66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Susanne Havlik of the Lutheran Church of the Resurrection in Oak Forest. Reverend Havlik is the guest of Representative Crotty. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Reverend Havlik: "Let us pray. Almighty God, author of universe, You have given us the good and fertile land in this beautiful State of Illinois as our heritage. Help us always to remember Your generosity and let our hearts always be thankful. Bless this state with honesty and industry, truth in education, justice in legislation, and an honorable way of life. Protect us from violence, from discord and confusion, and from pride and arrogance. Bless all those who hold office and otherwise work in the government of this state, especially those present at this Assembly today, that they may do their work in a spirit of wisdom and kindness. Help them use their authority to serve faithfully and to promote the general welfare. Grant these good men and women discernment as they wrestle with the difficult issues before them. Bring understanding and fellowship to their discussions and deliberations. Call to their minds those who need assistance in some way, the unemployed, the working poor, the uninsured, families, especially children and the elderly. Help them in their deliberations to remember the needs of our schools and teachers, of those who work the ground and care for the livestock, of those in our businesses and industries, of those who are caretakers and of all those who have concerns livelihood. Be present and bless this legislative Session that it may be productive and according to Your

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

- will. Finally, Oh God, author of liberty, we give You thanks for all those who have served and still serve in some capacity in the protection of the freedom we here live in and enjoy. We especially pray for the families of all who have given their lives in service to this state and this country. Lastly, we ask for Godspeed for those who travel this Memorial Day weekend. We pray all this in Your name, Oh God of life and salvation. 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 we do not have any excused absences to report today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Poe."
- Poe: "Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to report that all Republicans are here and accounted for and thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 118

 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
 quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Steve Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Constitutional Officers, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Friday, May 25, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1917. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

was/were referred, action taken on Friday, May 25, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 888."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brosnahan, do you wish to call the Motion for Concurrence on House Bill 2265? Mr. Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments House. #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2265. This is the initiative of Secretary of State Jesse White, part of his DUI package. Senate Amendment #1 in the original legislation for a person who commits the offense for a second time of driving under the influence while having a BAC of .16 or above. The original legislation, it was a mandatory minimum of 30 days in prison or 300 hours of community service. Under this Amendment, it is a minimum of two days imprisonment and a minimum fine of 12.50. Senate Amendment #2 makes some technical changes. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in the Senate Amendments. And Mr. Clerk, is the Gentleman's Motion that the House concur in both Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Motion is to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Madigan: "On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, in its current form, the Bill has come back. And I'm sorry, I didn't hear your explanation. And that was my fault, I was on the phone. This is Secretary

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

White's DUI initiative, correct?"

Brosnahan: "That's correct. That's one of the Bills."

Black: "And it... Is the plan... This Bill is before us now with the Senate Amendments. Is the plan still to get tough on those with multiple offenses who have in the past thumbed their nose at the law in responsibility, continue to drive without a license, maybe have had four or five DUIs and continue to drive? I'm trying to look at the Senate Amendments to make sure that it is the way I thought we wanted it and that is, we're not gonna put up with that."

Brosnahan: "That's correct. Representative, this is going after those chronic offenders, those individuals that choose to drive on our roadways with a blood alcohol content of twice the legal limit, .16 or above. That's who we're really targeting, the worst of the worst."

Black: "And one of the Senate Amendments requires a mandatory two-day jail term if you're twice the legal limit. Is that still on the Bill?"

Brosnahan: "For a second conviction."

Black: "For a second conviction."

Brosnahan: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. All right. So, you're satisfied with what Secretary White wanted; the Senate Amendments add to the Bill, they do not detract."

Brosnahan: "Not at all. We actually think this strengthens the Bill. I am satisfied with it. I know the Secretary of State is satisfied with this and that's why we have made the Motion to Concur."

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

Brosnahan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, I get calls and letters from people who are very frustrated with the DUI laws of this state and many people are demanding that those who continue to drink, who continue to go to court and just get their hand slapped that more severe action is taken to get them off the roads. The carnage and death from drunken drivers on these roads is unacceptable. Does this Bill take a small step or a big step in solving that problem of getting them off the roads, out of the cars, and into the prisons so they can no longer drink and kill or maim our citizens?"

Brosnahan: "I think we're taking a large step in the right direction and I think, quite frankly, this legislation is gonna prove to be a role model for other states to follow.

And I definitely think we're heading in the right direction."

Parke: "Well, what is going to be different than we're doing now in the courts? Is there anything that mandates prison time in this Bill or is there anything that mandates not having a driver's license or license plates for a period of time?"

Brosnahan: "Sure. One of the... What the Senate Amendment #1 does, it does mandate two days of prison time for a person convicted of a second DUI whose blood alcohol content was .16 or above. In the underlying Bill, what this does...

There was no... previously, there was no difference. If someone had a .08 and he was driving in a car or if he had a .25, you know, three times the legal limit, there was no difference in the penalty provision. So, that's why this Bill makes a large step and it's definitely stronger and it's gonna correct the problem, hopefully."

Parke: "Now, this is a... Part of this Bill, I understand, was already passed by this Body and Senate Amendment were put

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

on in the Senate. Are there any other DUI legislation out that you're aware of that tries to address this problem and maybe works to solve the problem of drunken driving on our roads? Is there... Do you know? Or is this it?"

Brosnahan: "Well, no. I know the Secretary of State also had another Bill that was passed by this Body and passed by the Senate, House Bill 2266, I believe that House Bill number was. I don't recall the other Bills, but there are a number of Bills that try to address the problems with DUIs."

Parke: "So, this is the only one that's still moving?"

Brosnahan: "That's still active, as far as I know, yes, but..."

Parke: "All right. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this. This legislation is a good step in the right direction. The citizens of this state just don't understand why we continue to allow people who drink and get arrested for excess alcohol content in their blood stream, arrest after arrest. And then we keep reading in the paper where more and more of our citizens are killed by these drunk drivers. I think this is a... the Sponsor's to be commended. I think that Jesse White, who helped initiate this, should be commended for his work on this legislation. And this is the kind of legislation that I expect this Body to put out. And hopefully, if this is effective and we still continue to find that there's still people driving drunk and still killing our citizens and injuring our citizens, then we have to take whatever next step is necessary. And I will try to make sure next year that I work with either the Sponsor or any Sponsor in this chamber to do that. So, I rise in strong support for this legislation and plan on voting for it."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Senate Amendments to House Bill 2265?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 118 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2265. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Winters on House Bill 1270. Mr. Winters."

- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1270 basically will validate taxes and bonds that were issued by the Rockford School District in 1991 and 1992 and validate the actions of the school district and the school board. I believe we have an agreement on this. And would answer any questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1270?' 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 81 people voting 'yes', 37 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1270. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. Delgado in the chamber? Mr. Delgado, House Resolution 304. Mr. Delgado."
- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House... and Members of the General Assembly. House Resolution 304 was borne out of my committee that I sit on in Appropriations for Elementary & Secondary Education. This is asking for a general audit of

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

the Academy of Math and Sciences which receives a major stipend from the State of Illinois. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 304. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 304?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie, have Representatives Novak and Brunsvold voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 118 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 304. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading there appears Senate Bill 396, Representative Coulson. Representative Coulson, did you wish to call the Bill? The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. Senate Bill 504, Representative Beaubien. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Senate Bill 598, Mr. Hassert. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 598, a Bill for an Act concerning library districts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hassert."

Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 598 simply amends the Public Library District Act of 1991. Allows property taxes to be extended to pay principal and interest on general obligation bonds of the library district are issued to refund certain bonds. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes';

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

those opposed by voting 'no'. Has Representative May voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 118 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, did you wish to call Senate Bill 698? The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. Is Mr. Dart in the chamber? Mr. Dart. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hartke. Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes. I was just wondering if you wanted to call House Resolution 190."

Speaker Madigan: "That's a good idea. House Resolution 190 by Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. House Resolution 190 is the product of a House Bill that failed in the Senate, in agreement with IDOT. Resolution calls for a study of the rural roads in Illinois and municipalities that currently use 80,000 pound trucks. I have been trying to get access to rural areas for rural development and economic development for years, but we really don't know how many roads in rural Illinois, counties and townships, are being used by the larger vehicles. And so, what this Resolution does is request the Illinois Department of Transportation to do a study of the amount of roads, the length of the roads, and the condition of those roads now and give us an estimate by January 1st of next year on the needs of rural roads in Illinois. I'm talking about county and township roads and those in our smaller municipalities. I would ask for your acceptance and adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 190?' Those in

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

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 118 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill... Rather the House does adopt House Resolution 190. Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. I have checked with Representative Lyons on your side of the aisle. I have a House Resolution 315 that was released from Rules Committee yesterday, but I would need to waive the posting requirements so that we could hear that in Revenue next Tuesday. Representative Lyons said that was fine with him. The Resolution simply asks that Congress continue with their efforts on the Federal Gasoline Tax."

Speaker Madigan: "I believe your Motion is to suspend the posting requirements?"

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Right. Is there leave? Is there leave for Mr. Black? Are there anybody... people that would object to Mr. Black? Leave is granted."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The posting requirements are suspended. Mr. Hassert, did you wish to call Senate Bill 888? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 888, a Bill for an Act concerning certain financial services. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hassert."

Hassert: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

This is an agency Bill. This amends the Transmitter of Money Act and Debt Management Services Act. Creates a new law with both Acts to deal with the potential bankruptcy of transmitters of money or debt management service firms. I'll be happy to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 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 105 people voting 'yes', 'no'. This Bill, having received a people voting Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Jay Hoffman. Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Stroger. Is Mr. Stroger in the chamber? Mr. Stroger. Mr. Cross, do you wish to call Senate Bill 1011? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "Distribution of the Fall Veto Session by the Clerk. The Chair recognizes Representative Tenhouse. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Tenhouse: "We're honored to have Representative Sommer back, but

I think he also has a picture of his new daughter, Megan,
with him. So, if anyone wants to stop by and congratulate
him, I know he's a proud dad and like to shake hands and
say 'hello' and show her off."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Tenhouse. Welcome back to the General Assembly, Representative Sommer. I think you went to China, did you not? Yes. On page 12 of the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 293, Representative Beaubien. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrences, on page 12 on the Regular Calendar appears House Bill 888, Representative Cross. Please explain Amendment #1."

This is a Bill that came out of Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Judiciary... а Motion that came out of Judiciary unanimously this morning. This Bill deals with the Code of Criminal Procedure. And under the original Bill, the Cook County State's Attorneys Office asked that someone other than the state's attorney be designated to pursue the requisite paperwork for an eavesdropping matter. The Senate said, that's fine, but we think their designee ought to be only an assistant state's attorney not anyone else. There was also a provision in this Bill that said a person subject to the eavesdropping had to be notified no later than 160 days, the law is currently 90. The Senate thought that we should keep it at 90 and delete the 160. That's the gist of their Amendment. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on the Motion. Thank you."

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

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

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

Bill 888?' All those in favor will signify by voting

'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,

take the record. On this question, there are 118 Members

voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And

the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House

Bill 888. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hoffman in the

chamber? Mr. Hoffman, are you ready for 1069? Out of the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

record. On page 13 on concurrences appears House Bill 1692. Mr. Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Black: "I would like to welcome to the floor a former Member of this Body, currently the Secretary of State of Illinois, the Honorable Jesse White."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the House Floor, Secretary White.

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

Mendoza: "I rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, state your point."

Mendoza: "I'd like to recognize... I'm so happy and proud and honored to have the class from Eli Whitney in my neighborhood, Little Village, is here to visit us today and see how we operate in Springfield. They're up there. Everybody say 'hello'. And they're here accompanied by their assistant principal, Mr. Garcia, and their teacher, Mr. Totto, along with some chaperones to make sure they behave. All right, let's say 'hello' everybody."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield, your state capital. Mr. Mathias. Out of the record. Mr. Hoffman, are you ready now? Mr. Parke, are you ready to call your Concurrence Motion? 1900. Okay. On page 13 of the Calendar appears... on Concurrence Motions appears House Bill 1900. Mr. Parke, would you please explain Senate Amendment #1."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1900 removes House Amendment 4 to House Bill 1900. House Amendment 4 expands the list of individuals who could receive notification of a pending abortion of a minor. House Amendment 4 adds grandparents, siblings, stepsiblings, aunts, uncles. It

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

did not require that these individuals reside with the minor. It did not require that these individuals have any relationship or involvement with the minor. These individuals could live anywhere in this country, anywhere in this world. These individuals were not required to have any knowledge of the medical history of the minor. House Amendment 4 also adds clergy to the list. It does not require that the clergy be the family pastor or the minor's pastor. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm having trouble..."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Parke: " ... hearing myself."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It did not require that the clergy even know the minor. It did not require that the clergy provide counsel for the minor. It simply required that a clergy, any clergy, be told that a minor is gonna have an abortion. Senate Amendment 1 restores House Bill 1900 to its original constitutional form. The United States Supreme Court has ruled that a minor girl's rights to an abortion is equal to that of an adult female. However, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that a minor's right to an abortion is subject to parental rights not grandparents' rights not aunts, uncles' rights not siblings' rights and certainly not the rights of some unknown clergy. Senate Amendment 1 returns House Bill 1900 to the known guidelines of the United States Supreme Court. The State of Illinois has recognized compelling state interest in protecting parents' rights to protect and raise House Amendment 4 diminishes and their children. undermines that state interest and places the Bill in jeopardy of being found unconstitutional. Senate Amendment 1 eliminates that risk and places the Bill on firm,

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

constitutional grounds. Ladies and Gentlemen, 33 states currently have parental notification or parental consent laws in effect, six of those states border the State of Illinois. Consequently, Illinois has become the abortion dumping ground for abortions of young girls in the Midwest. Senate Amendment 1 restores House Bill 1900 to a constitutional form that will rend me this disgraceful situation. I stand ready to answer any questions."

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

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Fritchey: "Let me preface by saying should this receive the requisite number of votes I do request a verification."

Speaker Hartke: "Your request will be granted."

Fritchey: "To my colleagues, all the Bills that we consider in this chamber impact somebody or some business interest of this state. There are precious few of them that come before us that mark a fundamental change in who we are as a state. House Bill 1900 is one of those Bills. When it comes to the issue of a woman's right to choose, exceedingly difficult to find any room for compromise or consensus, yet that is exactly what we tried to do when we passed an Amendment to this Bill when it was before us before. The Senate, however, has refused to recognize the reality of the structures of many of today's families and remove the Amendment from the Bill. I would urge people not to be led astray by those that would tell you that this vote is determinative of whether or not you support a woman's right to choose, it is not. A woman's right to choose to terminate her pregnancy is the law of the land in Illinois. It will be so regardless of the outcome of this

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Bill. This Bill is about real people, real families, and real minors who are confronted with the decision of incredible magnitude. To that end, I'd ask the indulgence of this Body as I read the words of some of the real people that were affected by this type of legislation. I'd like to read to you a letter that was written some time ago by a couple by the name of Karen and William Bell. Speaker, I understand there's a lot going on here, but if I can just get a little bit of quiet. This is an issue of importance."

Speaker Hartke: "Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very, very contentious piece of legislation. The timer will not be on and I expect a lot of speakers, we have seven who are wanting to speak already. We will discuss this Bill fully. And in order to avoid repeating testimony, please give the speakers your attention. Please."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate it. As I said, if I could just have the attention as I read the words of the Bell family on this issue. 'We understand that you are now considering adopting legislation that would restrict minors access to abortion services in the State of Illinois. urge you to consider the tragic events that surrounded the death of our daughter, Becky, in 1988. Our names are Karen and William Bell and we reside in Indianapolis, Indiana, with our 23-year-old son, Bill. We write this letter with mixed emotions dreading to relive the death of daughter, but also realizing responsibility to others, that the punitive and restrictive laws that are being heard before you are understood by all. In writing and in theory these laws appear reasonable and safe, but in practice they are punitive and dangerous. Our daughter, Becky, made a mistake and became pregnant. Parental consent law is

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

dictated and in order to terminate her pregnancy she had to obtain our approval, petition the courts, or travel to another state that would allow her a safe clinical abortion or seek back-alley assistance. She died of an illegal abortion. In confiding with her best friend, she said, want to disappoint my mother and dad, I love them so much. Do not be fooled into thinking that a parental notification law is somehow less damaging than a parental consent law. In the eyes of a teenager, confronted with an unintended pregnancy, there is no difference. Knowing our daughter, we believe that Indiana's judicial option was to intimidate him (sic-her), given her desperate, emotional state. She would also have been faced with the prospect of appearing before a pro-life judge, hardly a reasonable option considering the fact that she had decided to She chose the last terminate her pregnancy. option available to her, an illegal abortion. Unfortunately, we have been unable to piece together all the circumstances and today we struggle with the question, why did our daughter have to endure such mental torture in making what turned out to be her final decision? She was intelligent enough to pursue her options, yet we live with the pain of knowing our daughter was desperate and alone and because of punishing and restrictive laws, she further compounded her initial mistake with another and paid for it with her life. Our daughter was a wonderful child. She was raised in a functional family environment and was encouraged to develop her own thinking and reasoning skills, yet in her time of crisis, others denied her legitimate options, the right to self-determination. Had our daughter come to us, we would have counseled her, made her aware of all options, the circumstances and the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

consequences to the best of our ability, but I can emphatically state that the final decision would have been it stands today, Legislators, As judges, self-appointed moralists, and parents are making decisions for these young women allowing little or no input from them. How can we legislate or dictate that families communicate? How can we dictate to people how they must act or react in a time of crisis? We realize a great number of young women are going to their parents for counsel and for this we are grateful. Since the death of our daughter, we have counseled several young women and have been fortunate to get the parents involved. But what about the young woman who doesn't want to disappoint her family? If we understand correctly, the legislation before you offers no accommodation for a real-life situation like that of a Becky Bell nor does it consider the young lady from a dysfunctional home who may fear for her physical well-being. These laws speak to theories and hypotheticals. They do not address real-life circumstances taking place today. These punitive and restrictive laws being considered, if enacted, will serve to further isolate the young women of Illinois. In the interest of political gain and in the name of God, our daughter was punished. Others took it upon themselves to decide my daughter's fate thus denying her a safe option and the best care. theories and political stance were placed ahead of and valued more than the life of my daughter. These laws clearly denied her a safe and reasonable option. And because she had decided to terminate her pregnancy, she was forced into making a fatal mistake. Our beautiful Becky Bell died on September 16, 1988. Becky's death will count for something. She was somebody, somebody beautiful.

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

will not sit idly by and not speak to others that could face the same torment that the Bell family now lives with, not as long as there are those who will go to any length to take away basic human rights. We are not promoting abortion, far from it. But we are speaking out against those who want to punish, who suggest that we can reduce teenage pregnancy through legislation. We are speaking out against those who will simply not address the needs of birth control and sex education. Sex among teenagers will not be regulated by legislation nor will it be eliminated. We are a family with broken hearts and it is our desire that speaking out will in someway prevent others from living the same nightmare. We urge you to consider real-life situations and not punish the young women of Illinois. Rebecca Susanne Bell was not a theory; she was a beautiful human being. She was our daughter taken away because some others thought they had all the answers. W℮ urge you to defeat this legislation. Sincerely, Karen Bell and William C. Bell.' These are the words of parents. These are the words of pro-life parents, anti-choice parents. These are the words of parents who lost their daughter because of a law like the one we are considering right now. This is not a Bill that is going to decide how you stand on the issue of choice. This is a Bill that is going to stand... determine how you stand on the issue of reasonableness and what is right and what is right to do in this state. We put forth a reasonable piece of legislation out of this chamber. It has been sent back to us stripped of that reasonableness in a manner that will kill young girls in the State of Illinois. I urge you to vote 'no' on this measure."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson. Shhh."

Johnson: "I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation and obviously, we've discussed this piece on numerous occasions during the eight or nine years that I've been in this General Assembly. I'm gonna keep my remarks very brief, but I do need to ask a question for legislative intent, which I'll do in just a second. It never ceases to amaze me in here that we have no qualms about passing legislation that requires notification to parents about a whole range of issues, but when we get to the issue of something as significant as the abortion issue, it's off And you know, just a week ago I was struck, we passed a Bill in here, in which there was quite a bit of discussion in favor of, this is great, where we said that we had to require giving notice to parents of minors if they were to receive a traffic ticket. To parents, not to clergy, not to aunts and uncles, not to anybody else, but give notice to parents if your minor gets a traffic ticket. Yet, whenever we hit this wall and we hit it around the edges, obviously, nobody's ever challenging the right anymore to a woman to have the choice on abortion, was settled in Roe v. Wade, but certainly the practical aspects of bringing parents and family into this very difficult, difficult decision always ends up with a brick wall. And I might suggest that we hit that brick wall a week ago in Judiciary, as well, or two weeks ago in Judiciary when, in fact, because the original intent was an abortion that ended up with a live birth, that just because we have an abortion we have a right to a dead child as well and that live child is not a human being. I think this legislation is long overdue. We've passed it in here before and we should pass it again. For purposes of

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

legislative intent, I need to ask the Sponsor a question.
Will he yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "He will yield."

Parke: "Yes."

Johnson: "The question is this, in 1995, the Illinois Supreme
Court refused to promulgate the rules necessary to
implement the judicial bypass. I understand that Senate
Amendment #1 addresses this issue by including the rules.
Doesn't this intrude upon the authority of the Illinois
Supreme Court and won't the court find the Bill to be
unconstitutional for invading judicial territory?"

Parke: "Thank you, Representative Johnson. In 1995, the Illinois Supreme Court refused to promulgate the rules for the implementation of the judicial bypass. The court then found the law to be incomplete and issued a permanent injunction. Senate Amendment 1 includes the rules necessary to implement the judicial bypass. However, the Bill states that the rules are only in effect until such time as the Illinois Supreme Court promulgates its own It is not the intent of this Bill to infringe upon rules. or invade the judicial territory, we are simply responding to the court's decision in 1995. Without the rules and the law, it is incomplete. We wrote the rules to avoid the situation we encountered in 1995. We hold no malice When the court issues its rules, the towards the court. rules in the Bill are rendered ineffective. In the past, the Illinois Supreme Court took years to promulgate rules for parental involvement law. We are bridging that gap to allow time for the court to write its rules."

Johnson: "Thank you. And I urge everybody's support of this very reasonable piece of legislation."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

66th Legislative Day May 25, 2001

Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Miller: "You described Illinois as a... Representative Parke, you described Illinois as a dumping ground for abortions from other states, is that correct?"

Parke: "Yes."

Miller: "Do you have any demographics on what that... on the women that come over from other states as far as racially and also as far as economically?"

Parke: "No, I don't believe that information is available nor has it been asked, in my opinion."

Miller: "And as far as... I didn't hear any numbers that you're given... that you may have gave in regards to us being a dumping ground."

Parke: "Well, we estimate that over 4,000... by basis of those that have come from other states, over 4,000 young girls have come to Illinois to have an abortion. We do not know the racial make up of those 4,000 young girls."

Miller: "Okay. To the Bill. As you know, I've talked about this before when this came up before and I stand in strong opposition to this legislation as a health care provider. I practice dentistry in downtown Chicago and the southside suburbs, southside low-income, high-income. And in every health care situation I've practiced in, there's always been one situation when a relative, a brother, a sister and as I said before, a coach has brought that child in for dental treatment. Now, granted, dentistry and health care of the teeth is much different than seeking an abortion. No one would argue with that. However, with that comes a higher emotional degree of stress and higher emotional

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

consequence from that occurrence. At least we should be able to provide a safety net for children and women who decide to seek this option, whether we agree with it or A brother or a sister does take care of children in this state. That is a reality. I've seen it, that reality. A foster mother and a foster parent do take care of children in this state. A grandmother or grandfather and some clergy do take care of children in this state. And so by excluding these possibilities for these children, it does affect... does not protect the children of the Because eventually, if they aren't able to tell state. somebody and they're more comfortable with telling a sibling, then they are and will seek an abortion. we want to go back to the stage and the steps of a backroom abortion, absolutely no. So, I stand in strong opposition of this Amendment and I would encourage all my Members in the General Assembly to vote against this. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Zickus."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Zickus: "In your opening remarks, you refer to Illinois as being a dumping ground for abortions. Would you explain what you mean by that?"

Parke: "Thank you. All the states surrounding Illinois have parental involvement laws, all of 'em. And they're not just parental consent, I mean parental notification, two of 'em are parental consent. It said that there are thousands of minor girls flocking to Illinois to evade the laws in their home state. In 1998, 4,517 abortions were performed on out-of-state residents. We can assume most of those were minors because adult females would not have to travel

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

out of their state to obtain an abortion. The largest abortion clinic in Southern Illinois states on its literature that you do not have to tell your parents if you come here for an abortion. Many opponents of this Bill have expressed concern regarding harm to young girls, many have expressed concern in the past about undue burden of young girls having to travel to obtain an abortion. If this Bill does not pass, we are encouraging young pregnant girls to travel miles to have an abortion. Traveling without their parents' knowledge of their whereabouts, without a parental notification law, that is what we are encouraging here in the State of Illinois."

Zickus: "Thank you. I would like to support this legislation if we care at all about our children. You've raised some very good points about young girls having to travel miles to this state to have an abortion because in their own states they would have to notify their parents. They're at risk on the highways. Their parents have no idea where they are. Their parents have no idea what they're coming here for. So, I urge your support on this legislation."

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

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this legislation. First of all, someone said this legislation is long overdue. Well, Members, I would like you to look at the last page of this Bill. This Bill it says it repeals the Parental Consent Act of 1977, it repeals the Parental Consent Act of 1983 and the Parental Consent Act of 1995. Now, these earlier two Bills had been found unconstitutional. The Parental Consent Law of 1995 was an expanded notification Bill which included other family members including grandparents. And that is a Bill which I

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

voted for because I thought that this would give enough options for children who do not live with their families. This Bill, as it is, taking out expanded notification, simply ignores reality. I can tell the Sponsor that in my district, here in Springfield, there are substantial number of young children who do not live with their parents, who live with grandparents, who live with aunts and uncles, who maybe live with elder siblings. And those are the ones who are closest to them. The other thing that's interest (sic-interesting) about parents, it does not even require that they live with their parents. They could be living with a grandparent or an aunt and uncle or the parents could be anywhere else and out-of-state. But it does not even address that situation. We had a good Amendment and I appreciate the support of those who voted for it. And I would urge you all who supported this before to vote 'no' on concurrence."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw. Shhh, please." Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Each one of us is sent here to represent the folks back home. And back home, district of each and every Member of this House, there are a lot of moms and dads who are wonderful parents. there are exceptions. I know that there are some parents who really do not do a good job of parenting, but I truly believe that is very unusual. That for the most part the parents that all of you and I represent are moms and dads who genuinely care about their children, who will make sacrifices for those children, who will always love and nurture and care for them and who will share with them their problems in order to find solutions that for both the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

parents and the child are the best and wisest thing for the child in the long run. What this Amendment comes down to, I think, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is a matter of whether we believe we can trust the parents of this state's children. I know a lot of parents back home in my own district. I don't know any that I do not trust to care for their children, assist and help their children and for any problem their child may ever encounter, truly try to help the child through that problem in a way that is best for that child. So, what this comes down to, Mr. Speaker, is whether we have faith in the moms and dads back home, whether we believe that as parents we should respect them and respect their wishes. As a mom myself, I truly respect the moms and dads back home in my district. On this question, I intend to vote with them."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Gentleman will yield."

Flowers: "Representative Parke, I'm lookin' at the first page of the Bill and Section V under the short title. And would you please indulge me for a minute. It says the legislative finding and purpose. The General Assembly finds that notification of an adult family member, as defined in this Act, is in the best interest of an unemancipated minor. And the General Assemblys' purpose in this... enacting this parental notification law is to further the importance and the compelling state interest of protecting the best interest of an unemancipated minor. Now, would you define for me please, what is an unemancipated minor?"

Parke: "Okay. Just a minute... It says that 'has not been

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

married or has not been emancipated under the Emancipation of Minors Act... Mature Minors Act."

Flowers: "So, what would be emancipated minor?"

Parke: "I'm sorry. What's your question?"

Flowers: "What is an emancipated minor?"

Parke: "Okay. What it means is that, if a court orders that this child is capable of making her own decision because in the information or the background that she presents to the judge and the judicial bypass believes that she is capable of making the decision, then she would be considered emancipated."

Flowers: "So, Representative, under your legislation, an unemancipated minor must have parental notice before she can have an abortion? Am I correct?"

Parke: "Yes. But there are, built into the Bill, protections for exceptions."

Flowers: "Representative, once again, I've said it numerous times on this floor and I need to ask you again, you know it hasn't been very long ago that we had over 50,000 children as wards of the state. Some of them are now 16 and 17 years old. They have been sexually abused by their foster parents or guardianship. Under this Bill, who would that child go to, Sir?"

Parke: "When that child goes to the abortion clinic and says, I am considering abortion, the clinic then will say, under... you're going to have to give notice. And she says, I'm being abused in the home. What that does is then those abortion clinics will have lay people on staff that will help them get a lawyer to process a judicial bypass. Those children then will be protected by the court because they are anonymous, it is private, no one knows who the person is that's being presented to the court on behalf of this

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

judicial bypass."

Flowers: "Where is that in the Bill, please? What page are you on?"

Parke: "Page 4."

Flowers: "Would you read it to me, please?"

Parke: "Certainly. The minor declares in writing that she is a victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by an adult family member as defined in this Act, in which case the attending physician must certify in the patient's medical record that he or she has received the written declaration of abuse and neglect."

Flowers: "So, who does she go to?"

Parke: "She will present that to the abortion doctor and the doctor then can put in place a judicial bypass. It must be acted upon in 48 hours."

Flowers: "So, on Section 15 and I have page 3 here it says, 'no person shall knowingly perform an abortion upon a minor or upon incompetent person unless a person or his or her agent has given 48 hours actual notice to an adult family member of the pregnant minor or an incompetent person of his or her intentions to perform the abortion..."

Parke: "Keep going."

Flowers: "...unless the person or his or her agent has received a written notice statement by a referring physician certifying that the referring physician as his or her agent has been given a 48 hour notice to the effect that an adult family member of the pregnant minor...' It doesn't say that if the person has been impregnated by the family member."

Parke: "I'm still not sure I understand what your point is."

Flowers: "My point is, you read something totally different from what this Section is saying. This Section is telling me that we have to inform a family member within 48 hours."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Parke: "But that could be bypassed by simply going to the court and saying that there's abuse happening in the home."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, see... let me just say to you that you are assuming that this child, that you don't feel have enough sense to make a decision to go to have an abortion on her own, you want her to know that she can go to a court to get an attorney to go to the courts to have this... Representative, who are you talking to on the phone while you're talking to me? Representative Parke. Excuse me, Representative Parke, who are you..."

Parke: "Well, this is all technical questions. These are tech..."

Flowers: "But who..."

Parke: "I'm trying to make sure..."

Flowers: "...are you talk..."

Parke: "...I answer your questions."

Flowers: "I want to know who you're talking to. You supposed to be talkin' to me. I'm a little offended."

Parke: "I'm trying to address your question, Representative."

Flowers: "Well, who else are you talking to on the telephone?"

Parke: "It's a secret."

Flowers: "There's no secrets in this House, Representative."

Parke: "It is... I am talking to a lawyer..."

Flowers: "What's her name?"

Parke: "...that help me draw it."

Flowers: "What is her name?"

Parke: "I am talking to a lawyer..."

Flowers: "I know it's a her."

Parke: "It's a lawyer. Thank you."

Flowers: "She's a lawyer."

Parke: "And what does that have to do..."

Flowers: "And what are you all discussing? I want to know..."

66th Legislative Day May 25, 2001

Parke: "What does that have to do with your question?"

Flowers: "I want to know, what are you discussing with her?"

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me."

Parke: "The answer to your question..."

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me."

Parke: "...Representative..."

Flowers: "Well, where is she? Tell her to talk to me."

Parke: "What difference does it make? You know that no one can speak on the floor but you and I."

Flowers: "Well, then get off the phone. I don't want her whisperin' in your ear..."

Parke: "Well, these are technical questions, Representative."

Flowers: "...while nobody's whispering in my ear."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers..."

Parke: "I'd love to answer your question."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke, please keep your remarks to the discussion on this piece of legislation."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill.

This is House Bill 1900 as it should be because this is outdated, Representative Parke. This is 2001. We cannot and have not legislated or can we mandate good parents.

And as a mother, I would hope that the relationship between my daughter and I is so that she could feel comfortable in talking to me. I give her credit for havin' a lot of sense. I give a lot of children credit for havin' a lot of sense because this world is a lot smaller, Representative, than the world that you and I grew up in. So, as a result, if a minor feel within themselves that they cannot go and talk to their parent, we should respect that, Sir. We should respect that. I'm reminded of a situation where two sisters were impregnated by their father and their mother put them out of the house. The family in which you are

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

talking about, Sir, is outdated, it does not exist for the most part anymore because if it were true we would not have had 50,000 children locked up in the system. If it were true, Sir, we would not be sending children to adult This is not the same world. I would hope that you can appreciate an emancipated minor who does not have the wisdom or the wherewithal to maneuver the court system because she has no one that she can call upon other than a friend, other than the decision that she was wise enough to make on her own accord. I would wish, Sir, that you and I not try to be this young girl's parent because we've never walked a mile in her shoes. You don't know what all she's had to go through, you don't know why she or how she became impregnated or by whom. There are some religion out... religious group out there, Sir, if they found out that their daughter was pregnant, they would do them more vicious harm than that abortion might do. Again, Representative, what we should be doing is putting counseling in place for these young girls and having a place where they can go to talk to or talk to someone that does not neces... but it should not be a law that that person would be charged with a crime or the doctor that performs the abortion should be charged with a crime. And so, therefore, I would urge this Body to please vote on this antiquated Bill that's House Bill 1900. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reitz: "I had a question for legislative intent. Why does Senate

Amendment #1 remove clergy as a person to notify before an

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

abortion?"

Parke: "Thank you. House Amendment 4 does not specify that the clergy must be the minor's pastor or priest, any clergy can suffice. The physician could select the name of a pastor out of a phonebook, call him and her, or give 'em notice the telephone. That would satisfy the notice requirements under the House Amendment. The clergy would not be required to even know the young girl. If a physician could call the minor's pastor, think of the burden that's placed upon that individual. The pastor's now forced into a position of interfering with the rights of the parents who are also is charged, is thrust into the middle of a family. Should he tell the parents? does, will he alienate the young girl? If he doesn't, must he carry the knowledge that he kept it from the parents? The law does not allow a clergy to circumvent parental rights. None of the states with parental involvement laws include clergy. The United States Supreme Court has never held that the clergy has rights that circumvent that of a parent. Clearly, the inclusion of clergy would render the Bill unconstitutional."

Reitz: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Reitz: "I rise and support this concurrence on House Bill 1900.

I think, as was mentioned earlier, about Illinois being a dumping grounds, that's exactly right. We're surrounded by states that have either parental consent or parental notification. This will force minors to obey their own state laws and not come to Illinois just to have an abortion. I think parents have a right to know on this. That's why this is such an important piece of legislation and it's long overdue. For any minor medical procedures,

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

any minor has to let their parent know and have some sort of a way for them to sign off. And I don't believe abortion is a minor medical procedure. So, I think this is definitely the right thing to do. It's long overdue. And I hope that everyone in this chamber would join me in giving parents their rights back. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Garrett."

Garrett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong opposition to Senate Bill (sic-House Bill) 1900 as we are seeing it The 2000 census shows that the makeup of families today. no longer is the family of Ozzie and Harriet. In fact, are finding that there are more single-parent families than ever before and that single-parent families are on the rise. Seventy-five percent of American families do not have a mother and father living at the same address. are also seeing a rise in grandparents standing in as parents. Many times grandparents are not legal guardians and many girls, for a host of reasons, cannot consult with their only parent. We cannot pretend that the family relationships that may have existed in the 1950s exists today because they do not. If we really care about young girls and giving them the opportunity to consult with other family members and clergy on this critical issue, we will vote 'no' to accepting House Bill 1900 as it is presented before us today. Thank you."

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

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. You can't force a teenager to confide in his or her parents. I have two teenagers myself and I think that forcing a minor child to speak to her parents by giving them the kind of notice

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

that's required by this Bill is as surely a violation of her First Amendment rights, as a law forbidding her to speak to her parents would be a violation of her First Amendment rights. If we truly trust the parents of this state, if we truly trust the children of this state, not impose laws and regulations conversations with one another or try to make them appropriately in relation to one another. These decisions are quintessentially private matters where the state should not interfere. And I urge a 'no' vote on the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Mulligan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of the arguments that the Sponsor of this Bill makes prove that this Bill is a Bill that should be rejected. First, the argument that grandparent does not live with the young woman when we crafted a perfectly good Bill. Yet, nowhere in this legislation does it state that the child must live with the parent. A parent may be on drugs and a grandmother or an aunt or an uncle may have that child living in their home and not be the legal guardian. Of course, a parent who has a boyfriend living with them who allows them to impregnate her child is not someone that a child is going to go to or a young woman is going to go and tell. Another argument that he makes is that this is a dumping ground because the surrounding states have this type of a law. Well, then it only goes to prove particularly what the previous Sponsor (sic-speaker) says. Teenagers do not always do what their parents think they're going to do. And those of us that have been there and are too old to remember should think back to when you were a young person. It does not mean

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

that we don't respect parents, it means that we have wisdom enough to know that you never know what a young person is going to do in any given situation. And if 4,000 young people, young women, will travel from other states at expense to do something that is truly scary, all on their it means they will go to any length not to tell their It is a fact that the Sponsor brings up that only goes once again to prove why this Bill should be rejected. One of the other proponents of this Bill states it's a Bill that's time has come. This Bill's time has come three times, three times it has been rejected, three times the state has spent tolls of money defending this. probably cost us another million dollars if this Bill is passed. Nowhere in the Illinois Constitution does it give the Illinois General Assembly the right to write the rules for the Supreme Court. This Bill tries to do that. again, this Bill is unconstitutional. Young women who are abused and go to a doctor and say they are abused are telling someone who is a mandatory reporter of abuse. young person then knows for sure that that doctor will tell or whoever they must because they're mandatory reporters and it will go back to the parent who has abused Wouldn't that strike terror in anyone's heart, particularly if they're living in a household with a parent that's abused them? Why would we do this? Why would anyone suggest that any Legislator, many of whom are parents themselves, would disrespect the Illinois with this Bill? The majority of young people that need to tell, tell their parents. They have already established that long before this event occurs. And in some instances, as have been pointed out, it varies anywhere from not wanting to disappoint a parent, to being

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

fearful, or living in the home of the person impregnated them. This is a law that is very hard to craft. Most laws in this area that are personal are practically impossible for a Legislator to legislate. Why we would continue to try and pass a law or craft a law that is impossible to enforce and endangers young women when we had one that we had passed out of here that was perfectly good is beyond me. If they wanted to amend it, some of the same arguments that the Sponsor makes for the flaws about where grandparents live, what clergy, could have easily been amended. That would have meant that we would have probably had a decent law that would protect young women. Unfortunately, that's not the case here. And again, urge everyone here to reject a Bill that endangers young women, is unconstitutional, is a repeat of that we have done in the past and will cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois an untold amount of money, once again, in an argument that is not valid at all."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? There are still two people seeking recognition. When we finish with those two, we will go to a vote. Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last week we debated on this floor a Bill that required parents to be notified when their child, age 16 to 18, gets a traffic ticket. The Bill passed out with a very substantial majority. I asked the question of the Sponsor if it included, in the event the parents were not there to be notified of this traffic citation, a notice could be given to a minister, or a doctor, or a school counselor, or any other professional. And there was nothing in the Bill that indicated that. What we're talking about here is protecting the health of a young woman, probably after

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

she's had an abortion. She's not gonna have the accessibility of the same people that be notified under the previous legislation that was in here, but her parents in the vast overwhelming majority of cases will be there and they will be there to help her, not to harm her, anymore than those parents are gonna harm their children for getting a traffic ticket. We can't deal with the extreme cases that may come up in legislation that we do here. So, let's do what we know is right and what is consistent with what we voted on last week. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Collins."

Collins: "Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to this Bill. And I'm reflecting back when I was school and the girls... When I was in high school, I was one of the kids who worked and had a lot of money. And so, my friends would come to me and ask for money so that they could have an abortion. And it wasn't because they didn't have parents or they were abused or anything like that, but it was because their parents taught them that they needed take of their own business. They need to not get pregnant, they need to go to school, get an education and go to college, so they had a list of priorities that they needed to do. And it wasn't about them not... being afraid of their parents, but it was about doing the right that they didn't want to get pregnant without being married, they had made a mistake and they wanted to take care of it. Now, I also work with the Department of Children and Family Services who don't have that. They don't have parents, they have foster parents, but they're afraid 'cause if they got pregnant, then they can't stay in that home, they have to be removed to another home or

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

they're gonna go to a group home where they're gonna be criticized some more about getting pregnant or they may have been abused. And as a matter of fact, DCFS gives the kid a right. Once they become pregnant that they can do anything, as long as they're pregnant, with their body. So, they don't need consent to get an abortion, they don't need consent to go to the doctor or hospital. unconstitutional when the Supreme Court has given us the right to have an abortion and now you wanna come here and put all these stipulations on that, to notify the parents. No, once you become pregnant, you need to make that decision and nobody, but nobody can make that decision at that time but you. And you don't need to go through a of obstacles to make that decision. You need to know that you can go somewhere and there are counselors at abortion clinics to talk to them and they can fit them in. They're not trying to convey them one way or the other, to have the abortion or not to have the abortion. They're givin' them the facts and they need to make a decision because a lot of times... We have taught our children how to make decisions and the other kids that can't make that decision, that they're in abusive relationships or abusive Then at that time they don't have a parent or conditions. a guardian to go to, or those children who don't have a that they can tell or trust, then they need to be able to make that decision about their body. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke to close."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The debate today, as in the past, demonstrates that we are all concerned with the well-being of young girls caught in a most difficult and serious situation.

Teenagers do not have the same capacity to make decisions

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

as adults. This is recognized in law. That is why there are age restrictions regarding the use of alcohol or driving a car. That is why the Body has required consent from parents for tattoos and body piercing. Recently, we passed a law that required the notification of a parent when a minor received a speeding ticket. We recognize that minors need assistance in making decisions. And in those areas, we recognize that it is the parent who should be involved in the child's life and it is the parent who bears the responsibility for their children. Although we know that the majority of children live in a traditional home with two parents, we understand that many children do not. That is why we built in safeguards for these young girls. They simply have to tell the physician that they are victims of abuse or incest and the notice is waived. more importantly, this will trigger an investigation, this will reveal what has been going on in the minor's life. This Bill provides an opportunity to stop the abuse of these young girls. If she has an abortion in secret, she returns to the situation in secret. If we are sincerely concerned about the welfare of young girls, then we will not want to allow the abuse to continue. This Bill will assist in revealing abusive situations. If a minor girl does not wish to make such a statement, she can take advantage of judicial bypass. She can ask the judge to waive the notice requirements. The safeguards in this Bill are those that the United States Supreme Court has held to be sufficient to protect young girls. The highest court has ruled that these provisions will do the job of protecting a minor who may be in an abusive situation. agree with the court. And that is why we've been careful to conform these to those requirements. There's been much

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

said about the terrible and dire consequences that will occur if this law is passed. I understand these concerns. We don't have to worry and speculate about what will occur after this law is in effect. Many Members have urged us to look at the real world before voting. Well, let me do just Thirty-three states have parental involvement laws in effect today. There's no evidence of an increase in abuse as a result of these laws. There is absolutely no evidence of an increase of illegal abortions. There is, however, evidence of a drop in the rate of teenage pregnancy. Any Member of this Body who wants to view this law realistically can certainly do so by simply looking at what is actually happening in these states. And in doing so, we'll see that these laws facilitate communication between parents, child and strengthen the parent-child relationship. Senate Amendment 1 restores House Bill 1900 to a form that will meet constitutional mustard. All of its provisions have been written in compliance with the United States Supreme Court holdings. To add language such as expanded lists for those receiving notice is simply to invite the courts to strike down the law. this will be ... law will be challenged in the courts. However, I believe that House Bill 1900, as amended, will stand that challenge. I ask for a 'yes' vote on this important piece of legislation."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1900?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. There has been a request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all three people that have not voted. Have all voted who wish? Have

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 58 Members voting 'yes', 51 Members voting 'no', 8 Members voting 'present'. This concurrence, having failed to reach a necessary Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. The Chair recognizes Representative Novak. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Novak: "I'm very, very honored today to have some special guests on the House Floor that I'd like to introduce and I think everyone in the chamber remembers former Representative Terry Deering. His family is here with us today, Rita Deering, his wife, his mother, Verdell, and of course, his three beautiful children; Clayton, Grayson, and Alyssa. And I'd like everyone to provide a very, very warm welcome to the Terry Deering family."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome back to the Illinois General Assembly,
Rita. On Concurrence Motions appears House Bill 3576,
Representative Ryder. Is Mr. Ryder in the chamber? Take
that Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, do you have a
report to read?"

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 25, 2001, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for a Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 22; 'recommendation for adoption' of House Amendment #1 to House Resolution 263; and Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2440."

Speaker Hartke: "On the Order of Third Reading appears Senate

66th Legislative Day

- May 25, 2001
- Bill 754, Representative Granberg-McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 754, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill. Notes were requested on the Bill. The notes have been filed. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Clerk, has that Bill been read a second time?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 754 was read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 754, a Bill for an Act in relation to building codes. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 754, which I'm presenting on behalf of Representative Granberg, amends the Illinois Building Commission Act. It requires municipalities and counties to when they're considering adopting a new building code to post this on the website of the Illinois Building Commission. The Bill was discussed a little bit yesterday under a different Sponsor, so I want to tell my friend from Danville that this is a third Sponsor in three days. But there was no opposition in committee. And I would be happy to entertain any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition... Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."
- Black: "Representative, this is strongly supported by the Home Builders Association of Illinois, is it not?"

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

McCarthy: "Yes, it is, Representative."

- Black: "And it's simply a way to keep up to date, particularly with public building commissions on building codes that may change while you're preparing a bid specification or a bid document to know that you may be bidding PVC at 4 inch and suddenly the building code requires PVC at 8 inch. So, it's just a matter of constructive notice, correct?"
- McCarthy: "I believe you're absolutely correct and I appreciate the way you formed the question."
- Black: "All right. It's a great idea. It's one of the things that technology lets us do. We used to have to rely on getting the rules once or twice a year in paper form, it was hard to keep up with. This makes eminent good sense for anybody in the construction industry. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill requires that notice be given at least 30 days prior to the enactment of any ordinance, is that correct?"
- McCarthy: "Yes, it is, Representative. And I think you probably remember, from committee, he did take any kind of penalty provisions away. It's Representative McCarthy, Representative Mathias, over here. There you go."
- Mathias: "What is the penalty if notice is not given within the 30 days? If it's given, let's say, 29 or 28 days, how does that affect the validity of the ordinance that may be subsequently passed by the municipality?"
- McCarthy: "It really does not affect them. If you remember, the Senate... or the Chief Sponsor said that in our committee.

 And truthfully, even if they don't comply with this, we're

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

just hoping that public pressure will, you know, make them comply. And I think the intent of the Sponsor is if they do not comply and we see that this is a big problem with lack of compliance, then we may come back later and look for some minor penalties in order to encourage the municipalities and counties to comply with this. We don't think it's very overbearing. It's basically a phone call, an e-mail, or a letter that they could write very quickly to the building commission, they can put it on their website. And so, we don't think there's gonna be a big deal, we think the municipalities will understand the need for this."

Mathias: "So, as far as you understand, the legislative intent of this Bill is not to invalidate any ordinance that may be passed in violation if this becomes law, is that correct?"

McCarthy: "I agree. You're correct."

Mathias: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Hoffman: "Yes. Representative, I know that I handled the Amendment yesterday and I was wondering why you're handling it today, the Bill."

McCarthy: "I think the Chief Sponsor saw your handling of it or mishandling of it and requested a new Sponsor to move forward and handle the actual passage on Third Reading. So, I appreciate your ineptitude."

Hoffman: "Well, the reason I was asking is, is I was just wondering if anybody has seen Mr. Granberg in the last few days. Because I thought I saw him out in the rotunda about three or four days ago, but it wasn't him it was just

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

somebody else with gray hair."

McCarthy: "He has been spotted and has requested the change from you to me, which I think was probably a wise move on his behalf."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

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

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate the questions. And I think it's a good piece of legislation and will help the builders in our state. They wanna comply with these codes, but when they're changed at the last minute, they're in the middle of a bidding process and they have no notice that this is coming, it really makes it an undue burden on them. I think it's a good move. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on behalf..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 754?' 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 754, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 5 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie in the chamber, Barb Currie? On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2440, Representative O'Connor. Would you please explain Senate Amendment #1."

O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying legislation created the crime of aggravated dogfighting. In the Senate, the underlying legislation moved from the Agricultural Code certain provisions to the Criminal Code the idea being that the

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

enforcement would be easier if law enforcement were aware of the provisions in the Criminal Code. Senate Amendment #1 merely moves those original provisions to both the Criminal Code and the Agricultural Code for ease of enforcement by agricultural regulators. It makes no substantive change to the Bill. Be happy to answer any questions."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen I intend to vote for the Bill, but let me of the House. speak to what I consider to be a lack of institutional courage, not on the part of the Sponsor, Representative O'Connor, that's not... I'm not talking about him or anyone in particular. But this is a Bill that will fly out of here and has flown out of the Senate that will levy penalties on those who allow dogs to fight. This chamber passed a Bill with 114 'aye' votes that would make bestiality a crime, as it was for 50 years in this state, and it was thrown out by accident when they cleaned up the criminal statutes in the 1970s. No one would sponsor that Bill in the Senate. In fact, many Senators called it a frivolous Bill and some of the... even some of the members of the media said it was a frivolous Bill. So, it's okay to pass a Bill to make criminal penalties apply to those who fight dogs and that's fine with me, I have a dog and I think it's a reasonable Bill, but I guess it's all right for you to have sex with a dog. Sometime somebody in this chamber or across the aisle or a member of the media who thought the bestiality Bill was frivolous, maybe you could If you breed dogs to fight, you explain that to me. encourage dogs to fight, or you have a dog fight on which

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

money could be wagered, we're gonna send you to prison.

But if you raise a dog to have sex with it, that's okay.

Somebody explain that to me someday, will ya."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Dart: "Just a real quick question. The provisions in here dealing with the enhancement for someone who conducts a dogfight in the presence of somebody under the age of 18, does this Bill, would it deal with a fight that was set up by someone under the age of 18, a juvenile? There was an incident in Springfield... I have a Bill that somewhat, a little bit caught up now that I think's gonna get out, that might deal with them. I'm curious whether yours addresses that, too, in case mine gets caught up."

O'Connor: "Representative Dart, I haven't looked at the legislation. I'd be happy to take it out of the record, if you'd like, but my understanding is that in that instance they would be covered but possibly prosecuted as a juvenile."

Dart: "That's fine."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Connor to close."

O'Connor: "..."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2440?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there were 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Bill 2440. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Concurrence Motions appears Senate Bill 22. Representative Currie on Senate Amendment... Representative Currie."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 22, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 A Motion has been approved to table Committee Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion to Table Amendment #1 passes. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill, Senate Bill 22?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 22 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Novak, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. A point of inquiry. I filed an Amendment, I think a Floor Amendment to Senate Bill 22. I would like to know the status of that."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 have been referred to the Rules Committee."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Novak: "Could you translate that statement into a real scheme of things? I mean, does that mean the graveyard or does that mean consideration?"

Speaker Hartke: "Not a good sign."

66th Legislative Day May 25, 2001

Novak: "Not a good sign. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to a

point of personal privilege. To follow..."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Black: "To follow what Representative Novak said. I filed Floor Amendment #6 that would put the general homestead exemption on the same plane as those enjoyed by Cook County. Cook County gets a general homestead exemption of \$4,500. The other 101 counties get a general homestead exemption of \$3,500 on your property tax bill. That \$3,500 property tax general homestead exemption has never been changed for the other 101 counties since the day it was introduced. I think it's only an Amendment that's fair. I've changed it. I've rolled it back to not take effect until the year 2002. Why is it, time and time again, that what's good and right and fair for Cook County is never fair for the rest of us? That's what Floor Amendment #6 did. And I think it's an outrage that that Amendment doesn't at least get a chance to be debated. I thought this was a marketplace of ideas. don't like my Amendment or you don't like you Representative Novak's Amendment, then vote it down. But I thought we had some ability to at least advance an idea for discussion. But oh no. You won't even let us do that I don't know why we're here. Why don't you send anymore. us home and the four Leaders can vote on everything and then tell us what they want us to do a week from now. This is ridiculous."

Speaker Hartke: "Your concerns will be taken under consideration.

On Concurrence Motions appears Senate Bill 1069,

Representative Hoffman. House Bill 1069, excuse me. On

Senate Amendments #1 and 2, Representative Hoffman."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that we debated this a day or so ago. This is just a renewable Concurrence Motion of Senate Amendments #1 and 2. As you know, this Bill would save jobs in my district at Fairmount Racetrack. All this Bill does is it allows money that is bet at Fairmount facilities to remain... 80% of it to remain at the Fairmount facility in order to encourage live racing at Fairmount Racetrack. What this Bill would do is it would allow 80% of the money that is bet... that currently is sitting in escrow that is bet between the hours of 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. to go to purses for the racing of thoroughbreds at Fairmount Racetrack. The other 20% would then go to purses for harness racing at county fairs and the state fairs. would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Representative Poe."

Poe: "I think... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Poe: "We've spent quite a bit of time on this Bill this year.

And not only are we talking about jobs maybe in his area,

we have 400 standardbreds in Sangamon County, we have 150

jobs also. As, you know, that money that was agreement in

1995 and sets an escrow and was collected from bettors on

the standardbreds, we feel ought to stay with that breed.

Many breeders that go bet now in the OTB's in my area and

other areas of the state feel that it'd be fair to keep

that money with the breed rather than send it to one corner

of the state. The owners don't have a lot of choice, they

have to go to these OTB's to bet their money. And so, we'd

like to see it stay. I think something that we shouldn't

neglect, it saves jobs all over the state if we keep this

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

industry viable. We think that money ought to go to county fairs, state fairs, and help those purses around the state. But I guess today I'd like to ask you to vote 'no'. And so, we can send this back to negotiations and then let's get a better negotiated deal than is happening in this negotiations because that money ought to be left with the standardbreds. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Poe: "I'd like to have a verification if this passes."

Speaker Hartke: "Your request will be granted. A verification has been requested and will be granted. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of points. One, I heard a rumor earlier that well, we're gonna make a deal, the 'yes' vote's the right vote. But I'll vote 'yes' and then somebody... the rumor is that some people are gonna vote 'yes' and then walk off the floor and be verified off. That's... Vote your switch, stay with your switch. The verification's been asked for, so let's all stay here and let the issue be decided once and for all. Secondly, to correct some misinformation that was made public the other day in the debate. This money that we're talking about, it goes into the purse, it doesn't go to anybody... any of the owners of these tracks, it goes right That's what the issue has always been. into the purse. And this is a reasonable compromise and I rise in support and recognize that Representative Hoffman has done a lot of serious negotiation. This is the answer to the problem. It's the right issue, and it... By voting 'yes', you're talking about keeping a thousand jobs in Southwestern Illinois and thus, in Illinois. It's the right vote for the unions, it's the right vote for the guys who support

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

the working men and women of this state, and it's the right vote if you have a sense about what's fair in the business community. So, this Bill appeals to both sides of the aisle. I rise in strong support."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Hoffman to close. Yes, Representative Black. I'm sorry, I didn't see your light."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I'd just like to make one point on the Bill. This Bill has had three bites of the apple. Many of us have Amendments and Motions to Concur that can't get out of I have an Amendment that I think you'd all like, but we can't debate it. It would suspend the state's gasoline tax for 90 days, not the sales tax, the gasoline This Bill gets three bites of the apple and most us can't even get a sniff of the Bills or the ideas we want heard because they go to the Rules Committee, where they're not even given the courtesy of last rites. They're buried while they're still breathing. This is wrong. elected just like any of you. We should have certain I... If I'm the only one, so be it. I'm sick and tired of being treated like a second-class citizen. I'm an elected Member of this Body and by god, I have a right to represent my Members. And I'm sick and tired of being denied that right."

Speaker Hartke: "The opinions will be taken under consideration.

Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to say, first of all, I appreciate the indulgence of the Members. This is something that Representative Stephens, Representative

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Holbrook, Representative Younge, and I feel very strongly about. And the reason is, it affects families in our area. It directly affects about 1,000 families as to whether or not they're gonna continue to have employment Southwestern Illinois. I certainly agree with many of the other statements. I agree with some of the concerns of the opponents of this legislation. But we are faced with a problem right now, right here, if we don't pass this Bill as of the middle of August, live racing at Fairmount Racetrack will no longer continue for this calendar year. What does that mean? That means that the institution and the economic engine in our area will not have live racing, that means that the workers who rely on live racing in our area will not be working, it means that the stores that they buy things from will not have their business. ask for the families in our area, that you vote 'aye', and I ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 1069?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 67 Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. There has been a request for a verification. Representative Poe, do you persist in your request for a verification? His request will be granted. Mr. Clerk, read the affirmative vote. Members will please be in their chairs, staff retire to the back of the chamber."

Clerk Rossi: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative.

Representatives Acevedo. Beaubien. Berns. Biggins.

Boland. Bradley. Brosnahan. Brunsvold. Bugielski.

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Burke. Capparelli. Collins. Cowlishaw. Crotty. Currie.

Curry. Daniels. Davis, M. Davis, S. Delgado.

Feigenholtz. Flowers. Forby. Fritchey. Granberg.

Hamos. Hannig. Hassert. Hoffman. Holbrook. Howard.

Jefferson. Jones, S. Kenner. Lyons, J. May. McAuliffe.

McCarthy. McGuire. McKeon. Mendoza. Meyer. Miller.

Moore. Murphy. Novak. O'Brien. O'Connor. Osterman.

Pankau. Parke. Persico. Reitz. Ryan. Saviano. Schmitz.

Schoenberg. Scully. Slone. Soto. Stephens. Stroger.

Winkel. Wojcik. Yarbrough. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Poe, questions of the affirmative."

Poe: "Representative Slone."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Slone, in the back of the chamber."

Poe: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig. I do believe Representative Hannig is at budget meeting. Representative Hannig in the chamber?"

Poe: "It's all right if he's in Rules. That's okay."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Poe: "Representative O'Connor."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Connor. Representative O'Connor in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he registered as voting?"

Clerk Rossi: "Representative O'Connor is voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hartke: "Remove him from the Roll."

Poe: "Representative Boland."

Speaker Hartke: "Anything further, Representative Poe?"

Poe: "Representative Boland."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Boland's in his chair."

Poe: "Representative Forby."

66th Legislative Day May 25, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Forby is in his chair."

Poe: "Representative Granberg."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Granberg. Has anyone seen Representative Granberg?"

Poe: "Hey, we got a sighting."

Speaker Hartke: "There's Representative Granberg right in the center of the aisle. Right there is Representative Granberg. Right there. Are you sure that's Representative Granberg?"

Poe: "That's all."

Speaker Hartke: "Nothing further? On this question, there are 66

Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no', 1 Member

voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate

Amendment #2... 1 and 2 to House Bill 1069. And this Bill,

having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence Motions

appears House Bill 3576. Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3,

Representative Black. Please explain those Amendments."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Give me just a I'm handling this for Representative Senate Amendment #1 adds to the Bill, amends the Clerks of the Court Act. Provides that in counties having one or more state correctional institutions, in addition to compensation from the county board, that clerk of the circuit court shall receive a minimum reimbursement from the state treasury in the amount \$2,500 of for administrative assistants to perform services in connection with the state correctional institution inmate population that exceeds 250. Senate Amendment #1 of this legislation identical to Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 687, is which was held up in the Senate. Senate Amendment #2 from Senator Walsh adds to the Bill, amends the local government

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

acceptance of Credit Cards Act. Provides that a local government entity may impose fees on a credit transaction that is greater than the amount specified in the Act if the fee imposed by the local government no greater than the fee charged by a financial institution or service provider accepting and processing credit card payments. This Amendment is so that you can pay your various county fees and property taxes by credit card if that's what you want to do. It is supported by the County Clerks Association. And Senate Amendment #3 also adds to the Bill and changes the title to an Act concerning local governments. And that was a technical Amendment to reflect the substantive change made in Senate Amendment #1 and 2. The original Bill goes back to say that in counties of population of 180,000 or less the circuit clerk may a fee of \$25 for each check that has twice not been honored by the financial institution on which it is drawn. Be glad to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 3576?' 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? Representative Delgado and Representative Shirley Jones, would you like to vote on this issue? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 52 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 3576. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, are you

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

seeking recognition? He's declined recognition. On the regular Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading appears Senate Bill 71, Representative Daniels. 71. Out of the record. Senate Bill 75, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 75, a Bill for an Act concerning the environment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On Floor Amendment #2, this would actually become the Bill and then Floor Amendment #3 actually makes some minor changes to the Bill. What this is is the Brownfields Site Restoration program. It would allow for funding for a Brownfield Site Restoration Grant program and would insure that some of the Brownfield areas that are currently not in production in this state are put back... are cleaned up and are remediated and are put back into production. I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2?

The Chair recognizes Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Representative Hoffman, is there anything in your Amendment that would change the structure or priority of payouts on Brownfield cleanups now?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that this does not affect the current Brownfields program. This is just an additional program for an additional amount of money that developers could potentially access once they begin to remediate the area."

Mautino: "And what's the funding source?"

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Hoffman: "Well, currently, this is obviously subject to appropriations, as everything is, but we've identified and we don't have a firm agreement on this, but there is a low-interest loan program of \$10 million... low-interest loan program, I believe, that was under Illinois FIRST that's currently with the EPA of about \$10 million for Brownfields and for Brownfields remediation. That is being, it's my understanding, underutilized. And we're looking at potentially instead of having a low-interest loan program, potentially utilizing that funding for this purpose."

Mautino: "And who would pay off the low-interest loan?"

Hoffman: "Well, the current low-interest loan program, I guess the developer would pay it off, that's the current program."

Mautino: "Okay."

Hoffman: "This is not a low-interest loan program. This is reimbursement of capital costs, up to 20% of the capital costs, for taking old abandoned sites where they're in the inner city or anywhere else in the rural areas and getting them redeveloped, remediated and then actually investing into getting 'em back on the tax rolls."

Mautino: "Thank you. I appreciate the questions and do support your Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, I'm not sure I understand the intent going through the Amendment. The Amendment, it does not apply just to sites already identified as Brownfields,

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Black: "In other words, if a community in my district discovers a

Brownfields site two years from now, they could go through
the application process and if everything was in order,
perhaps would be eligible for the grant?"

Hoffman: "Absolutely."

Black: "All right. So, it..."

Hoffman: "And that's the whole intent of the program."

Black: "All right. So, there's no intent just to catch up with those already on file. One could be encouraged to file a year or two from now."

Hoffman: "Absolutely..."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Hoffman: "...that's the intention."

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

Hoffman: "I would just ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 75?' All those in favor

signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of

the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is

adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Floor Amendment #3 is simply a technical Amendment that was requested by the, I believe, the EPA so that the... It would give us nine months instead of just six months to adopt the rules under this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "...discussion? Representative Black."

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

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, my analysis says this is for the Pollution Control Board not the IEPA. And the only question I have is, when you lengthen the rule-making process, if you're going through a siting process for a landfill or a siting process for a... What I just had in my district a year or two ago was a siting process for a medical waste incinerator. I always get nervous when an agency wants more time to adopt rules rather than less time. That keeps everybody hanging. Is there a reason why they want to extend it by another 90 days so that they would..."

Hoffman: "Yeah."

Black: "...have nine months..."

Hoffman: "You're right..."

Black: "...to promulgate the rules?"

Hoffman: "...it was the Pollution Control... I apologize for that. They came to me. They said that generally, in order to get everything written, everything done, in order to effectuate the intent of this Bill, generally it would take 'em nine months. And they asked me to do it and that's why we did it."

Black: "The press gets all over us because we can't do a budget in one week, but they leave all the bureaucrats alone who say they can't do anything in less than nine months. Makes sense to me."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? No one is seeking recognition, Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I would just ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor

Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 75?' All in favor signify by

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Amendments?"

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes

Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Moffitt: "I'd like for the Body to recognize some students from my district. This is the eighth grade class from Warren High School over by Monmouth, have about 45 students up here in the Speaker's Gallery. If you'd make 'em welcome."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly in your State Capitol. On Second Reading on Senate Bills appears Senate Bill 103, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 103 has been read a second..."

Speaker Hartke: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 113,
Representative Moore, Andrea Moore. Out of the record.

Senate Bill 163, Representative Moore. Out of the record.

Senate Bill 263, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read
the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 263 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

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

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 263 is the agreed Amendment

between the Illinois polygraphers and the Department of

Professional Regulation. With that, it's an Agreed Bill.

And I would ask that we adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Bill 263."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 263?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 284, Representative Boland. Representative Boland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 489, Representative Dart. Senate Bill 489. Out of the record. Senate Bill 493, Representative Reitz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 518, Representative Hamos. Out of the record. Senate Bill 758, Representative Hannig. Out of the record. Senate Bill 795, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 796, Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 885, Representative Cross. Out of the record. Senate Bill 926, Representative Erwin. Judy Erwin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 945, Representative Boland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 989, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1033, Representative Curry. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1069, Smith. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1089, Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1176, Representative Moore. Andrea Moore, 1176. Out of The Chair recognizes Representative Cross. the record. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, occasionally, we hear... often we have special occasions here on the House Floor and we're gonna have one tomorrow. And we won't be here and that's too bad, but tomorrow is Representative Rutherford's birthday and he is gonna be, I believe, 46

66th Legislative Day

- May 25, 2001
- years old. He does not have cake, but has goodies down here, right by Representative Kurtz and Representative Hultgren. So, everybody you'll certainly want to wish Representative Rutherford a happy birthday and I would encourage all to send him a thank you card for havin' a birthday."
- Speaker Hartke: "Congratulations, Representative Rutherford, his 64th (sic-46th) birthday. Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "First of all, I want to thank Representative Cross, but I'd also like to note that it's Representative Doug Hoeft's birthday tomorrow, Congressman Jan Schakowsky's birthday tomorrow, and President 'Pate' Philip's birthday tomorrow."
- Speaker Hartke: "Oh, mercy."
- Rutherford: "So, thank you, Representative Cross."
- Speaker Hartke: "Thank you very much. Happy birthday, colleagues. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens.

 For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Stephens: "Well, of course, to thank Representative Rutherford for being so courteous and thanking Representative Cross."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bost: "Yes, I'd like to thank Representative Stephens for thanking Representative Rutherford for thanking Representative Cross."
- Speaker Hartke: "On Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1283, Representative May. Representative May. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1486, Representative Hannig. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1504, Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1504 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not ready to adjourn yet, but we will be doing the Agreed Resolutions to get that off the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 367, offered by Representative Righter; House Resolution 368, Dale offered by Representative Dale Righter; House Resolution 369, offered by Representative Kosel; House Resolution 371, offered by Representative May; House Resolution 373, offered by Representative Howard; House Resolution 375, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell; House Resolution 376, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 377, offered by Representative Art Turner; House Resolution 378, offered by Representative Hultgren; House Resolution 379, offered by Representative Osterman; House Resolution 382, offered by Representative Klingler; House Resolution 383, offered by Representative Klingler; House Resolution 384, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 386, offered by Representative Barbara Currie; House Resolution offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 391, offered by Representative Fowler; House Resolution 392, offered by Representative Mautino; House Resolution 393, offered by Representative Mendoza; House Resolution 394, offered by Representative Daniels."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On page 18 of the Calendar appears Resolutions. House Resolution 91, Representative Burke. Mr. Burke on Resolution 91."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. I think there's probably not a Member here or a lobbyist or a visitor that comes to this Capitol that doesn't understand that it's a very easy thing to gain access to our arena here. This Resolution would call on the Secretary of State to do a study of the security measures that are in place here and expand, when necessary, to insure the safety of not only this Legislature but certainly the visitors and other bureaucrats within this Capitol dome. And I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration and encourage..."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Resolution 91? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 91?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote Have all voted who wish? Have all The voting is open. voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 91, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting the House adopts House Resolution 91. 'no'. And Representative Jones. Yes, Representative Jones wishes to be recorded 'aye' on Resolution 91. House Resolution 122, Representative Younge. Out of the record. Resolution 169, Representative Davis, Steve Davis. the record. House Resolution 171, Representative Granberg. Has anyone seen Mr. Granberg? Out of the record. Resolution 176, Representative Howard, Constance Howard. Would you please explain Read the Resolution. the Resolution, Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, I will. About two months ago, my sorority was here, and it was our third annual Alpha Kappa Alpha Day in Springfield. And I ask that my colleagues welcome my sorority sisters and we did so very amicably. And I appreciate... That's what this Amendment is all about."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 176?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 200, Representative May. Karen May. House Resolution 200. Please explain the Resolution. Would you like to explain the Resolution?"

May: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 200 is to have DNR and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency assess the impact of the recent Supreme Court decision that leaves 152 thousand acres in Illinois at risk. The isolated wetlands. They would require to give a report back to this Assembly by March 1st of 2002. They would be assessing the protection that is required on flooding, wildlife habitat, and groundwater quality."

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

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Complimenting Representative May on this particular Resolution but following up with a question. I know that you are trying to encourage some kind of a task force that would go along with the protection of wetlands and I was wondering if you'd had any progress on that."

May: "Yes, several people have signed up for the task force."

Moore: "And are you intending that the task force be both for Republicans and Democrats?"

May: "At this stage, it is a Democratic task force."

Moore: "And so, is there any way to broaden that into both a Republican... would you be willing, as an example, to broaden that into both a Republican and Democratic?"

May: "Yes, Representative, I am. I appreciate all the work and

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

support that you have given to the environment. And I met with staff today. And too, as we have meetings around the state... I also had the idea to invite all Representatives when we have hearings around the state."

Moore: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor answer a question?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Osmond: "Representative May, do you also intend to have in that study the economic impact of 101 or 102 different environmental laws to treat this and will your survey look at any of the business impact as to how it might be changed if we have separate entities looking at wetlands problems?"

May: "I'm having trouble hearing the question. If I understand, will we look at business impact? I am sure we will get a testimony from the realtors and the homebuilders. And if that's what you mean by business impact, I'm sure that they will give us their thoughts on the matter also."

Osmond: "Will that be represented on your panel? Any of those folks, themselves?"

May: "I can't hear the question."

Osmond: "Will there be any representatives from those industries as part of the ongoing panel that you're asking for?"

May: "I believe this is a legislative panel and they would be asked to provide input. And based on that, I am sure that we'd be having negotiations with them. I think this is the first step to lead to negotiating with them and understanding and addressing their concerns."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 200?' All those in favor

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

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 House Resolution 200, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 200. House Resolution 215, Representative Garrett. Out of the record. House Resolution 218, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. House Resolution 240, Representative Dart. Mr. Clerk, post the Resolution. Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This merely recognizes May 14th as a day to talk about and focus on the children of people who are in prison. There's a group that's been working on trying to deal with the children and the problems that they've had as a result of it and they asked for this. And I appreciate its adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 240?' All those in
favor signify by saying 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the
opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the
Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 250,
Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 250 is the work of the Higher Education Committee. Representative Wirsing and myself and all of the Members on both sides of the aisle worked on a Resolution that we thought would help the State Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, the Governor's Office, and all parties involved in dealing with the teacher shortage to do a strategic plan and analysis of exactly how we can retain and attract high-quality teachers in all parts of the state and then to report back to us in a more cohesive manner, a strategy for all of us to deal

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

with. And there is a reporting date that will allow us, in the fall, to be able to do this for the next budget. I would urge your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wirsing."

- Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand in full support of this Resolution. As we came into Session back in January, there was the discussion about the severe teacher shortage currently and becoming more dramatic in the next three to five years. And I'm very proud to be a part of the House Higher Education Committee that stepped forward and we drew a clientele of people together to really start to formulate this and this Resolution can only do nothing but support that effort in an organized manner to address the issue. So, certainly would ask for your full support. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, I believe this is a very timely Resolution. I didn't hear you give a date or time in which this information would be shared."
- Erwin: "Thank you. Representative Davis, the reporting date is October 15, 2001."
- Davis, M.: "So, by that date we should have some... What exactly will we have by that date?"
- Erwin: "Well, Representative Davis, what we're asking all parties to do is to work to develop the plan to assist in maintaining and recruiting high-quality teachers. And we're asking them to, after analyzing the situation, to do a report responding to the need and to file the report with the General Assembly. I think, Representative Davis, as you know, we've had many, many Bills throughout this year that have attempted to do pieces of it, but it seemed

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

logical that we would ask the State Board, the Governor's Office, BHE to work with the colleges of education and with all parties involved, including the Teacher Pension Funds, the Retirement Systems, 'cause in some instances the answers may be related to how we encourage our good teachers to come back after they've retired. So, I can't tell you what's gonna be in the report, but it will be on your desk October 15th."

Davis, M.: "Representative, will there be any information in reference to the difference in certified people and noncertified people, what the certified people are currently eligible to do, what the noncertified people are eligible to do, perhaps, how many certified teachers we have in the state, how many noncertified people do we have working in the state?"

Erwin: "Representative Davis, I certainly welcome and as I know, Representative Wirsing does, and you're a member of the Higher Ed Committee, as we said during the hearings that we had, we welcome everyone's ideas on what should be included in this. So, I think... I would think it would be hard to assess these things without looking at the certification issues, particularly when we're talking about filling, in the neighborhood of 80 thousand teachers, empty classrooms within three years. But I would encourage you, as well as all of the other Members that are interested, to direct those questions, if not to myself or Dave Wirsing, we'll be happy to pass them on to the Joint Education Committee, which it will be sort of coordinating this from the Governor's Office. So, I'm sure that they would appreciate your input."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative. And I do stand in support of this Resolution because we do know there is a shortage

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

of teachers in the State of Illinois. And with the massive number of teachers who will be retiring this June, that number will escalate. We also need to know in this state as we pass legislation, talking about alternative schools and smaller class sizes, we need to know that space as well as certified people will be available for those positions. I encourage all of you who are Sponsors of this legislation to advise us when the report is made available to us. And we should continue the process of studying teacher needs and how we can meet those needs in the State of Illinois. I encourage a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mitchell, do you stand in opposition? Okay. State your point."
- Mitchell, J.: "I stand in support, Sir. I think it's high time that we had this kind of study done and I certainly commend Representative Erwin for coming forth with this Resolution. Sometimes in the General Assembly we are accused of not planning ahead for things that happen and sometimes we say, well, we studied this to death. But quite frankly, this is a study that should have some pretty rapid response to it because we are facing a problem already of high-quality teachers. In fact, we may be even facing a problem of having enough bodies in the classroom just to cover all of the classrooms in the State of Illinois for the children that need a good education. So, I certainly stand in strong support of Representative Erwin's Resolution and I hope that we have 118 'yes' votes on this. Thank you,
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 250?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Mr Clerk, take the record. On this question... or on this Resolution, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House adopts Resolution 250. House Resolution 258, Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this Resolution...

 If you take that out of the record, I need to... House
 Resolution 342, which contains the agreement in committee."
- Speaker Hartke: "Take it out of the record. House Resolution 263, Representative Lang. Representative Lang. Lou Lang, House Resolution 263. Floor Amendment #1 has to be adopted."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It simply changes the reporting date from October to January."
- Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing no one is standing in opposition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 263?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Lang on the Amendment, on the Resolution." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Lang: The general accounting office in Washington discovered upon research that there were many federal agencies that were tracking the purchasing and other Internet habits of people who were accessing the Federal Government websites. seems to be something we ought to take a look at. this Resolution does is asks the Auditor General to do an audit of state agencies to make sure that we are not violating the privacy rights of any citizens who access state websites. I've spoken to the Auditor General about He's not in opposition to it. In fact, this Resolution. he's the one that suggested the change in reporting dates

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

that was Amendment #1. So, I would ask your support of this Resolution."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 263?' 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 House Resolution 263, there are 118 Members voting 'yes'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 263. House Resolution 264, Representative Novak. Novak. Out of the record. House Bill 265, Representative Dart. Mr. Dart on the Resolution."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution I've had in the last, I think, two or three years. It just would name April as the Child Abuse Prevention Month. It's an effort to try to focus more attention on child abuse. And I'd appreciate its adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "...the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 308, Representative Erwin. On the Resolution."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 308 is the product of some meetings and work by Speaker Madigan and the Illinois Coalition. As we all know today, both technology and biotechnology research really are economic engines that help drive the state's economy. House Resolution 308 asks the Board of Higher Education... or rather asks research institutions, colleges, and universities to report to the Board of Higher Education and to DCCA the number of patents, new licenses, and registrations of commercial technologies that are products of part of the universities.

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

So, the technology transfer issue... our hope is that BHE and DCCA will be able to help us keep better track of exactly what the good end products are of this sound research. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 308?' 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 House Resolution 308, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 326, Representative Giles. On the Resolution."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Simply, House Resolution 326, what it does is simply create a legislative task force to examine policies, programs, and other related issues developing an approach to reenroll and teaching graduate high school dropouts. This task force is gonna consist of ten members, five Democratic Members appointed by the Speaker of the House, five Republican Members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House. A final report with the recommendations on how to address the issues of the student dropout. This report shall have its findings no later than January 10th the year 2002. And I ask for its favorable adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 326?' 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 House Resolution 326, there are 117 Members voting 'yes'. And

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

the House does adopt House Resolution 326. House Resolution 333, Representative Delgado. Representative Delgado on House Resolution 333."

- Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 333 basically just urges the superintendent of ISBE to make sure that physical education waivers are properly being submitted by school districts. I would urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 333?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 334, Representative Kosel. Representative Kosel on the..."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the adoption of this Resolution. This Resolution asks the Board of Higher Education to do a study on what their role will be in educating dentists in the State of Illinois. This spring, the last private dental school in the state closed its doors leaving the only dental education on being done in this state in the hands of both the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University. Currently, there are over 350 funded unfilled vacancies of faculty in the country and we have over 20 in the State of Illinois alone. We need to decide what our commitment is to this field. And this study will look at it and decide what direction we should go. And I would ask for your approval."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 334?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Resolution 334, there are 118 Members voting 'yes'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 334. House Resolution 340, Representative Granberg. Granberg. Representative Novak, would you like to handle that Resolution?"

Novak: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Novak: "I, like my colleague Representative Hoffman, have been wondering where that... no... well, I know where Mr. Granberg is. He's toiling away, working for the benefit of the citizens."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you like to handle this Resolution for him?"

Novak: "Certainly. The energies are as toiling away at work. This Resolution simply calls for the United States Government whether it's through the Federal Commission, through the Federal Energy Commission or whatever appropriate agencies 'cause I think the Resolution doesn't specify which really to conduct an in-depth investigation about the precipitous rise in fuel costs, specifically gasoline and natural gas prices that have occurred in the Midwest in the last year. And simply, that's all it asks and to report back to give us some type of indication of whether there was any price gouging, price fixing, market fluctuations. And I know we've had a task force to deal with this, but I think we need to hear from the Federal Government a little more about this issue that's affecting the lives of everyone."

66th Legislative Day May 25, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black on the Resolution."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. certainly have no objection to the Resolution, but we've had a House task force studying this issue and we have that response if you've read it or put it in your file. Attorney General investigated this as it began last summer, found no evidence of collusion. The Federal Government has investigated and found no evidence of collusion. know whether those are accurate findings or not, but if you look on the Calendar on page 22, I have a Motion to Discharge Committee on Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1176. It doesn't call for any study. It calls for a 90-day elimination of the 18 cent Illinois gas tax. wanna do something for your constituents, help me get that Amendment outta here. If you're gettin' the calls getting, they're saying, do something. Don't study it anymore, do something. Well, my Amendment will do it. It'll do away with the 18 cent Illinois gas tax from July 1 to September 30. That's not the sales tax, so don't give me that song and dance about, oh, my God, you're ripping off all the Human Services agencies. It's the gas tax that goes to the Motor Fund, to the Road Fund. All the road projects under construction are already paid for or t.he money's in the bank. That would cost 300 million. The question is, does the State of Illinois need t.he 300 million more than your constituents or mine? I don't think If your telephone's ringing off the wall like I am, then help me get Floor Amendment #4 out of the Rules Committee on 1176 and do away with the state gasoline tax for 90 days. Put the money back in the pocket of working and women who need it rather than give it to men bureaucrats to spend it willy-nilly."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 340?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 342, Representative Mautino. On the Resolution."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And this is... House Resolution 342 is identical to 258 with the exception of one condition. The commission which will look at the on-site wastewater treatment centers and how we do, basically, deal with the water treatment will now be equally bipartisan. This commission has been set up for each of the last three years."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 342?' 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 House Resolution 342, there are 118 Members voting 'yes'. And this Resolution is adopted. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1504?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1504 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of Representative Bellock. The House will be at ease for about 15 minutes. Representative Turner, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Turner, J.: "Inquiry of the Chair."

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Turner, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my mother's here visiting today along with two of my aunts and they've asked me what's going on, what's the House doing? And I said, 'Well, it's rather complex.' And I assured them that there's something going on right now even as you and I speak behind the scenes. And I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if you could explain to them and the rest of the Body, what are we doing right now and what are we waiting for?"

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Turner, we're at ease."

Turner, J.: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Hartke: "We're at ease."

Turner, J.: "It's easy?"

Speaker Hartke: "We're at ease."

Turner, J.: "Oh, at ease."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Turner, J.: "Well, what would you have me tell my mother here, standing just to my left that..."

Speaker Hartke: "I'll come down and tell ya exactly what we're doin'."

Turner, J.: "She's a taxpayer and my two aunts are also taxpayers. And I assure them we work very hard here in the House Floor and I know we're workin' hard right now. But I just wanted you to help me explain to them exactly what it is we're doing, other than being at ease."

Speaker Hartke: "Let me come down there and explain to her exactly what we're doin'."

Turner, J.: "Oh, Mr. Speaker, I would enjoy that."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you."

Turner, J.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jones."

Jones, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I think really what the holdup here is

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

Mr. Turner, himself, because he has vowed to stay here until the General Assembly is done this year and we all know he has a new job starting on June the 1st and the building's not quite ready yet. So, that's the holdup, really. We're waiting for the building across the street here to be ready."

Speaker Hartke: "And they're working on it, right? That is true.

Mr. Turner, I'll be there in just a second. The House will

be in order. The Chair recognizes Representative Daniels

for House Resolution 395. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that House Resolution 395 be read."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Amendment... the Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 395"

HOUSE RESOLUTION 395

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives offer our sincere congratulations to the 2001 York Community High School Girls Track Team on an impressive showing at the Class AA State Finals in Charleston on May 19, 2001; and

WHEREAS, The Team captured the 4×800 Meter Relay Title with a first place time of 9:19.98; and

WHEREAS, Team members, Kelly O'Neill, Hillary Palumbo, Allison Billhardt, Kara Henry, and Lauren Dick, have demonstrated extraordinary determination and commitment in their quest to win yet another State title for York Community High School; and

WHEREAS, The 4 x 800 Meter Relay Team also placed first at the Illinois Top Times Indoor Prep Meet on March 31, 2001; and

WHEREAS, This young team of sophomores and one junior, who,

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

except for Kelly O'Neill, had never run at State before, overcame a lack of experience by working together and remaining cool under the intense pressure of Statewide competition; and

WHEREAS, Senior Kelly Forst, one of York's top runners, who served as captain of both the Track and Cross Country Teams, offered inspiration, encouragement and leadership to her younger teammates and was instrumental in their victory; and

WHEREAS, We recognize the efforts of the Lady Duke Track Coaches, Annette Schulte, Phil Urvanski, Carolyn Brandt, and Gretchen Kulat, whose guidance motivated these young athletes and many others before them, to excel to record levels; and

WHEREAS, the State 4 \times 800 Relay Title is a source of great pride to the school and the entire Elmhurst community, building upon one of the nation's most prominent and successful athletic programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we do hereby offer our congratulations to the members of the 4 x 800 Meter Relay Team, their Coach Annette Schulte, and the entire York Community High School Track Team on their achievements this year; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the Lady Duke Coaches, the 4 x 800 Relay Team Members and Kelly Forst."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Daniels on the Resolution."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I was yesterday in presenting the Class A champions from Timothy Christian High School in Elmhurst, I am absolutely delighted to present to you the 4 x 800 Meter Relay Team first place winners in the State AA Women's Tournament

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

track and field. And they completed it in a time of 9 minutes and 19 seconds. If you can imagine running that fast, it's beyond comprehension to me. I think I'd probably need a motorcycle or something like that to stay up with them. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you please congratulate the team members that are here today by adopting House Resolution 395 and honoring this great team, champions here in Illinois, champions in life and people that have made us extremely proud of their efforts as well as their coach who's right behind me; Annette Schulte and their coach Phil Urvanski, as well. So, please join me in congratulating them on their great victory here in Illinois."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 396, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 396."

HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives offer our sincere congratulations to Maria Cicero on an exceptional high school Cross Country and Track and Field career; and

WHEREAS, Maria Cicero has won numerous awards in Class AA Cross Country and Track and Field including, All State Honors as well as Class AA State Championship Titles; and

WHEREAS, Maria broke an eighteen year old record in Illinois for the 3,200 meters with a time of 10:17.28 on May 19, 2001; and

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

WHEREAS, Maria, on the same day, also won the 1,600 meters, becoming only the fourth Class AA runner to win both the 3,200 meters and 1,600 meters State championships in the same year; and

WHEREAS, Maria, in addition to being a member of last year's Lady Dukes State Championship Class AA Track and Field Team, also won the individual Class AA Cross Country Title on November 4, 2000; and

WHEREAS, Maria's determination and pursuit of excellence serve as an example for not only her fellow teammates, but for the entire student body of York Community High School; and

WHEREAS, Maria demonstrates what it means to be a true student-athlete by achieving success not only on the playing field, but also in the classroom; and

WHEREAS, We offer Maria our sincere best wishes as she finishes her career at York Community High School and begins her collegiate career; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we do hereby offer our congratulations to Maria Cicero on concluding an amazing athletic career at York Community High School; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Maria Cicero."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thank you for your courtesies extended to this great athlete, Maria Cicero. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask you to take a look at this young lady. Her name is Maria Cicero, she won the State Cross Country championship earlier this year and she was honored by all of you at that

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

is now returning having won the state championship in the 3200 meters, 2 miles and the 1600 meter, 1 mile race. Now, catch this. She ran the 1 mile race in her victory time 4 minutes, 51 seconds. One of the fastest women in the history of Illinois sports. She won the 2 mile race and she ran all these in the same day. first she ran 2 miles and won it; she ran it in 10 minutes and 17 seconds, if you can imagine that. And then repeated and ran the 1 mile race in 4 minutes and 51 seconds. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a great athlete. This is somebody that we in Illinois want to continue to honor. She's a senior, she'll graduate on June 3rd from York Community High School in Elmhurst and she's off to Boston College in Boston, Massachusetts. You're gonna see this young lady in the future and you're gonna be able to all of us when we say, we were proud to honor her here in Illinois. So, Maria Cicero, once again, we're honored to be part of your career and your victory. We congratulate you, your teammates, each one of 'em who are a important component of your career and your coach, Annette Schulte. Please, give Maria Cicero the congratulations she so warmly deserves."

Speaker Hartke: "Congratulations. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 885?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 885 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 885, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

the Bill. No further Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Miller on... Mr. Miller on the Amendment."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. I'd like to table Amendment #1 of Senate Bill 885."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to adjourn. I have an announcement. Mr. Clerk, would you please read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 48

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 Friday, May 25, 2001, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 29, 2001 at 4:00 p.m.; and when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 25, 2001 it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 29, 2001 at 3:00 p.m."

Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Now, for the announcements. The Assembly will adjourn today until Tuesday at the hour of

4:00. Members are reminded that on the Calendar there are

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

committees scheduled at 12 and at 2 p.m. Members are also advised that we will be here Tuesday and plan to stay through Thursday with an extra reminder that as of June 1st, there will be no per diem paid. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Turner now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 4 p.m. on Tuesday, May 29th. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned. Representative Lyons, do you have a quick announcement?"

- Lyons, J.: "I have an inquiry of the Chair. Do you have the Revenue Committee posted for a time, Chuck? Is there a time posted on the Revenue Committee?"
- Speaker Hartke: "On the Regular Calendar, the committees are posted."
- Lyons, J.: "All right. I was not a party to the picking of the time. Is there any reason it has to be at noon? It couldn't be at 3:00 or 2:00?"
- Speaker Hartke: "They're posted as posted. Mr. Lyons, would you like to ... post that? I was in error at a later date, no later than 2:00."
- Lyons, J.: "No later than 2. Well, 2:00 is better than 12:00.

 That would be fine, Chuck, if that could be arranged.

 Revenue Committee at 2:00."
- Speaker Hartke: "Okay."
- Lyons, J.: "Thank you. They'll be a change in the schedule."
- Speaker Hartke: "...every Member hear that's on the Revenue Committee? The Revenue Committee will be posted at 2... or delayed 'til 2 rather than at 12. Mr. Mautino."
- Mautino: "Just a question. For those Bills remaining on the Calendar that have had deadlines extended to 5-25-01, will they be further extended? I mean, or are all these Bills

66th Legislative Day

May 25, 2001

dead?"

Speaker Hartke: "It is the intent of the Chair to extend those deadlines until June 1."

Mautino: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hartke: "May 31 rather than June 1, May 31st. Yes. Mr. Lyons, Revenue will meet in 114, since you have changed the time. Okay."