured."

Bost: "Actually, all three of the items deal more with safety, whether it's regulation put forward by the State Police, whether it is the safety of our nuclear power plants or whether it is the safety of training new people that might want to carry a firearm."

Stephens: "And is there anything in your Bill, as amended, that reflects the concern that both you and I have about military personnel from outside the State of Illinois being... having to buy a Illinois FOID card?"

Bost: "No."

Stephens: "And do you understand like I do that the changes that are needed in that area can be handled administratively by Department of State Police?"

Bost: "That is correct. That's what was given... that was testimony given in committee."

Stephens: "You're a great Legislator."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Bost, I have some fundamental questions about the cost of this Bill, but I also would like to clarify whether the Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, the real Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, not the organization that actually stole the

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

name, is opposed to this Bill. I think that there's a little bit of confusion. It's late in the day. It's been a long week. And I think that there needs to be a little bit of clarification on this Bill and some Members should pay attention."

Bost: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the question is...
that relevant to this Bill, the second part of the
question. The first... first, is the cost would be just
the... the regular charges for FOID card. That was your
first question. The second has nothing to do with this
Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Well, the question is, Mr. Bost, the question was and it is relevant to the Bill about who is and who isn't opposed to it. Is the real Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence opposed to this Bill?"

Bost: "It's my understanding that there was no opposition slip filed against it. But let me confirm that."

Feigenholtz: "I think it needs a little clarification. I've been informed that they are opposed as is the City of Chicago."

Bost: "There were no slips filed in committee. I..."

Feigenholtz: "We're trying to get some clarification."

Bost: "I can clear that up. On the Amendments, there was no... on the underlying Bill, yes, they were... they were opposed."

Feigenholtz: "Yeah. I'm sorry, Representative Bost, I was referring to the underlying Bill and whether or not there was opposition to that from the real Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence."

Bost: "The City of Chicago was opposed, yes."

Feigenholtz: "So, how much also is the state estimated to lose if we initiate this?"

Bost: "Nothing."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Feigenholtz: "So, I'd also like to clarify two things,

Representative Bost. The Illinois Association of Chiefs of

Police and the City of Chicago are both opposed to this

Bill, correct? The underlying Bill."

Bost: "They were originally."

Feigenholtz: "On the underlying Bill, they are..."

Bost: "On the underlying Bill, they were originally. That's correct."

Feigenholtz: "... they are opposed..."

Bost: "The City of Chicago..."

Feigenholtz: "... to the underlying Bill?"

Bost: "Yes. Yes, they were."

Feigenholtz: "And the Amendments do not change any of that. They are still opposed..."

Bost: "They do not."

Feigenholtz: "... to the Bill."

Bost: "They are not opposed to the Amendments, but the underlying Bill..."

Feigenholtz: "But they are..."

Bost: "... in opposition, yes."

Feigenholtz: "... opposed to the underlying Bill."

Bost: "Yes, there was opposition to the underlying Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Let's try and not be confusing here. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two items here, I think.

The training part of this Bill would be taking your wife to the gun range to have her shoot and train with a handgun, if you will. I mean, that is not something that us downstaters or sportsmen disagree with. I mean, if the people in Chicago can't support the Amateur Trap Association in Sparta because they shoot clay birds,

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

sobeit. But when we're training people at training ranges to be safe, I think that's what we ought to be doing. think that's what... that's what this Bill does. should all support that. I don't think and even the anti-gun people should be against safety and training on gun ranges. That is what, I think, the people in Chicago should not necessarily oppose because that is what we're about in training and being safe with handguns and with all guns. Secondly, the FOID card with security officers at nuclear plants, I have one close to my district and this issue has come up many times about people living in Iowa coming across working at the nuclear plant and being security guards carrying guns. So, this is a small exception here. I don't think it's a problem at all. will also be checked out, merely by the fact that they work at a nuclear plant. And their identity as well, prescribed because of their identification process through that nuclear plant. So, I would ask for support of the Members on Senate Bill 1936."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise... in the heat of debate, obviously, we say many things and insinuate many things and sometimes wish we hadn't done so. In response to a... an earlier comment, I don't think it's accurate nor does it serve any purpose to say that someone stole the charter of an organization. I don't think you can steal a charter of an organization that files its annual report, pays its annual fee and continues to do business under the State of Illinois rules and regulations. When a... Or when an organization doesn't do that, fails to file annual reports, does not pay the annual fee, then that charter or

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

that trademark may be available for any other organization who would like to use that name. And while you may not agree with what has been done, it was done in accordance with the law and it certainly wasn't stolen. If you're opposed to the Bill, that's fine, but I don't think we need to insinuate that someone was in violation of the law and stole somebody's identity or organizational charter when, in fact, that simply is not the case."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Representative, I have a couple of questions. First, as I understand the underlying Bill, you would create an exemption for someone who is taking a firearms course who could get a FOID card and who is being trained by someone who had a FOID card. Is that correct?"

Bost: "That is correct."

Lang: "And the theory is, well, he could go spend his \$5 and get it, but he'd taken this course and someone who's well-trained, who has a FOID card, is training him so he doesn't need to go spend the five bucks. Is that pretty much what you're saying here?"

Bost: "Well, yes, pretty much so, because it might be that that person might not want a FOID card after going through this."

Lang: "Well, then that leaves me with a couple of issues. First,

I... we can't really assume can we that the person who has
the FOID card, who is doing the training, is a good
trainer. We can't assume that that person's a good
trainer, can we?"

Bost: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you. Repeat it, repeat your..."

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

Lang: "The premise of this is that someone with a FOID card is going to train the person how to use their firearms, correct?"

Bost: "That's correct."

Lang: "We can't ensure that the trainer is a good trainer, can we?"

Bost: "No, I believe we can... I believe that we do in the fact that if they'd been issued a FOID card then would they have been rule that they... they have met the requirements of the state. They are running one of these facilities. There's other, you know, there's other things that we've put out there in place to make sure these facilities operate according to the law. Can we say that everyone's perfect out there? No, no more than we can say every driver is perfect who teaches someone how to drive."

Lang: "Yes, but we don't exempt people from getting driver's licenses, if... if they're driving around with people in the car who have them?"

Bost: "Probably the best example and I want to thank Representative Black, he and I were talking about that was if the classic example would be where a spouse wouldn't want to get a FOID card in a household, but husband or wife themselves have a FOID card and have weapons, so they want to be safe with those weapons being around the house. And I don't see what a problem with that that we could say that someone could go and train and like that they've... that they feel at comfortable at a time when we want people to be safe. And I don't think it's anymore than a safety issue."

Lang: "Well, why should that person be exempt from getting a FOID card? What's the public policy reason behind that?"

Bost: "Because... because a FOID card is for the purposes of

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

purchasing guns and purchasing ammunition in the State of Illinois. They're not saying they're wanting to do those things. They're saying they're wanting to be trained for safety purposes because they may be around some people that would have. That's one example. Another example is that maybe they've just want to be trained because maybe they're wanting to go into sports. But it might also be that after a training course they realize, okay, no, I don't want to do this."

Lang: "Well, let me go on to another issue. You've got something in your Bill providing an exemption to those under 18. Can you explain that provision?"

Bost: "The same thing. Is we're trained... it is very common around the state to train young hunters how to handle weapons. This allows that opportunity without them purchasing the FOID card to work at these ranges and at these hunting clubs to be trained in that way as well with safety. It's strictly a safety issue."

Lang: "Do we not already have a provision in the law that if you're under 21 and you would get parental consent you can get a FOID card?"

Bost: "Only if... only if 18."

Lang: "Well, if... I've got the statute in front of me."

Bost: "Okay."

Lang: "Says you can get a FOID card if you're under 21, if you have written consent of your parent or legal guardian."

Bost: "But suppose you're... suppose you're under 20 and you don't know... or under 18 and you don't know that you want a FOID card? Same situation. Suppose a parent wants to train their child on how to be safe around the house who does not need to apply for a FOID card, but they want them to have the safety course. Under this scenario, they don't

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

- have to get a FOID card, they can go and do the training."
- Lang: "But also under this scenario, you can agree to situation where if you have a family of five, one person needs a FOID card and the rest of them don't."
- Bost: "Only at these locations would that be true. That's not true because every family member to use a FOID card or to purchase a weapon or to purchase rounds of ammunition has to have a FOID card. Little Bobby Smith couldn't borrow dad's FOID card and go out and buy a new gun or ammunition and that's not we're asking for in this. It's simply to go and take these safety courses and use the weapon on-site and use the ammunition on-site, leave... do not leave the site. It is a safety issue."
- Lang: "Well, so, I understand, this Bill only deals with training."
- Bost: "Partic... training what... training on these sites, yes."
- Lang: "So, if this same 18-year-old wants to purchase a weapon or purchase ammunition, they'd still need a FOID card?"
- Bost: "They have to purchase a FOID card, that is correct, Representative."
- Lang: "And if this same 18-year-old is gonna use his or her father's gun at home, do they need a FOID card?"
- Bost: "If they transport it, they would need a FOID card."
- Lang: "So, the only exemption here is for these training courses."
- Bost: "Only these facilities, that's correct."
- Lang: "And what will the fiscal impact on the State of Illinois be?"
- Bost: "The only impact at all... I don't think there would be any. I mean, there was no fiscal impact filed or notice filed... note filed. Unless it would be the fact that maybe... no, there wouldn't be any because if these people

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

weren't gonna purchase anyway, they wouldn't... there is no... They're... and they're paying for these training courses through... through the trainers."

Lang: "Well, today, Representative, all these people have to get their FOID card, right?"

Bost: "If they would go to a facility, they would have to, yes."

Lang: "And they're each spending five bucks for that FOID card, right?"

Bost: "That's probably the case, yes."

Lang: "So, if 10 thousand people are taking these courses, that's \$50 thousand. How many people are taking these courses?"

Bost: "Well, I... I don't know how... we don't have the numbers on that. That right now, to tell you exactly how many people are taking these courses, but if we can encourage more people to be safe I don't see where it isn't worth the cost."

Lang: "Well..."

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

Lang: "One more question, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Is it conceivable there's a million people a year taking these classes?"

Bost: "No. I would doubt that there would be a million people."

Lang: "Can you give me the range?"

Bost: "Probably 20 thousand, 25 thousand a year, tops."

Lang: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 85 'ayes', 24 'noes'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

- 135th Legislative Day May 23, 2002 declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1542?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1542 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 2215?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 2215 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. On Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House Bill 4787. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 4787 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4788. What is the status of that
 Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 4788 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

 The Chair is prepared to adjourn. The Republicans are planning a caucus. Representative Lindner, Mr. Poe. Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Republicans will caucus in 118 immediately upon adjournment."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, again, the plan is to return on Monday for a 6 p.m. Session and the Resolution provides that we'll convene at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. So, with all of that in mind, Representative Currie moves that the... Representative Currie moves that the House stand

135th Legislative Day

May 23, 2002

adjourned until Monday at 5:30 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until Monday at 5:30 p.m., providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 23, 2002, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' House Resolution 950."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

 House Bill 6290, offered by Representative John Jones, a

 Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. First Reading of
 this House Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 81, offered by Representative Currie, is assigned to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."