29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "The House will come to order. Members will please be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of Victory Temple Church in Springfield. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and sovereign King, we humbly bow down to You in humble submission. We submit to You our lives, our minds to be renewed, our hearts to be searched and our bodies to be used for Your will and divine purpose throughout this great land that You have created. For it is what we do for You that will last. And it is because of You that all of our labors are not in vain. This we ask in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Hartke: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Eddy Washington."
- Washington 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 Hartke: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, your report on the Democrat side."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show we have no excused absences to report today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Daniels is excused today."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 Members answering the Quorum Call, a quorum is present. We're ready to do the business. Committee Reports. We'll do them later. Rules Committee meeting."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it's the Chair's intention to start on Third Reading and run as many Bills as possible. I would suggest for all the Members to keep their remarks brief and to the point. I care not to use the timer but I may. On page 28 of the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1268. Representative Coulson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1268 requires a study and a report by the Department of Public Aid before anti-hemophiliac drugs can be placed on prior approval. A little bit of an explanation is since these are specific medications for a very unique disease, hemophilia, we didn't feel it was appropriate for prior approval to be required. But we would like to have the department do a study and report on how much this would cost. We're under the understanding there's about 235 people who receive anti-hemophiliac drugs in the State of Illinois at this time. And I would answer any questions."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1268? Seeing that no one is seeking... recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1268?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1273, Representative Saviano. Representative Saviano. Out of the record. House Bill 1274, Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1274, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien on House Bill 1274."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does is it sets up an opportunity for the Secretary of State to issue a refund in the event that somebody comes in, excuse me, when somebody comes in and they get the wrong kind of plates, if they were to get apportioned plates and didn't get apportioned plates and if they got a different kind of plate it would save money. Right now, there's no mechanism for the Secretary of State to issue a refund to somebody. This Bill simply does that."

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

House Bill 1274?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flider, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Flider: "I would like to inform the gallery and please welcome, if you would, form Decatur, Illinois, the 11th grade history class form the Lutheran School Association of Decatur. And this is also... these are also members of the first graduating class of the Lutheran School. So, please welcome them."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol. House Bill 1279, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1279, a Bill for an Act concerning hazardous materials. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1279 is an initiative of the fire districts and the fire chiefs. What this Bill does, basically, under our state's Hazardous Material Emergency Reimbursement Act also known as the HMER Act, local and

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

emergency response agencies are eligible to receive reimbursements for costs incurred responding to hazardous material emergencies. Currently, fire fighters, emergency rescue services, civil defense agencies and hazardous material response teams are eligible for reimbursement from the MHER (sic-HMER) fund. What this Bill does it adds technical rescue teams to this list. I know of no opposition. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "This reimbursement comes from the person or... or company or corporation that has spilled the hazardous material?"

Brosnahan: "That's correct."

Parke: "And is there... is there any exten... extenuating circumstances as if it was an accident. Would this have to be deliberate?"

Brosnahan: "No, it could also be an accident. If they're... if they're responsible for the emergency then they would be responsible for the reimbursement to these responding agencies. If... and if they don't pay than they would get reimbursement from the HMER Act. That's my understanding."

Parke: "Do you know what kind of fiscal impact this is gonna have?"

Brosnahan: "No, I... I am not aware of that. I mean, presently,

Representative Parke, there's dozens of these technical

rescue teams in the State of Illinois, but I think each

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

month that goes by there's more of them. More and more departments are... are adding these, obviously this is a result of 9/11."

Parke: "And do our fire service industry feel that this will be a good tool for them to be more effective in doing their jobs?"

Brosnahan: "Yes, they do. According to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency what these technical rescue teams do is they provide the capabilities for victim extraction from a below grade/high angle and structural collapse where people are entrapped."

Parke: "Now, are these teams ready to go now? Are they in place..."

Brosnahan: "Yes, there are dozens of teams right now in the State of Illinois that are... that are ready to go and that they've already had their training and they're ready to be called into service if needed. But again as I said it seems every month that goes by more departments and fire districts are adding."

Parke: "Now, is this similar to a mutual assistance program where you find firemen and technical people from more than one fire service unit?"

Brosnahan: "Exactly. That's exactly what it is."

Parke: "Okay, thank you. I think this is a good idea."

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

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Mulligan: "Representative, how do you determine if the entity that caused the emergency such as a railroad car tipping over with toxic material that they're not going to pay. Who determines when the state has to pay and when the entity that caused the emergency is not going to pay and will the state go after them in order to be reimbursed?"

Brosnahan: "My understanding is the state will try to get these, whether it's a company or a corporation, the state will try to get them to reimburse the... the local emergency agencies. If they don't pay, then the HMRE (sic-HMER) fund will then provide a reimbursement. Now, I... I'm assuming that the state would still have possibly a cause of action against these companies or corporations, but you know, whether they decide..."

Mulligan: "Well, if... if it's a company..."

Brosnahan: "...to pursue it or not. But that's not covered in this Bill."

Mulligan: "All right. Because my concern is that we just automatically pay without seeking reimbursement when we could use the reimbursement too."

Brosnahan: "Yeah, I understand your concern but the State of Illinois, I know, would still have a cause of action even if they... if they'd paid it out of this HMER fund the state could still try to get payment from those companies at a later date. There's nothing that'll prevent the state from doing that."

Mulligan: "All right, thank you."

Brosnahan: "Thank you."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1279?' 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 this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1273, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1273, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1273 was brought to me by the Cook County Board and the Pace Suburban Bus System. What happened is that the Cook County Board appoints a certain amount of members to the Pace Bus Board which oversees the Pace Bus System throughout suburban Cook County and the collar counties. They appointed the mayor of Willow Springs to a position on the board that was outside of the region that was designated by that town. So, what this Bill merely does is re... redraw the region to include that town into that district. And that's simply what it does and I would ask for your support."

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, if you're... if you're changing the boundaries, are we adding or subtracting from what's there now?"

Saviano: "We're... we're simply... the town of Willow Springs is directly adjacent to the... to the region that he needed to move into. So, all you're doing is adding Willow streaks... Springs into that new region."

Parke: "Did anybody rise in opposition to this in committee or do you know of any opposition?"

Saviano: "No, there... there's absolutely no opposition. This was brought to me by the general counsel of Pace."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1273?' 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. Wirsing. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jakobsson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Jakobsson: "I hope that many of you had an opportunity to hear the Urbana High School concert choir. They sang in the rotunda at 12:30 and they were here because they were receiving the Illinois Alliance for Arts Education Award for Excellence in arts education, the National Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network and National School Boards Association Award. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "What? So noted. Page 28 of the Calendar, on House Bill-Third Reading, appears House Bill 1280. Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1280, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brosnahan."

- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 12... House Bill 1280 is a mission of the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. This proposal removes the single course of conduct language in the Code of Corrections to clarify that consecutive sentences are mandatory whenever a defendant commits multiple offenses including murder and more serious offenses. This proposal does not make consecutive sentences mandatory in any situation where it is not already mandatory. It does give judges more discretion to impose consecutive sentences when he or she rules that the sentence is necessary to protect the public. I know of no opposition to this Bill. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

House Bill 1280?' 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, are you having a problem with your board? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're having problems with our board. We'll apparently have to do something. Mr. Black. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Representative Feigenholtz. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting And this Bill, having received 'present'. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1284, Representative May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1284, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative May."

May: "Yes. House Bill 1284 amends the Abuse and Neglected Child Reporting Act. And it is brought to me by the licensed professional counselors and licensed clinical professional counselors. They were inadvertently left out of the list of people who are required to report. Ethically they report sexual child abuse and they can even be fined if they don't, so this is just fixing a little glitch in the law. It is supported by the Department of Children and Family Services."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1284?

Representative Lang."

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Representative, just a matter of clarification. Does...

does your Bill create any confidentiality issues?"

May: "The... it doesn't change anything that is there that's a privileged quality of communication shall not apply in situations for abused and neglected children."

Lang: "And so, when there's... under these circumstances the person waives their privilege?"

May: "Is that... all it's..."

Lang: "Is there any other part of the law where we do that?"

May: "I would have to check it out and get back to you. It just adds this, it does not change the other law in any way. It just adds these people to the people who they report."

Lang: "All right. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, why... can you tell me in a brief sentence why anybody wants to be added to the list of mandated reporters? There are some people on that list who would like to get off the list. Why do these people want on?"

May: "The... these are highly trained professional counselors..."

Black: "I'm sorry, they're what?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

May: "They are highly trained professional counselors.

Ethically and morac... morally they want to report. And they started being licensed in 1993, after this law was first written. So, every... every General Assembly they've made slight changes to it. But they want to be on it because they know it's their obligation to report it."

Black: "What are... what are the penalties if a licensed clinical counselor doesn't report?"

May: "They can... they can be fined up to a thousand dollars."

Black: "You mean they aren't eligible for the death penalty."

May: "I don't believe so, no."

Black: "Ohh."

May: "That's not hidden in this."

Black: "All right. Could you... could you explain to me how in a... in a licensed clinical counseling session a licensed clinical counselor would be able to witness signs of child abuse? Are... are these sessions performed in a... in gym shorts and a T-shirt?"

May: "No, no."

Black: "I would think not."

May: "No. I... I think you're right about that. These are private counseling sessions."

Black: "You know, I can understand a doctor and I can understand a teacher and I can understand a few on the list, but I don't understand how a licensed clinical counselor is going to be able to see any sign of child abuse unless they ask the child..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

May: "The children tell them. Oh, excuse me, for interrupting, but the children tell them. These are counselors and they are advising them."

Black: "Now, wait a minute."

May: "So, it's..."

Black: "You're either a licensed clinical professional counselor or you're a child assistant in an institution.

What... what are you under your Bill?"

May: "A licensed clinical professional counselor."

Black: "Anybody that hangs out a shingle, right?"

May: "Oh no, no, no, no. I'm sorry. These people are... go through vigorous training, I think I've got some of their training here. They are... they have advanced degrees. They are trained."

Black: "Well, I... I think, number one, your Bill has a definitional problem. I'm under the law of the State of Illinois. I am a licensed and registered and certified counselor. I don't think I'm covered under this law. But I... I, number one, I think you have a definitional problem. Number two, I think you have a problem in the underlying Bill. If you'll read the underlying Bill, your Bill states that if one of these counselors sees a potential abusive situation, in the grocery store, out on the street, in the parking lot of the mall, they are duty bound to report. Now, why is that in there?"

May: "This list... we're just adding this list of licensed clinic... professional counselors..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Black: "I don't think so, Representative, you better read the Bill."

May: "We are just adding it along with..."

Black: "No, you're not. No, you're not. The Bill states that if they see any of this happening anywhere in public they must report it."

May: "Along with a long list of social workers, social services administrators, domestic violence program personnel, registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, respiratory care practitioners, advance practice nurses, home health aides, director and staff assistant of a nursery school or a child or daycare center, hygienist... dental hygienist, osteopaths, chiropractors, podiatrist. This is a very, very comprehensive list of people."

Black: "Oh, yes, yes. I... I... it has... it has saved millions of children from abuse. We all know that. The... the newspapers in Chicago are just full of feel-good stories every day about how many children are saved by the Mandated Reporting Act that most people, quite frankly, ignore because they don't want to get involved. So, in other words, if a licensed clinical counselor sees a mother grab a child while at the grocery store who wanted to reach for a... a can of pop and the mother didn't want the child to have the can of pop and grabs the kid, pulls him away, smacks him on the rear end. Is that a mandated reporting situation?"

May: "The mandated reporting is I... I believe under the professional... when someone is in the office with them."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Black: "That doesn't... your Bill doesn't say that. It says anywhere. Duh. Mr. Speaker, I give up. Can I amend the Bill on its face? Every individual in the State of Illinois, if the woman will accept my Amendment, every living person in the State of Illinois over the age of 18 should be a mandated reporter. We'll amend it on its face. How'd that be? Would she accept that Amendment?"

Speaker Hartke: "No, Sir."

Black: "I mean, we're getting there step by step. Let's just accept... let's just accept the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "You have a right to vote 'no'."

Black: "I intend to. And by the way, it might be helpful if Sponsors would sometime read their Bill before they present it."

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

May: "...for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1284?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 104 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 2626. Mr... On Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2626 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2626.
  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2626, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a shell Bill that I would ask your indulgence that we send over to the Senate so that as we go through the process that we have Bills in place so that we can act in a matter to expedite opportunities that may come along. So, this is a shell Bill... well if... should the Senate put language in the Bill it would come back to us for a concurrence and a final vote. This is not the... the final passage vote. This is only a vote to send it to the Senate. So, I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would encourage Members on our side of the aisle to vote either 'present' or 'no' on this Bill at this time. House Bill 2626, while it's a shell Bill, is a Bill that potentially could be used to authorize the state, through the Governor's Office..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shh."

Cross: "...to issue bonds up to \$10 billion. Now, I wanna make sure it's clear that I'm not standing up here opposed to the ultimate product. I may very well be in favor of that

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

at the end of the day. I mean, I'm... I'm not speaking at this time as an opponent, but there are a great deal of questions that remain unanswered with respect to this particular program. Questions such as, what is the reaction from the rating agencies on the effect and what this mean... will mean to the state. We've been looking for a summary of projected market reaction from the banking community. We've been looking for a Bill that's completed, it's gonna be a rather comprehensive Bill and we haven't gotten there yet as a chamber or as a Body. We've been looking for detailed bond numbers including issuance cost, the bond structure and the time table... time table of issuance. We've been looking for position statements from the five pension systems. And ultimately we've also been, or last but not least, we've been looking for a framework in a larger sense as to the rest of the ... as to the rest of the budget scenario. So, Mr. Speaker, again, I say and... and I say it with a great deal of respect to the Governor and to your side of the aisle, we may be there at the end of the day but we're not there yet. These are substantive questions that need to be answered. They're not political, they're primarily substantive, in fact, they're all substantive. And until those are answered, it's very difficult for us to support this. So, again, I would encourage those of you on our side of the aisle to vote 'present' or 'no' and until we can get a greater picture of this puzzle. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

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

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't disagree with what Representative Cross said about people wanting to know what it is that the final product is. But what this proposal is right now in front of us that I'm asking your vote on is a shell Bill that we wish to send to the sen... Senate so that procedurally we'll be in a position, should we reach an agreement, that we can take action. Any... any Bill that would incur additional debt obligation through bonding in the State of Illinois will require a three-fifths vote. So, this is something that will have to be bipartisan to come back to us. And so, ya know, I'm just asking that we move the process along and that we send this Bill to the Senate as we continue to negotiate."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2626?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 Members voting 'yes', 28 Members voting 'no', and 24 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back on page 28 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1285. Representative May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1285, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1285 amends the Ag Areas Conservation and Protection Act, which now reads that an area of 350 acres can be included. This Bill lowers the minimum agricultural area to a hundred acres in the counties of 600 thousand people, which really applies only to DuPage and Lake County. As you are well aware, in areas that have rapid growth we want to preserve our family farm and this allows us to do it. It's an initiative of Lake County. It is permissive. And it is supported by the Farm Bureau."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1285?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Howard on House Bill 1353. Representative Howard. Temporarily take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 1356, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1356, a Bill for an Act concerning the practice of medicine. Third Reading of this House Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 1356 simply allows the public member on the Medical Practice Disciplinary Board to be a voting member, now. This is an initiative that we've been trying to get passed for some time. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1356?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 28 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1353. Representative Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1353 requires the Department of Public Health to conduct an informational campaign for the general public and health professionals whenever the state is required by the Federal Government to participate in a response plan to a national health threat. You perhaps know that on December 13th of last year the President issued an order that requested that health

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

workers receive smallpox vaccinations so that those workers could provide services in the case of public emergencies such as smallpox. In the face of possible bioterrorism, it is possible that Federal Government would enlist the state's assistance in administering similar vaccination programs. The fact of the matter is that there are many individuals who ought not to take smallpox vaccinations. And I think the state has a responsibility to make those announcements loud and clear. Those who have HIV/AIDS, eczema, hepatitis C, if you are pregnant, eczema, as I said before, you should not get the smallpox vaccination and there are many others, as well. Many other conditions where the immune system has been compromised where you will die if you get that vaccination. I think the State of Illinois Department of Public Health should let everybody Illinois know this. I ask for your positive consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1353? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1353?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1360, Representative Jones. Lou Jones. Out of the record. House Bill 1372,

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Representative Lyons. Eileen Lyons. Representative Lyons.

Out of the record. House Bill 1373, Representative Ei...

Eileen Lyons. Out of the record. House Bill 1377,

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Millner."

Millner: "Yes, House Bill 1377, is to... going after unlicensed gun dealers. It provides that it's a Class A misdemeanor for a first offense and a Class 4 felony for a second and subsequence offense to sell or give a firearm while engaged in their business of selling firearms at wholesale or retail without being licensed as a federal firearms dealer. Basically, this allows local pro... prosecutors to arrest people for selling guns without a federal firearm license."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition on this Gentleman's first Bill... oh, second Bill, excuse me. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1377?' All in favor... 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... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 115 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', and 2 people voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1382, Mr. Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1382, a Bill for an Act concerning families. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1382 deals with the issue of court orders dealing with the removal of a child while there's custody issues pending. I've worked on this issue along with Representatives Black and McAuliffe. The Bill needs a little bit of fine-tuning, which we're gonna do over in the Senate side. It's really gonna clarify things for all interested parties. It also mandates the courts always take into consideration the best interest of the child in issuing orders that would restrict removal of a child pending custody issue resolution. I'd ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is... Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you..."

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Meyer: "...Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Meyer: "Representative, is there any opposition of this Bill as it currently is?"

Fritchey: "There is opposition pending an Amendment which we've agreed we'll put on in the Senate. And with that Amendment there's absolutely no opposition to this Bill."

Meyer: "All right. Thank you."

Fritchey: "Thank you."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1382?' 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 Have all voted who wish? Representative who wish? Hoffman. Representative Flowers. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1385, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1385, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1385 is an initiative of township officials of Illinois. It would allow a township to sell or lease its property without having to do a referendum if the value of the property is 5 thousand or less. The current limit was 200. It also clarifies that trading in current township property for new equipment does not constitute selling the property. There's no known opposition. And in checking, I believe, municipalities did have a \$5 thousand limit and even that has been eliminated. So, this is just simply allowing them if they need to trade in equipment or buy or

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

sell it would, of course, be official action but not by referendum. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1385?

Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House pass House Bill 1385?' All those in favor

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

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Osmond.

Representative Burke. Burke. Mr. Burke. Mr. Clerk, take

the record. On this question, there 117 Members voting

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

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

hereby declared passed. House Bill 1387, Representative

McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1387, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1387 amends the Public Community College Act. It basically changes it so that the city colleges in Chicago have a bond for their treasurer that is identical to the bond for common school district treasurers in all other of the 39 community college districts. It was supported in committee 12-0-0. And I'd appreciate your favorable consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1387?

Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House

Bill 1387?' All those in favor signify by s... voting 'aye';

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

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... Representative Bailey. Representative Hassert. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1389, on page 29 on Third Reading. Representative McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1389, a Bill for Act relating... in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1389 amends the Vehicle Code. It removes the \$2 surcharge on various veteran plates. We have three plates today that don't pay the extra \$2 and we felt it was fair that these other seven that are charged a \$2 fee, in addition to their regular \$78 fee... you know, it's kind of a fairness thing and a tribute to our veterans to remove that \$2 fee. I would like to point out that my four cosponsors are also veterans and I am honored to have them on this Bill with me."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1389?' 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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Represe...

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1394, Representative McKeon. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1394, a Bill for an Act concerning preventative services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McKeon."

McKeon: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to recommit this Bill to Rules Committee."

Speaker Hartke: "So... so, the Bill will be committed to Rules."
McKeon: "Right."

Speaker Hartke: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. House Bill 1412, Representative Lyons. Joe Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act concerning assisted living. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1412 amends the... allows certain type of independent living facilities to obtain a floating assisted living facilities license for a portion of their units. The Assisted Living Act was passed, of course, three years ago in the 91st General Assembly to recognize a form of

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

long-term care, independent... independent living and nursing home cares at level. This Bill, in essence, just codifies what's been allowed by Rules the last several years. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1412? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1412?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Younge. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let's go back to page 28, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1372. Representative Lyons. Eileen Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1372 was an initiative that passed this chamber two years ago by Representative... former Representative Jim Durkin. It is an improvement on the truth-seeking process and is based on a 1963 Supreme Court decision, Brady v. Maryland, that held that the state's suppression of evidence favorable to the accused after a

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

request for production violates due process. This legislation spells out the affirmative duty upon the prosecution to disclose evidence which is material and tends to negate the guilt of the accused, impeach state witnesses or mitigate the degree of punishment. Additionally, the legislation places the burden upon the state to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the outcome would not have changed, notwithstanding the nondisclosure. This section departs from the present law which places the burden upon the defense to establish..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shh."

Lyons, E.: "...that the nondisclosed evidence would have changed the outcome of the trial."

Speaker Hartke: "Shh."

Lyons, E.: "Why should the defense be the movant when they were not responsible for the nondisclosure? I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass... Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I didn't have a chance to go up and talk to the rep... Legislator you're... you're moving so quickly. This Bill, as originally passed by the General Assembly, had an exclusion and the exclusion was the... it mandated... automatically mandated a new trial, if by any reason certain evidence was not made known to the defense and that re... that generated opposition from the

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

State's Attorneys Association. Now, is the mandatory language for a new trial in the Bill or out of the Bill?"

Lyons, E.: "It is out of the Bill."

Black: "You're sure? In other words, it's in the same form as it was when Representative Durkin amended it... when he amended it to take out... So, why are the state's attorneys still opposed to the Bill? I thought the only thing they were exposed to, or opposed to was the mandatory new trial language in the case of an in... inadvertent failure to disclose?"

Lyons, E.: "That is true. And the Bill is the amended version.

It does no… no longer mandates it, it allows for it. I

don't know why they're still opposed to it."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Representative, I may have misunderstood you, but did I just hear you say this Bill was amended?"

Lyons, E.: "No. I mean, it was amend... when Representative Durkin had it, it was amended back then. This is the amended version of Representative Durkin's Bill."

Lang: "All right. So, this Bill is intact the way it was drafted. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1372?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes';

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Black. Mr. Brady. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there a 106 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1373, Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1373, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill.
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lyons. Out of the record."
- Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move this back to second for an Amendment, please."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. On page 29 on the Calendar appears House Bill 1423. Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1423 gives authorization to add 80 beds to the LaSalle County Veteran's Home. And currently we have 281 veterans on the waiting list for admission to that facility. Currently, it's a hundred and twenty, this addition will make it a two hundred bed facility. And the

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

average amount of time is about 15 to 18 months that a veteran waits to gain access to one of these facilities. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1423? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1423?' 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... Representative ChapaLaVia. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 91 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 26 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1425, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act concerning the freedom of information. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates an additional exception to the Freedom of Information Act. House Bill 1425 simply provides that for those participating in park district and forest preserve programs can expect privacy on their name, address and phone number and other personal information and that information is not required to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1425?

Representative Lang, the Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Lang."

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

Speaker Hartke: "She doesn't look very comfortable."

Lang: "I understand..."

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

Lang: "I understand there are a number of Legislators that had their first Bill the other day when I was not here."

Speaker Hartke: "That's true."

Lang: "And so I'll have to talk to them on their second Bill.

But I understand..."

Nekritz: "I should've been so lucky."

Lang: "...this is Representative Nekritz's first Bill. So, who asked you to bring this Bill to us today, Representative?"

Nekritz: "That would be the Illinois Association of Park Districts."

Lang: "All of them? They all came to your office?"

Nekritz: "Every... every last one of 'em."

Lang: "You... you have room in your office for all these people?"

Nekritz: "I have a great big office."

Lang: "I see. And what is this business about inspection and copying. I mean, what... why... don't they have copy machines at these places?"

Nekritz: "At what places?"

Lang: "Well, at all the… I ask the questions here,
Representative. At… at… at these park districts, forest
preserves and conservation districts. Don't… Don't they
have copy machines?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Nekritz: "They do. But they have limited supplies of paper, so their trying to... to conserve on that."

Lang: "What if... well, why don't we charge fees?"

Nekritz: "Pardon me?"

Lang: "Why don't we charge fees? Like a dime a page, a nickel..."

Nekritz: "I think... I think we do charge fees under the freedom in... they're... they're allowed to charge fees under the Freedom of Information Act."

Lang: "I don't know what to say. I think you know your Bill pretty well. All right, I'm done."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Lang."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, what... what is the genesis of this Bill?"

Nekritz: "I believe there is some concern about the disclosure of personal information under... under the park dis... under the Freedom of Information Act."

Black: "I certainly agree with you on that. Can you tell me what the law is that mandates a Social Security number on every permit, every application and every license that anyone applies for in the State of Illinois?"

Nekritz: "I don't believe I can, Sir."

Black: "It's a Federal Law. Are you aware that you must give your Social Security number if you apply for a permit to rent a pavilion at a park?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Nekritz: "I... I guess I've rented pavilions before and I don't recall having to give my Social Security number."

Black: "Are... are you aware that you must give a Social Security number to apply for a driver's license?"

Nekritz: "I... yes, I am aware of that."

Black: "How about a plumber's license. Are you aware of that?"

Nekritz: "No, Sir."

Black: "Are you aware that you must supply your Social Security number to apply for a hunting license?"

Nekritz: "No, Sir, I was not aware of that."

Black: "Or a fishing license? Or a deer permit?"

Nekritz: "No, Sir."

Black: "Would you amend this Bill on its face to take all of these instances that I mentioned, which is a federal mandate, one of the sillier federal mandates that I tried to pass out of this chamber two years ago, a law that said... told Uncle Sam to go stick it in his ear. They have no right to ask for my Social Security number when I want to get a deer hunting permit, or a barber's license, or a beautician's license, or a driver's license. But they do, they do. And this state doesn't have the means or the wherewithal to tell Uncle Sam that's a bad idea. But I've got a hunch that if I could amend this Bill of yours to say that all FOI requests shall be immune to a person's personal records. Now, that's a Bill I'd cosponsor if you'd consider that Amendment."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Nekritz: "I'd be happy to consider that in the future, but I don't think I want to amend this particular Bill. I've had a hard enough time getting it to Third Reading as it is.

Black: "Welcome to our wonderful Representative democracy,

Representative."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Black: "Representative, I may give you an opportunity because I'm... I'm going to... I... I have a Bill... I didn't... I was not able to get it out of committee and I will try a Resolution and I'm not... I'm not trying to set you up for your first Bill. I am serious. I think government is hypocritical at best, stupid at worst, because we constantly tell people guard that Social Security number. Identity theft is a growing problem. But the Federal Government under the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1997 requires that any license or permit issued by any state the individual must furnish the Social Security number. Now, on a deer permit... I... I have a hunch you've never been deer hunting?"

Nekritz: "Your hunch would be correct."

Black: "We'll have to invite you the... next fall. I may purchase a deer per... permit..."

Nekritz: "Although, I have been pheasant hunting before."

Black: "...at Joe's bar and grill and the application may sit in a cigar box behind the bar for a week before it's forwarded to... the Department of Natural Resources. I think this is wrong, I really do. I'm gonna vote for your Bill. I think this insatiable demand by the Federal Government to use a Social Security number as our national ID number is wrong.

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

It says right on the Social Security card its not to be used for identification purposes. I think this Bill is a small step in the right direction, but I hope you will join with me if I can get my Bill in... in Resolution form. think the Federal Government should stop mandating that we furnish a Social Security number on every license and permit application that we have to fill out. I think your Bill's a good idea. I'm not about to try and trick you. I think it's a step in the right direction. But I'm serious and you may want to look into this. I think you need to expand it to every state or local agency that is required by Federal Law to collect my Social Security number to exempt that information from any FOIA request. They don't need my social security number on a FOIA request. That's why I think for your first Bill you have a good one, an excellent Bill."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Black: "One that I fully intend to support. I hope you don't give up. I hope you continue to expand this Bill to say to people you do not have an inalienable right to my Social Security number and... and if you wanna pursue that, I'll be glad to work with you."

Speaker Hartke: "Fur..."

Black: "And of all the freshman Bills I've seen for a first Bill yours is one I not only embrace, but I think it's a positive step in the right direction. And I hope everybody votes 'aye'."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Representative."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Repre... Representative Nekritz to close."
- Nekritz: "I would appreciate your support for this important step forward for privacy. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1425?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Yarbrough. Representative Colvin. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1434, Representative Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act in relation to penal ordinances. Third Reading of this House Bill."

  Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1434 is an initiative of the Illinois Municipal League. It would allow non-Home Rule municipalities to enact a local retail theft ordinance. And I believe this Bill in the 91st General Assembly passed out unanimously out of the House, but died in the Senate. And I urge your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1434?

  Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

  'Shall the House pass House Bill 1434?' All those in favor

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1436, Representative McGuire. Jack McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act in relation to aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1436, excuse me, it amends the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. And the Bill states that beginning on January 1, the year 2004, the pharmaceutical assistance program will cover prescription drugs used in the treatment of multiple sclerosis. This is all that the Bill does and I will be happy to answer any questions, fiscal impact, whatever it might be. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1436?' All those in favor signify by... Representative Lyons, a little slow on the switch, but we'll back up. Representative Lyons."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Lyons, E.: "Representative McGuire, can you tell me what the fiscal impact of this be?"

McGuire: "I'm sorry. Once again, we have somebody holding a conservation just momentarily. Could you repeat that?"

Lyons, E.: "Sure."

McGuire: "Thank you."

Lyons, E.: "I'd like to know what the fiscal impact will be."

McGuire: "Okay. The MS Foundation has predicted a couple hundred thousand. I had a fiscal note on this from the Fiscal Commission and during the year 2002 they expended a hundred and ninety-three million dollars. In fiscal year 2003, which we are in, the total expenditures through December, which was just a couple of months ago, was thirty million. So, it's 30 million this year compared to 193 million last year. And the answer to your question or I hope your question, how come so much difference, the Senior Care Program. That many people are going on the Senior Care Program, off the Pharmaceutical Assistance Program, so that there would be... there would be money to fund this... this change."

Lyons, E.: "Representative, again, what I'd like to know is what the fiscal impact is gonna be to this state."

McGuire: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you when there's other conversations..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

McGuire: "...going on here. Hold... would you hold the noise down a little."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Lyons, E.: "I'd like to know what the fiscal impact is going to be to the state to add muscular scler... muscular dis... Which is it? ...muscular sclerosis to the Circuit Breaker Program?"

McGuire: "The MS people feel and they have told me that they feel about 600 people would be affected."

Lyons, E.: "Six hundred people would be affected. How much to do you think that's going to cost to cover those people?"

McGuire: "I don't have the cost. They claim that out of 14 thousand people in the State of Illinois only 600 would be affected, because they are on Medicaid. The MS Society has given us figures of under \$500 thousand."

Lyons, E.: "Under \$500 thousand?"

McGuire: "Under 500 thousand."

Lyons, E.: "And have you identified a revenue stream to fund that?"

McGuire: "I would think that it would come out of the difference between the hundred and ninety-three million one year and the thirty million so far this year."

Lyons, E.: "And where do those two figures come from?"

McGuire: "Pardon me? Pardon me? I'm sorry, Eileen."

Lyons, E.: "To the Bill."

McGuire: "What'd you..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Lyons, E.: "Although, this is a laudable effort and I really do think that this is a... an effort to include yet another disease and for seniors to be covered by. I do think, again, we have to think about the fiscal impact this is gonna have to the state. And I would encourage those who

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

are... who do not know the revenue stream that's going to cover this to vote 'present' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1436?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 95 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 22 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1437, Representative Flider. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1437, a Bill for an Act concerning payroll deductions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lang. Representative Flider."

Flider: "Hello. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would simply provide that new state hires or employees could be provided information about the annual or ongoing State and University Employee Campaign Appeals, sometimes known as SECA, outside the statutory eight week window. SECA is synonymous with the United Way and it is a voluntary program. Currently, state statutes provide that employees may receive this information only during the eight week campaign, between September 1 and November 30. So, therefore, a new employee hire today would not be eligible to receive this information and contribute, though perhaps

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

they would like to do so. So, at any rate, this is a voluntary program. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Lang."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Representative, you were not so fortunate as to run your first Bill last Friday, were you?"

Flider: "No, Sir, I was not."

Lang: "All right. So, I'm trying to understand your Bill and I see something here about solicitation. I thought solicitation at all times is illegal under our statutes?"

Flider: "Well, in this case, solicitation is permissive."

Lang: "It's what, Sir?"

Flider: "It's permitted by law."

Lang: "This kind of solicitation is permitted?"

Flider: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "You wanna explain how it differs from the other kind of solicitation?"

Flider: "Yes, Sir. This solicitation is for funds for charitable organizations, which do a lot of good for society."

Lang: "But you'll admit that both kinds involve an exchange of money?"

Flider: "Yes, I would admit that."

Lang: "All right, just checking. This also refers to an eight week campaign period."

Flider: "Yes."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Lang: "So, do these people have to campaign to do these solicitations or these donations? Are they gonna prepare posters and put union bugs on 'em and all that stuff?"
- Flider: "Actually, I think that those who are involved in organizing the... the solicitation would be doing a campaign, yes."
- Lang: "Now, it says here that the informational materials from the immediately prior SECA campaign period shall be provided to each such employee. What's the SECA campaign?

  Is that a political party I've not yet to hear about?"
- Flider: "No, it is the State and University Employee Campaign...

  Appeals Campaign, which is synonymous for United Way campaign."
- Lang: "Now, Representative, I think you'll admit that the university employees, maybe not the administration, but the employees, particularly the lower level staff, they aren't paid very much are they?"
- Flider: "Probably in their minds, probably not enough."
- Lang: "But you wanna take more money out of their pockets with this Bill?"
- Flider: "I think certainly the organizations who sponsor this legislation would like to give those people, at least the new hires who fall into that category, an opportunity to contribute."
- Lang: "All right. Now, I'm looking at your Amendment and the Amendment says in one place you're replacing 'shall be' with 'may make', in another place you're deleting the term 'solicited for', in the other line you're replacing 'shall'

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

with 'may'. Do you think these are very important changes replacing 'shall' with 'may'?"

Flider: "I think in this instance it's very important, yes."

Lang: "Now, does Representative May have a problem with this Amendment at all?"

Flider: "Representative May, do you have a problem with the Amendment? She does not. Thank you."

Lang: "You're not allowed to talk to her, I'm the one standing here. Well, thank you, Representative. I'm not sure you understand your own Bill, but I certainly will listen. I'm sure Representative May, whose name was mentioned in debate, is gonna grill you for a while now."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Stephens, the Gentleman from Fayette. He declines. Chair recognizes Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, I... I'm confused. I thought you were a lobbyist, what are you... what are you doing here?"

Flider: "No, Sir, I'm not a lobbyist."

Parke: "Oh."

Flider: "I'm a State Legislator."

Parke: "Didn't I see you on the rail?"

Flider: "You have on... at times seen me on the rail, yes."

Parke: "Okay. So, you left the rail to do the work of the people here?"

Flider: "That is the case, yes."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Parke: "Okay. Well, I... ya know, I'm just surprised to see ya.

I think it's a good thing that you're here. Do you find it
much different?"

Flider: "I find it much different, yes."

Parke: "Okay. Well, that's good. In your Bill, it says that it's a eight week campaign. Why is this necessary at all? Why not somebody new coming in you just tell 'em that you're collecting for the United Way and they just write a check or they... and this is to do a payroll deduction?"

Flider: "Yes. State Law currently provides that these campaigns can only occur during an eight week period. So, this legislation as amended would provide that if an employee was hired outside of that eight week period that they could be provided the materials so that they could make a decision as to whether to contribute to these charitable organizations."

Parke: "Well, I know that a lot of the organizations that I volunteer for and help out with cannot fundraise when the United Way is fundraising. Is this gonna interfere with their ability to... to put out their own fundraiser for their own organizations now that you've extended the period of time? And won't that be in conflict with that understanding of other non for profits not to campaign or set up campaigns while the United Way is doing theirs?"

Flider: "To my understanding, I think that this would pertain only to the SECA campaign appeals, so therefore it would not apply to any organizations who are currently soliciting funds."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Parke: "Well, I understand, but I'm saying is that if this is...
  if they can do this at any time, does this interfere with
  that understanding bet... for other non for profits that when
  the United Way is out no other group that collects money
  from the United Way can solicit from, so that there's no...
  so that there isn't ten people soliciting at the same time
  the United Way is?"
- Flider: "To my knowledge, it would not interfere with anything like that."
- Parke: "And so this is a... and this is an important Bill for you?"
- Flider: "Well, the... I believe that it was expressed to me by the community health charities of Illinois, the representative who... of that organization who asked me to sponsor this, he said that he thought it would be a good Bill that would make me a lot of friends. So, I would suggest to you that if you support this Bill it would make you a lot of friends, too."
- Parke: "Well, it's nice to have friends, that's all I can say, it is nice to have friends. Well, it sounds to me like you have a real important Bill here as your first Bill. So, I'm debating whether or not... I think it'll probably interfere with other... other group fundraisers, so I'm gonna... I'll have to weigh that."
- Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Black: "Representative, it's good to see you. I've known you since you were a young lad climbing power poles for Illinois Power many, many years ago and you did a fine job... a fine job with Illinois Power. This Bill doesn't measure up to your previous profession, however. What... since you're on that side of the aisle, although I joined with many of tho... many of your colleagues in reform, how... how do you... how do you reconcile the reform movement with a Bill as amended that says, I can be solicited where I work if I'm a university employee?"

Flider: "To which reform movement are referring, Representative Black?"

Black: "Well, the very reform movement about not coercing state employees to... to buy fundraising tickets, not asking people who work in your department to sell tickets on behalf of the elected official. Ya know, it's... if your supervisor, if the department of... the department chair or the dean of the college comes to you and says, ya know, I think it'd be a great idea, Representative, if you would contribute \$500 to our combined campaign, I think you're... now, you're under pressure. So, and not only that, but they're being solicited where they work."

Flider: "I think that that is a very good question. On the other hand, I don't think that these kinds of campaigns have come under the kind of scrutiny that... to which you're referring. I also would suggest that this is a voluntary kind of a program and in addition, there may be employees

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

who are hired who would very much like to contribute to these kinds of organizations."

- Black: "All right. Before you amended the Bill, if... if I read this correctly, it was almost required that a new hire be contacted. Is that a fair assumption of the original Bill?"
- Flider: "Representative Black, the ori... the intent of the Bill,

  I think, has always been the same, however, I would add
  that the original drafting of the Bill probably was not...
  the Bill was not drafted as well as it could have,
  therefore the Amendment followed."
- Black: "And so the Amendment clearly makes it less of a requirement and more of a voluntary situation, but... on the part of the new hire. But as I understand it, it's not that voluntary on part of the camp... on the campaign coordinator. In other words, that... that coordinator is going to make sure you are contacted and given every opportunity to give until it hurts."
- Flider: "I would state that generally campaign coordinators do so on a voluntary basis because they like the idea of helping raise funds for organizations."
- Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, very quickly."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I won't belabor the point. When my lights used to go out and they go out more frequently now than they did when I knew Representative Flider as a young lad, I always called him and he always gave me good advice and he always

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

managed to keep the power on. This Bill on the other hand has, for a first Bill, some very, very dangerous ground on which some of you are about to tread. I... I warn you, I would tread that on bare feet, I don't think some of you ought to tread that even in work boots. codifies... this codifies a practice that new hires at the universities can be solicited where they work. Now, that's a slippery slope that may very well let me solicit people in here for my favorite charity on the floor of the House. I don't think that meets the definition of reform as advanced by our new Governor. This is a very... well, I'm a little bit surprised that a freshman would carry this Bill, because it's very, very close to violating certain rules and even statutory requirements about soliciting state employees at their place of employment. So, I... I don't know, I'm torn. My respect for the Gentleman is... is very high, but I'm not sure this is a very good Bill. I... It's gonna require some thought."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative May. Please be brief."

May: "Yes, my name was used on, Mr. Speaker, so I would like to respond. Is it true that my name is in this Bill?"

Flider: "Yes, Representative May, your name is in the Bill."

May: "And even though you didn't ask my permission, I am proud to have my name in the Illinois Statutes so many times. I think it'll be one of the legacies of the General Assembly. I'm proud to have associated with 501c3 corporations, such as the American Red Cross and the community health care

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- agencies and all. So, thank you very much for putting my name in this Bill and thank you to everyone on the floor who puts my name in a Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Flider to close."
- Flider: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just conclude that among the organizations in support of this are the American Red Cross, American Cancer Society, American Heart Association and many other similar organizations. And I would encourage your vote for the Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1437?' 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... Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no', and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought there was an unwritten rule that freshmen weren't allowed to pass Bills in their first term? We need to cut all this crap out, sink these freshmen Bills."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 29 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1447. Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1447, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. Third Reading of this House Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1447 amends the Township Code. It provides that the township committee on youth with the approval of the township board may contract with certain entities for needed transportation for their services."

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

Lang: "I'm... I'm mistaken, Mr. Speaker. I have no questions."

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

Morrow: "Kill the Bill. Kill the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate... or House Bill 1447?' 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... Representative Berrios. Beaubien. Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 29 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1445. Representative Rita, do you wanna do that one again? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1445 amends the Municipal Code. It establishes tax incremented evaluation task force to evaluate the effectiveness of TIF districts."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Brady: "What'd you just say?"

Speaker Hartke: "Please give your attention to Representative Rita."

Rita: "I just explained what House Bill 1445 is."

Brady: "Could... could ya skim it again one more time..."

Rita: "Wait... wait... one..."

Brady: "...for me?"

Rita: "What it does is it establishes a tax increment evaluation task force to evaluate the effectiveness of TIF districts."

Brady: "Okay. That's about it then?"

Rita: "Yes."

Brady: "Okay."

Rita: "Basically."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 14... Mr. Millner. Miller. Mr. Miller"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Miller: "It's Miller..."

Speaker Hartke: "Miller."

Miller: "...not my cousin Millner."

Speaker Hartke: "My eyes are fuzzy."

Miller: "What is the purpose of this, Representative Rita?"

Rita: "Just to evaluate to see what the effectiveness of what TIF districts do to us. Can you hear that?"

Miller: "Yeah, there we go. Could you repeat yourself?"

Rita: "Just to evaluate the effectiveness of TIF districts."

Miller: "What are they evaluating for?"

Rita: "The effectiveness."

Miller: "The effectiveness. I mean in what regards... since you had a pretty easy time on your first Bill..."

Rita: "What? I thought that..."

Miller: "...and you being in the south suburbs."

Rita: "I thought..."

Miller: "Somebody's gotta do it."

Rita: "...you guys are gonna ask these question."

Miller: "Huh? So... so, what is the evaluation process for and why is this important and who's gonna pay for it?"

Rita: "Wanna repeat the question?"

Miller: "What criteria are they using for the evaluation?"

Rita: "They're setting up a 21-member board and they give a report to the Governor and to the General Assembly by the 30 of June of 2004..."

Miller: "Are... Is that..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Rita: "...of what their findings are."

Miller: "In the lieu of our \$5 billion budget deficit, are those paid positions?"

Rita: "No."

Miller: "And when will the board meet?"

Rita: "What's that?"

Miller: "When will the board meet? There's... the 21... are they 21 freshmen?"

Rita: "They'll set it all up. Once the board's established they'll set up the... when they're gonna meet and how they're gonna do that."

Miller: "Say that again, I couldn't hear you."

Rita: "I said, once the board is established they would set up the rules and criteria."

Miller: "Okay. So, TIF... Now, these TIF districts and the effectiveness, what will come out of or what do you propose that's gonna happen to these TIF districts? I mean, are you gonna find out are they good, bad, do we need more?"

Rita: "Well, that's what the board will come up with the findings to see if they're being used in a proper manner or being established where they should be established."

Miller: "Will this have any effect on educational funding in those particular TIF districts or regions?"

Rita: "We'll have to find that out with what they come up with."

Miller: "And that's what the group is for?"

Rita: "Yes."

Miller: "Okay. This is your second Bill?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Rita: "Yes."

Miller: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Miller: "As another Legislator from the south suburbs, the TIF districts have proliferated in our region and I believe that because of this fine group that Representative Rita has put it together, I think I will support this legislation and hopefully other Members of the General Assembly will, too. Thank you."

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

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

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

Scully: "Representative Rita, are you familiar with the procedures for a House Resolutions for task force?"

Rita: "No."

Scully: "Representative, I think you should become familiar with this procedure, because I think you'll find it's a very convenient vehicle to accomplish your goal, get from here to there in a shorter distance. What's your task force going to accomplish?"

Rita: "I don't know."

Scully: "You don't know. What will be the duration of this task force?"

Rita: "They have a report by June 30, 2004."

Scully: "By the end of 2004?"

Rita: "Yes."

Scully: "So, if we..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Rita: "By June..."

Scully: "...change Illinois Law..."

Rita: "...by June 30."

Scully: "I'm sorry?"

Rita: "By June 30. You said the end."

Scully: "Now, if we adopt this proposal as a matter of Illinois

Law, we have now expanded the Illinois Revised Statutes one

more time. Now, does this law have any effectiveness at

all beyond the presentation of the report?"

Rita: "Does it have any effectiveness?"

Scully: "What happens after the report is...?"

Rita: "Well, then we... we... we... the report will spell out what needs to be changed, not changed and so on about TIF districts."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh."

Rita: "Right."

Scully: "Does your statute go out of existence?"

Rita: "Yeah, I would imagine so."

Scully: "I'm sorry?"

Rita: "Yes."

Scully: "It does sunset?"

Rita: "I guess, yeah."

Scully: "Where's that sunset provision in the language of the Bill?"

Rita: "Well, it doesn't say it."

Scully: "I'm sorry. Oh, it doesn't say it?"

Rita: "No."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Scully: "Okay. So, are you gonna sponsor another Bill next month to repeal it?"

Rita: "I said, after the report on June 30."

Scully: "Does this Bill have a sunset clause?"

Rita: "What's that?"

Scully: "Does this Bill have a sunset clause?"

Rita: "No."

Scully: "So, after the task force presents its report, what happens to this law that you've created?"

Rita: "Nuttin'."

Scully: "Are you gonna come back next..."

Rita: "We'd evaluate what their... what they come up with at that point."

Scully: "Are you gonna come back next year and propose another

Bill to repeal this law that has no longer any
effectiveness?"

Rita: "Maybe."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Scully: "As stated so eloquently earlier by a Member from the other side of the aisle, whose name isn't Representative White, really is important for Sponsors of Bills to carefully read their Bills and fully understand the implementation and the effectiveness of their Bills. This is just another effort to further expand the Illinois Revised Statutes for no darn good reason. Everything in this Bill can be accomplished with a Joint Resolution for a

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

task force to accomplish the same goal. I ask everyone to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yesterday, on my desk was a yellow sheet, which generally means it's from the Office of the Speaker and over the 17 or 18 years I've learned to just glance at them, because things change very often. But I do remember reading something that starting next week we're all supposed to identify our top priority Bill, which means that maybe we'll get to call one Bill on Third Reading. Was that what I read yesterday?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sir, would you like to address this piece of legislation and we'll talk..."

Black: "Yes, it does."

Speaker Hartke: "...about that in a few minutes."

Black: "It certainly does. It's certainly related. If you'll let me make my case."

Speaker Hartke: "Please."

Black: "Well, my case is simply this, starting next Tuesday the Speaker has indicated that we should indicate what our priority Bills are. Nothing like doing something after the fact. So, those of us who have been here years and years and paid some dues and left some blood, sweat and tears on the floor, we may be lucky and get to call one Bill or two

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Bills on Third Reading. My point is this, Mr. Speaker, here's a freshman who now has called two successive Bills on Third Reading. That's more bologna than Oscar Meyer sliced all day yesterday in every plant in the United States. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Black: "Representative, your Bill reference is DCCA. What is that agency now called?"

Rita: "DCEO."

Black: "And how do you propose to pass a Bill in statute amending something under an agency that the Governor has already changed the name of? Your Bill is fundamentally out of order."

Rita: "Is it?"

Black: "There is no DCCA."

Rita: "So, I'll change this legislation."

Black: "It's DCEO. Art deco. Frank Deco. Louie Deco. I don't know."

Rita: "Yeah. Okay."

Black: "I think you need to amend the Bill. There's no DCCA, it's DCEO."

Rita: "Who... We... Ha... But the statute's still DCCA."

Black: "Well, I think your Bill is fundamentally flawed, it's a case where the Executive Branch has changed the name of an agency before he got statutory authority to do so. Now, I'm not gonna vote for the Bill. If the Governor wants to change the name of an agency or every agency, that's his prerogative, but he forgot one little detail, he needs to

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

bring that name change here and it needs to pass the House and it needs to pass the Senate. I'm not gonna vote for a Bill to change a TIF district in DCCA when I know there's a trailer Bill to change it from DCCA to DCEO. No thanks, I'm not gonna be put in that conundrum. And by the way, that priority notice, I'll have more to say about that next Tuesday. That's another classic example of the way this chamber's run."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hartke: "State your point."
- Lang: "I'm really just shocked and appalled that anybody would be giving Representative Rita difficulty on any Bill. He's a fine Legislator. He does not deserve this abuse, especially on his second Bill, we should've done that on his first Bill. But I know that in his closing he's gonna explain to us exactly what we need to know about why we should vote for this Bill, which no one seems to be prepared to vote for, Representative."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Rita to close."
- Rita: "House Bill 1445 is a good piece of legislation. How's that? I'm asking everybody to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1445?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all vote... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1455, Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1455, a Bill for an Act in relation to highways. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Township Code. It allows that the road commissioner in a township can enter into contracts for projects over \$10 thousand and that they can spend that \$10 thousand without getting the approval of the county superintendent of highways. Traditionally, this has just been a rubber stamp and many of the highway... the county highway superintendents are too busy, they let this paperwork build up and it slows down the process for the township road commissioner and their ability to get work done. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1455?' 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... Representative Pankau. Pihos.

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1457, Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act in relation to educational labor relations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1457 provides that part-time community college teachers who teach at least three credit hours of instruction shall be considered employees under the Bargaining Act... under the Act, so that they can collectively bargain. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, we wanna move it from..."

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Thank you. I'm sorry. ...from six hours to three hours. Why is that necessary?"

O'Brien: "Well, the way a lot of times a lot of these instructors are considered to be part-time, they might put 'em on three hours for the summer, three hours for the fall, three hours for the spring and use 'em over and over and over again and do this, from what I've been told, as a

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

method to avoid having to bargain with them collectively as for employee rights."

Parke: "Are they eligible for more benefits if they go from six to three?"

O'Brien: "That's why they want the opportunity to bargain."

Parke: "And so, is there any attempt to bring it down to even zero hours?"

O'Brien: "I know you had recommended that in committee and, ya know, that's why we'll have a 94th General Assembly. I guess somebody might be able to bring that Bill then, but my intent is strictly for three hours."

Parke: "Thank you. I normally am in support of collective bargaining, but..."

O'Brien: "Really?"

Parke: "...when we... Yeah. Yeah. See, you were only in the committee to present the Bill, you need to sit in on a regular basis and you'd know that. But I just seems to me like you keep lowering the level, ya know, we had a Bill recently that went from 25 employees and said that they couldn't go below that even if they laid people off and, ya know, you just keep pushing it further and further down that it would seem like anybody, two or three people getting together can collectively bargain. I think you have to be careful on how far we push these things. I'm not gonna oppose the Bill, but I just want the Body to think that we keep pushing it further and further down on who collectively bargain, I just don't know if that's... becomes effective then. Thank you."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

O'Brien: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1457?' 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 this question, there are 103 Members voting 'yes', 14 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1460, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Bill 1460 which would simply rewrite and simplify the provision relating to the veterans preference for the MWRD. It would add five bonus points on the hiring exam and also allow a veteran to get five bonus points for each promotional exam. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. This Bill did pass out of the House here last year."

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

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Mulligan: "Representative, I know there are more women in the military in years that have come by, but could you tell me if there's any estimate on how much this penalizes women because there are more men in the military than women and puts 'em at a disadvantage as far as acquiring employment from anybody that takes a veterans preference?"
- McAuliffe: "Representative, as far as the MWRD is concerned, I'm trying to look to see how many female employees they have and the number I'm looking right now is 26.4 employees. How many of those are veterans I'm not sure, but they have 26.4 employees as of now."
- Mulligan: "Well, much as... much as I support veterans, particularly at a time like this when we're looking at more people going in, there are more women in the service. It's always a problem to me when you pass something that seems to be more discriminatory against women because there are less women veterans. Now, I'm willing to support this Bill, but I think people ought to start taking into consideration that there are less women veterans than there are men and it puts them at a disadvantage when you put out bonus points in employment. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this... this Bill that you have... Will the Sponsor yield? Thank you. With this Bill are we... these five bonus points makes it... gives the... it's a... it's purely a veterans preference, right? I mean, what is it currently?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

McAuliffe: "Well, like, currently they have 5 bonus points, I believe, when they get hired, then they're only able to get a 3.5 maximum amount of points. So, once you... if you... for example, if you get hired when you're say 30 years old, you work for WMRD (sic-MWRD) you get the bonus points, say when you're 40 or 45 you go for a promotional exam that's being held against you or you can only use it one other time. And my regard, if you're a veteran, you should always be able to have maybe an extra leg up if you wanted to move through in State Government."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Parke, are you finished?"

Parke: "I am. Thank you."

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

Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Gentleman will yield."

Stephens: "Representative, well, first of all, let me say this, to the Bill, that a lot..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Stephens: "...all of a sudden this side of the aisle and I'm sure the other side, too, support the idea of helping veterans get a job when they come back from their service. But I as understand your Bill, unlike the State of Illinois where we have, I believe, a ten point veterans preference and if there's an open... Thank you, Representative. ...if there's an opening and a veteran has applied and a non-veteran has applied and both have the... an 'a' rating then the veteran gets the job. But in your Bill, is it true that you can

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

not only use it for the initial hire, but promotions, hirings outstand the department. Is that tr... is that true?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, yes, that would be true."

Stephens: "Why?"

McAuliffe: "Well, again, okay, if you're a state employee, you get hired as an office clerk, now you're hired. Every time you go to get promoted you may not be able to get promoted and if you're a veteran you're hired in the first place. I mean, I'm not disagreeing with you and maybe that's something that we should look at with the state, but once you're hired from the... or for the state one time as a veteran preference then you're pretty much ignored throughout the system."

Stephens: "Representative, is there a... is there any other group that you can think of or situation that you can think of where we bestow this privilege to potential workers?"

McAuliffe: "None, that I'm aware of. There may be, but none that I'm aware of."

Stephens: "All right. Well, I appreciate your straightforward and honest answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Stephens: "As one of the Members of this Assembly that is a veteran, we have several, I don't know if they all feel like I do, but when I came home from overseas, I just wanted a break, I just wanted a little something that said, welcome home. In Illinois, I remember my break was, back in those days, they'd give us a hundred bucks for making it

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

back. If you didn't make it back, by the way, those guys got 15 thousand. Neither, neither was enough. But on behalf of myself and some of the veterans that agree with me, we are grateful for being... given an advantage to be hired and we don't think we need to have a perpetual advantage. Once got... we've gotten... gotten ourselves on the ladder, as we've proven before, we will climb our way up. So, it's not that I don't support the concept of helping veterans, everyone in this Assembly knows that I do, but this particular Bill I have to rise in opposition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative McAuliffe to close."
- McAuliffe: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1460?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 91 Members voting 'yes', 25 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1462, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1462, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McAuliffe."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

McAuliffe: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Bill 1462 which is a residency for police officers. We did pass this in the 90th General Assembly, but we just wanna make sure that this may not be in any violation of the single subject rule. And I ask for the passage of this Bill and be happy to answer any questions anyone would have."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I like this Bill, but does it apply to the Chicago Fire Department?"

McAuliffe: "No. No. This is..."

Parke: "Does it apply to the Chicago Police Department?"

McAuliffe: "No, it doesn't."

Parke: "Well, why is this good for the rest of this state and not good for the City of Chicago?"

McAuliffe: "Because when the Bill... Chicago was excluded from that original Bill, I believe that was in 1995."

Parke: "Again, I would ask the same question, why is this good for downstate and not for Chicago? Why can't we amend it and make it apply... resident... so that the firefighters and police officers don't have to have a residency requirement in the City of Chicago?"

McAuliffe: "I believe they... because... well, the group that's asking for this is the Fraternal Order of Police and not the Chicago FOP. I think if they wanted to do that they would have to run a Bill to get that done."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one... Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Mike, the Bill that we passed, I think I was a Sponsor and Senator Sieben was the Sponsor in the Senate, took care of this and it is a Public Act. And I don't remember, was what... were there more provisions in 674, because you said you were doing this in anticipating a possible Supreme Court review of the original Bill that may contain more than one subject. Correct?"

McAuliffe: "Right. I believe some of the original Bill had some things to do with animal acts..."

Black: "Okay."

McAuliffe: "...and other various..."

Black: "All right."

McAuliffe: "...issues like that."

Black: "And the downstate firefighters and Chicago firefighters are handled under a different section of the code, as I recall."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Black: "Are they not? Okay. I think this Bill passed, I don't wanna misspeak, but I think it passed unanimously two General Assemblies ago, but you're right it was in a, somewhat of an omnibus Bill and so this is just a precautionary move in case the single subject clause is

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

sent to the Supreme Court. Thank you very much. It's a good Bill, Representative."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1462?' 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 this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1469, Representative Hamos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1469, a Bill for an Act concerning dispute resolution. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This was a Bill that we passed last year unanimously. It pertains to one small part of the law which created many years ago in the 85th General Assembly something called the Illinois Not-For-Profit Dispute Resolution Center and they get about 2 thousand cases from the courts to mediate, something that's very worthwhile to keep these cases out of the courts. But they also get other... other groups coming to them and they would like to be able to charge fees, where possible, to help other groups mediate their cases. That's all this Bill does. And I ask for your support."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1469?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1487, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act concerning executions. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1487 was in the 92nd General Assembly, passed out of this House and was held up in the Senate. It simply states that the particular presence of the way executions are presently done in this state, even with the present moratorium going on, that the physicians would be let out of the particular process of giving the lethal injection, also of certifying death. Presently, the way that the system has worked is that the physicians are the ones that would... that are administering this particular dosage and that is against their Hippocratic oath. This has been an initiative of the Illinois State Medical Society. This particular piece of legislation would also

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

take nurses out of the particular process, as well. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Franks: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis here for the first time and our analysis is written in a double negative. And it says, 'removes language that administering a lethal injection at a execution does not constitute the practice of medicine'. Does that mean that administering a lethal injection constitutes the practice of medicine?"

Brady: "Well, what I can say, Representative, is that the physicians, at least the Medical Society, feels that the particular practice is against the Hippocratic oath that they swear to. And this has been an initiative over the last several years in the Medical Society trying to remove physicians from this process and leaving it up to the Department of Corrections medical tech. So, the fine line I guess would be that, in my opinion and I'm not an expert, but, yes, that it would be."

Franks: "Okay. I understand the rationale, but I'm not sure I heard the answer. Does this mean that a lethal injection constitutes the practice of medicine?"

Brady: "In the opinion of physicians it does, yes."

Franks: "In the opinion of who?"

Brady: "In the opinion of the physicians that have been..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Franks: "Okay."

Brady: "...behind this in the Medical Society, yes."

Franks: "But isn't that what... what does the language do here?

Because it says here, it removes the language that administering a lethal injection constitutes the practice of medicine. So, what does your Bill do? Does it say now that the lethal injection does not constitute the practice of medicine? I'm just confused when I'm reading this, I'm not sure what you're trying to get at."

Brady: "What my Bill would do is remove the physicians from administering the lethal..."

Franks: "Okay."

Brady: "...dosage."

Franks: "Okay. So, you'd have someone who's not a licensed physician..."

Brady: "That's correct."

Franks: "...to administer..."

Brady: "Or..."

Franks: "...the lethal dosage."

Brady: "That's correct. Or a nurse, which is also covered in this. And so, if the moratorium were lifted and we had executions continued in this state, one would ask then, well, who's gonna do it."

Franks: "Okay. That's..."

Brady: "And that would be medical techs trained by physicians, but not physicians administering it."

Franks: "Okay. How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Brady: "I'm just trying to give you all the facts the way... what the intent is."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Effingham. It's always good to be in your presence. Representative, who puts the needle..."

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "...in the condemned person's arm? Who puts the IV needle in?"

Brady: "It's my understanding that the actual insertion is done not only by physicians, but also individuals that are trained from the Department of Corrections that are medical techs. At different facilities it could be a nurse anesthetist."

Black: "All right. It would seem to me then there's a... there's a problem with the Bill. If you put the intravenous needle in the... in the condemned person's arm, you are making the execution possible, it can't take place without the in... without the needle being placed in the vein. Now, are you saying that the doctor is excused from pushing the buttons that run the fluid through the IV or are you saying that the doctors cannot even put the IV in?"

Brady: "Doctors would be removed from the entire process, from the putting the IV in, from being in the room, from certifying the cause of death, from anything to do with the aspect of the execution, Representative."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- Black: "Okay. Now, nurses then are covered under the Medical Practice Act, so who… who would be left with the knowledge, some kind of humane knowledge and training of how to insert an IV? Would an EMT be able to do this or a paramedic?"
- Brady: "That's... that's entirely possible. The theory behind it or the thought behind it would be that it would be medical tech staff from the Department of Corrections that would be trained in this."
- Black: "All right. So, it isn't your intent just to call for volunteers and somebody's who's a butcher in the meat shop, says, oh, I can put that needle in. I mean, I'm using that, ya know, it's a factious argument, but it will be somebody who knows what they're doing. I'd hate to think the condemned person would sit there and be subject to experimentation by somebody trying to find the vein to insert the needle."

Brady: "That's correct. It would be someone that had training, it would not be just anyone pulled in from any..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Brady: "...area of the Department of Corrections. It would be someone with training and..."

Black: "Okay."

Brady: "...as humane as possible."

Black: "Then... then who would do the actual pronouncement? Would it be the coroner?"

Brady: "It would be the coroner who presently now in Illinois

Law signs the death certificate and certifies the death and

is in the room anyway."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Black: "Would the coroner have to be present at an execution or a designee?"

Brady: "The coroner and/or his..."

Black: "To do the actual pronouncement."

Brady: "The coroner and/or his deputy..."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you."

Brady: "...would have to be present."

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

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I simply ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1487?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 30 of the Calendar, on House Bills-Third Reading, appears House Bill 1491. Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1491, a Bill for an Act concerning driver training. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The... this Bill is an initiative of the Secretary of

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

State. It has four main functions. First, it prohibits community colleges and universities from contracting with non-licensed driver training schools for the purpose of operating a school that teaches driving skills at the institution. Second, it increases the surety bond requirements for applicants for driver training school operation license. Third, it extends the length of a license period and exten... and increases the application and renewal fees for the licenses. And lastly, it requires that applicants for a driver training school operation license or instructor license authorized by the Secretary of State to perform a background check, which includes finker... fingerprints, fingerprint check. Be more than happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative, then the driving school has to licensed by the Secretary of State's Office?"

Novak: "Yes."

Mulligan: "And how much will it cost for that?"

Novak: "The fee has increased from... the fee has increased to \$250."

Mulligan: "For a... for a commercial license?"

Novak: "Correct."

Mulligan: "So, a community college or..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Novak: "No, excuse me, Representative Mulligan, I stand corrected. The fee is increased from \$250 to \$500."

Mulligan: "To be certified by the Secretary of State's Office as qualified to teach a course?"

Novak: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay. And that would provide that if a community college is doing a program for, say, truck drivers or something that they have to be certified by the Secretary of State's Office?"

Novak: "Correct."

Mulligan: "And what would that... how would they go about being certified?"

Novak: "How would they what, Ma'am?"

Mulligan: "How would they go about being certified? Does the Secretary of State's Office come out and test the..."

Novak: "Well, I'm sure the Secretary of State's Office has a program of rules and regulations that the individuals wishing to become certified have to... have to follow."

Mulligan: "My feeling is, if they have to pay for it, it should be qualified and there should be some criteria in it. Are you saying that you're sure that there is a criteria that they would use in order to train the people that are training the drivers?"

Novak: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "My question to you is, is there a prescribed course that the Secretary of State's Office goes out and gives a test or trains the people that are going to train the drivers?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Novak: "The answer is... the answer is 'yes'."

Mulligan: "All right. So, all you're doing is raising the fee and saying that nobody can take the commercial driver's license unless they passed a certified course taught by someone that's approved by the Secretary of State's Office?"

Novak: "Correct."

Mulligan: "So, in other words, you'd have to come in with your receipt or tuition receipt from a certified school in order to even take the test?"

Novak: "That's... that's correct."

Mulligan: "Okay. Staff is telling me it doubles the fee, but makes it for two years instead of one year?"

Novak: "What now?"

Mulligan: "Staff is telling me it doubles the fee, but makes it for two years instead of one year?"

Novak: "Yes, it does."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Novak: "You're welcome."

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

Novak: "I just simply ask for your support."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1491?' 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 this question, there are 94 Members voting

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

'yes', 23 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1506, Representative Hultgren. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1506, a Bill for an Act concerning estates. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill that recognizes the busyness of our court system and also the increased in valuation of the dollar over the last years. We have in our court system in the probate process what they call a Small Estate Affidavit, where an estate when all the bills have been paid, is less then \$50 It can go through with an affidavit by a thousand. relative or someone serving as executor received by the court, rather than taking the court time and legal time. This Bill is a simple Bill that raises the amount of this 1975 Act up to \$75 thousand from \$50 thousand. And it is supported by AARP, it's also supported by Corporate Fiduc... Fiduciaries Association. I don't know of any opponents at this time. And I'd answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1506?

Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is,

'Shall the House pass House Bill 1506?' All those in favor

signify by voting 'aye'; 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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1514, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1514, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation districts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. This is the same Bill we passed in the 91st General Assembly 114 to 0 and unfortunately, it was not heard in Senate. We also passed this unanimously in committee. What the Bill does is it allows for voters to put on, as a referendum, whether conservation districts should be elected or appointed. Right now, the conservation districts, at least in my county, and I believe there are five counties that have 'em, but in McHenry County they have taxing authority. All property owners have to pay to the conservation district. A few years ago, they passed a \$68 million referendum. conservation district also has eminent domain authority and it also has its own police force. What it doesn't have though, is any accountability directly to the voters because they're appointed and not elected. I'd... I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Granberg: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Gentleman will yield."

Granberg: "Representative Franks, hi, Jack. When you talk about this, is this a property tax that is imposed?"

Franks: "Yes. Right now, there's a property tax imposed for these taxing bodies."

Granberg: "Okay. We have a Rend Land Conservancy District in southern Illinois..."

Franks: "Uh huh."

Granberg: "...and they do it by water rates and that board is appointed."

Franks: "Right."

Granberg: "Do you think this Bill would actually apply to them 'cause they're a conservancy district?"

Franks: "It only deals with conservation districts. And there...
the ones that we believe... that they have, there are five
counties with conservation districts being Boone, Macon,
McHenry, Putnam and Vermilion."

Granberg: "Okay. No, I think it's a good idea. I just didn't know if it was applicable to our situation in downstate Illinois."

Franks: "If you'd like to have it amended in the Senate, I'd be glad... I would allow that because, I tell ya, we need one more Amendment and I wanna let the Members of the General Assembly know. In committee, they wanted to have some uniformity in the amounts of the requirements for the... for the signatures and we had passed the Bill unanimously earlier calling for 8 percent of the gubernatorial vote.

Mr. Osterman voted for that, as a matter of fact. And the

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

problem was we have not been able to get the Amendment yet, so I'd like once... should this pass in the General Assembly, at this side in the House, in the Senate we'd have that Amendment."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Franks: "If you'd like to have yours amended, I'd be glad to do that."

Granberg: "Thank you very much."

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

Kurtz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Kurtz: "In McHenry County, we have a conservation district. As you will remember or maybe not, it was 31 years ago, when it was established. The oversight, our elected people on the county board and they choose throughout the county in proportion to the area, people that have proved themselves to be interested in conservation. And in those 31 years, people have gone to the polls to... to approve referenda for money to buy up much of this land, that we have now, that is undeveloped to preserve it for the future. And it would just be a travesty of justice to impose an election on this kind of board because that means politics, that means people get into running for the board, have to raise money and you... as we all know, campaigns can get pretty dirty. The kind of people that are appointed right now are just ordinary citizens that have committed their at least five

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

to ten years of their lives interested in this... in this saving land for the future."

Franks: "Representative, right now, we elect school board members because we have taxing... they have a taxing authority. We elect library board members, as well, because they are taxing bodies. Why, should a body that has taxing authority, have eminent domain authority, have its own police force, not be accountable directly to the voters? I don't know what anyone's scared about when it comes about accountability."

Kurtz: "Well, in a library board or with the school district it is a small area, it's not a countywide, huge, geographical area. Remember, the elected officials of the county board appoint these people and they bend over backwards to do it on a geographical... different parts of the county itself."

Franks: "I understand their point and I also stand there...
understand there are abuses, as well. When you look at the
budgets of the... of this organization, when you notice that
executive directors, at one time, lived for free on 300
acres of property and driving an SUV and people aren't
allowed to use the land. There's a lot of people who'd
like some input on who chooses these... these people. And
I'm a very big supporter, as I know you are,
Representative, of conservation in our county. It's the
fastest growing county in the State of Illinois. But we
also have an obligation to our taxpayers and to our
citizens to make sure that... that they have real input on
who's chosen. As you know, there are many people who wanna

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

hunt on land, and just recently that was allowed by the conversation district, but that took petitions and that type of thing. I always believe and I think you believe, as well, that direct accountability is always the best way to go when it comes... when... when it comes to dealing with tax dollars, public tax dollars."

Kurtz: "Because the fact that we've had many referendum and...
referenda and they have been approved by the people, that
shows that the members of the conservation district board
have been accountable or they wouldn't have gotten a new or
more recent referenda passed."

Franks: "Representative, they... the argument that I've heard is you're gonna get developers, you're saying, on the board. The last two county... the last two choices, by the county board, for the conservation district are developers. So, the argument saying you're gonna get developers on this board is moot, they're already putting 'em on there. I just think that people ought to be able to vote when they're spending \$68 million and when they have a police force, we need to have some accountability. I know I'm sounding like a broken record, but I just think that the other arguments just don't hold any water."

Kurtz: "The last person to be appointed was Joseph Gottemueller who is a lawyer and he's a zoning lawyer and he lives on a small... in a small home and he has nothing to do with developing and he's been in our area for 30 years."

Franks: "I met with him on..."

Kurtz: "So, I don't know what you're talking about as far as..."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Franks: "I... I met... I met with that gentleman on Monday, as a matter of fact, I met with him at the courthouse and we talked about this. We also talked about the legal fees that the conservation district has and how astronomical they are and there's no... and there's absolutely no oversight and nobody's watching the books."

Kurtz: "Currently, the county board uses the committee that
 takes and I... and I have listened to the process and it's
 been in the papers where people apply..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh..."

Kurtz: "...and they are selected, so there is a process, a due
process..."

Franks: "Representative..."

Kurtz: "...a Democratic process."

Franks: "I didn't want to bring this up 'cause I didn't... 'cause I don't wanna embarrass anyone. But the fact is, the conservation district set up a foundation a few years ago and took a million dollars of taxpayer dollars to then use it to lobby and spent a mil... they spent I don't know how many hundreds of thousands on their campaigns to pass their referendum. And they used tax dollars to do it because they sold an easement to... what was it... some pipeline, took the money and then used it in a campaign. So, I think the people would like to have a voice here."

Kurtz: "You..."

Franks: "And I understand what they're trying to do and they might be successful, if they wanna do that, but let us have a say at least. I don't want them dictating and taking a

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

million bucks of our money and then spending it so we can raise our taxes."

Kurtz: "You are introducing a brand new foundation which is a
 private entity, the McHenry Conservation Foundation."

Franks: "It's private, but it was using public funds."

Kurtz: "And these people have put their own money into this and have also asked others, like myself, to contribute to pass referenda. So, it is not the same."

Franks: "It's a private foundation, Representative..."

Kurtz: "Exactly."

Franks: "...but it was funded with the million dollars of a sale of an easement of public lands."

Kurtz: "That is debatable."

Franks: "It's the facts."

Kurtz: "And I would have to see the papers. I... I know there
have been charges, but I don't believe it."

Franks: "Okay."

Kurtz: "'Til I see it. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thanks. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Mautino: "Jack, I've... this Bill's been around for quite a while and I remember when Ann Hughes did it originally."

Franks: "Uh huh."

Mautino: "She had mandatory going... I have Putnam County, smallest county, where you're talking about \$68 million

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

conservation district, we're 13 thousand. George cuts the grass."

Franks: "Okay."

Mautino: "So, it's apples... apples to apples here on these. Are we going to make Putnam County... 'cause we have a big problem getting people willing to serve on the... on the board."

Franks: "That's a really good question, Representative, because it's not mandatory. People would have... to have them elected, there would first have to be a referendum and the citizens would have to ask for them. So, if people are happy with the conservation districts and don't have any qualms, they're not gonna put this on the referendum. This is just a means to let people, if they so choose, to determine how they wish to choose the conservation district, whether they're appointed or whether they should be elected, that's all. We are just giving an option to our taxpayers."

Mautino: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Franks: "Thank you."

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

Franks: "Thank you. I appreciate the spirited debate and I appreciate my colleague from McHenry County speaking on this. I can tell you, you're... you're... the predecessors here from McHenry County always supported this. I would... I would ask for support on the House floor. What we're asking here is to allow people self-determination to

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

determine how they wish to choose the officials who are making monumental decisions that affect their lives. We're asking for accountability when people are taxing us. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1514?' 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 this question, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 47 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1522, Mr. Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1522, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental protection. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1522 amends the Environmental Protection Act. It raises the tipping fees on solid-waste landfills from 5.5 cents to 8 cents. This money will be used by the EPA to help them hire enough people to make sure that we can do all the duties that the EPA needs to do to make sure that we inspect landfills and are able to open them and adjust to all of the permits that they may need. And be happy to answer any questions."

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

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

House Bill 1522?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question... on this question, there are 60 Members voting 'yes', 56 Members voting 'no', and 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1534, Representative Winters. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1534, a Bill for an Act concerning fees. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 13... 1534 amends the County Code, requires that anyone wishing to serve papers must pay the county the statutory fee before a sheriff performs such service. It's sponsored by the Illinois... supported by the Illinois Sheriff's Association. Rather than having to go through court and trying to collect on these fees, simply requires the fee upfront."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1534?

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

'Shall the House pass House Bill 1534?' 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? Have all voted who

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Parke. Mr. Saviano.

Mr. Meyer. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

record. On this question, there are 91 Members voting 'yes', 26 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. It's the intent of the Chair to do two more Bills this evening and then we'll have some announcements. The Chair recognizes House... House Bill 1536, Representative Mendoza. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1536 is a pretty simple Bill. Currently, under the law, if you are a... an adult and a convicted felon, you are ineligible for a FOID card, but if you're a juvenile who is convicted of a felony, upon your adulthood you would be eligible for a FOID card. Quite simply what House Bill 1536 means to do is eliminate or close that loophole and it says that if you're a juvenile who is convicted of a felony, upon your adjudication that would make you ineligible for a FOID card. Not for your entire life, but for a ten-year period. At which time if you've had good behavior, haven't committed any subsequent crimes, you could go before a judge and have that relief given to you at that time. I would ask for a 'aye' vote. And be happy to answer any questions."

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

Bost: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "I just have a... a couple questions because..."

Mendoza: "Sure."

Bost: "...is there anything that says that... that this felony has to somehow involve a weapon?"

Mendoza: "No. This... it would be consistent with the... the law dealing with adults, which would be any felony conviction, Representative."

Bost: "You know... you know, back when we first passed the law that had FOID card removal on a felon, we didn't have things like, for instance, if a dispute broke out between two people on the street and they fought on the sidewalk. Now, battery has been moved up to a Class 1 felony, I think, so based on that two kids at 15 or 16 years old could get into a fight on the street and all of a sudden, you have a very aggressive state's attorney and pursues a felony charge as battery and then you're saying that this child then could not, at any time, for the next ten years go hunting in southern Illinois if they're, you know, a southern Illinois resident?"

Mendoza: "Yes. What this Bill says is that if you commit a felony act as a juvenile, the same laws that apply to you as an adult would... it... it would stay consistent with that category. So, basically, if you're guilty of a felony, the court would notify the Illinois State Police that at that time that juvenile is ineligible for a FOID card and at the very latest, the oldest that juvenile would be eligible for a FOID card would be, at the latest, 27 years old. So,

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

what we're saying is, if you commit a felony act you need to realize that that felony act brings with it specific consequences, but at the same time, you do have the opportunity to turn your life around and stay on the right path and just not commit any... any other errors. The reason why I amended this Bill to... originally, it didn't have the ten-year provision. Originally, the Bill just said that it would be the same for an adult felon versus a juvenile, but I do agree that, you know, juveniles sometime make mistakes. And that's why I think that they should have the opportunity to correct those errors in the future and go before a judge and say, 'your honor, I made a mistake, but I haven't made any more and I would like to be granted relief so that I can go hunting with my family, if that's what I would like to do'."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Bost: "I believe that the idea and the intent, by the Sponsor, and I respect her tremendously, is... is in the right mind, however, the problem that exists here is we are in a time when, through this chamber, we have passed many Bills and created the opportunity to be charged, a lot of people, with felony charges that sometimes are situations that, years ago, wouldn't have been felony charges. Those are things that an argument, like I was talking about, would break out. We're talking about juveniles here and now, if we would modify this language and this language would say something like if you were involved with a gang or if you

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

were involved... and that felony involved gang activity or a weapon, then I could agree with this. But what we're saying here now is, is that, you know, an over aggressive state's attorney when you're a juvenile can stop you from participating in those things that... that many families around this state participate in and that's hunting and that's the reason why we have the FOID card. I encourage people to vote 'no' or 'present' on this. And I would hope that you'd pay very close attention when you make this vote."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative Mendoza..."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "...correct me if I'm wrong, please. But my understanding is, your Bill is saying if a youth commits a felony and later on, as the years pass, becomes an adult, that felony will be held against him when requesting this card. Is that right?"

Mendoza: "Yes, yes. But up to ten years from the date they were convicted, so not their whole life. Whereas with an adult, they pretty much carry it with you."

Davis, M.: "Well, let's say I'm 15 years old."

Mendoza: "Right."

Davis, M.: "And I commit a very bad whatever."

Mendoza: "Um hmm."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Davis, M.: "And whatever law that applied to juveniles for that felony applied to me."

Mendoza: "Right."

Davis, M.: "Now, I'm 21, that's six years later."

Mendoza: "Right."

Davis, M.: "I've been to the Army and I'm back. And for whatever reason, I wanna own a weapon. You're saying he's gotta wait some more years?"

Mendoza: "At 25 that juvenile, who is now an adult, could go before a court and get his or her relief, yes."

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "It'll probably fly because people will think they're being tough on crime. But what we're saying here is, we have an... we have a juvenile code that applies to juveniles and even though that code has been administered, we now want to apply something else when they become adults for something they did when they were a kid. You're sayin' this child, who was 15, did whatever the penalty was as a juvenile felony offender, you're sayin', well, okay, that might have happened, but now you're an adult and we're still gonna hold you to 10 years before you can own a card. Now, a lot of these young people will have been to the service and served this country and they will be back and I don't believe they should be denied the right to have a FOID card. Now, I don't support a lot weaponry and people owning guns, but nor do I support treating children like children when they're children and then punishing them

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

again when they're an adult, for what they did when they were a child. I would urge a 'present' vote on this Bill. It'll probably fly, but I would urge a 'present' vote. People should not have double jeopardy. They just shouldn't have double jeopardy. If we're gonna punish 'em as adults, let's wait 'til they're adults and punish 'em. Let's not punish 'em as a kid and then again when they become an adult. It's not right. It just is not right. I don't agree with anybody havin' a gun, but people have a right to them in this country and in this state. would just urge you to consider the fact that once you've been punished for a crime and then you reach the age of maturity, people should not look at you again and say, oh, oh, we remember when and we gotta give you 10 more years. No."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh..."

Collins: "I rise in opposition of this Bill because, as a juvenile... the reason why juveniles court records are sealed..."

Speaker Hartke: "Shhh..."

Collins: "...is because the things that they did as a child should remain as a child. These children wanna go out now that they've led productive lives. They wanna join the police force, maybe they wanna join the sheriff. Maybe

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

they wanna be correctional officers. I don't know what they wanna be that my require them to have a FOID card, but now they can't. So, now they gotta wait 10 years. If they go to college, they're out of college by 22, so depending on the age that they got involved with the law as a juvenile, now they have to prolong their life that much longer if they wanna go into law enforcement. Who knows? They may have seen the light. I don't think, again, don't think children should be constantly punished for the things that they did as a child. Thank you. I... I rise to say vote 'no'."

- Speaker Hartke: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still four people seeking recognition. Please make your remarks brief. Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanna clarify something. You cannot go into the Armed Services or Forces with a felony conviction. Okay. I am an Army officer in active-ready reserve. You cannot go into the Armed Forces with that. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. If you drive be... without a driver's license, you can't get a driver's license until you're 18. If you're a convicted felon as an adult, you can't get a FOID card for 20 years, from what Representative Mendoza says. I think there are consequences to everything that we do and in some instances, there has to be a reason why you tell a young person, you don't do this because you lose this privilege,

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

this privilege and this privilege. They should know that upfront and if they don't and they act irresponsibly, having a felony as a youth is not an... particularly easy thing to get. And I think there should be some consequences. She's not saying they can never own a firearm, but I do think she is saying that there has to be consequences for what you do and you have to demonstrate for a certain period of time that you're responsible and that you will take that responsibility seriously. I don't think this is a bad Bill, at all. I think it's a very good Bill. And I think it means there are consequences to what you do and young people should take them quite seriously."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Millner."

Millner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak in support of this Bill. Every day in this state, there are children 16 years of age that are arrested for armed robbery, murder and other things. These children arrested for armed robbery, now, what you're saying is, currently, can get a FOID card as soon as they turn 17. So, they commit the armed robbery, they're charged as felons; when they're 17 they get a FOID card. I don't think that's what we intend here. That 16-year-old armed robber doesn't deserve a FOID card when they're 17 nor does a 21-year-old armed robber deserve a FOID card and that's what this Bill is addressing. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Representative Black, please make your remarks brief."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

"Just simply to echo what Representative Millner said and I appreciate Representative Mendoza coming over and talking to me about this Bill. Why in the world would you want any convicted felon to have a FOID card? Why? You've got somebody running out there that's done 20 years for murder, he waits 20 years, he gets a FOID card and he can buy a gun legally. Look, folks, we're not talking about juveniles who tip over outhouses or key your car or spit on the sidewalk. We're talkin' about juveniles that commit armed robbery, attempted murder, aggravated sexual assault and because the records are sealed the current law said, it could be less than a year. As a 16-year-old, he does a little time in the juvenile section, court section, or jail section, he turns 18, maybe 18 months after he fired a weapon at an individual and attempted to kill them in a drive-by shooting, but in less than 18 months he can go in and get a FOID card and own a gun legally. Come on, give me a break. I'm a strong supporter of gun owner rights, but man, oh, man, you gotta accept responsibility for what you do. And at some point, you misuse a weapon or you misuse and abuse the law, you need to pay for that crime. And I don't want some juvenile, who's already been out there as a gang banger, misusing firearms, being convicted of armed robbery or aggravated sexual assault because of the fact his juvenile status changes in 18 months, can now go get a FOID card and buy a gun legally. That's ludicrous."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mendoza to close."

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Mendoza: "...very... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate everyone who got up and spoke. And again, I think that... Representative Black, thank you for your comments. This is about responsibility and I do believe that it's a fair Bill. It does not limit a person's right to own a gun someday; it just simply says for those who have already decided or made decisions that haven't been that well thought out, that those decisions carry with them some consequences, sometimes they're not very good ones and we need to live up to those. is hope at the end of the tunnel and if you change your life around and you stick to what you're supposed to be doing, there's always a day that you can go before the judge and ask for relief and go out and exercise your right to own a weapon and go hunting, if that's what you'd like to use it for. That's hopefully the only thing that you would use it for. So, again, this is targeting, as Representative Black and some of my other colleagues said, convicted... people who are convicted of felony crimes. That's not simple things we're talkin' about. And for that same reason, I would ask for a hardy 'aye' vote. you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1536?' 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 this question, there are 93 Members

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no', and 17 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The final Bill of the day, House Bill 1543, Representative Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1543, a Bill for..."

Speaker Hartke: "Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, would you like to make an announcement."

Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. The Judiciary I Committee will meet immediately upon adjournment in Room 118."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Parke: "Thank you. I just want to remind the Body and something that's obvious. We're all beat. We've had one heck of a week and we've done a lot of business, but as hard as we've worked, our staffs, on both sides of the aisle, have worked as hard as we have and I just wanna give thanks to all the hard work of all the staffs in this."

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

Reitz: "A point of personal privilege. I'd like..."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Reitz: "...like to remind everyone that the Sportsman's Caucus is next Wednesday. We're accepting guests. If you could just

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

make sure you're there. We gotta a new director we're gonna make fun of. Thanks. Bye."

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

Fritchey: "Thank you. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Fritchey: "We're preparing to adjourn today and there are a lot of Bills that a lot of us consider to be important which we probably will not get to over the remaining couple of weeks. Is there an intention to have an Agreed Bill List?"

Speaker Hartke: "I'll... I'll address that in a moment. Do you have anything else?"

Fritchey: "No, Sir."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when I awoken this morning, I heard some good news. And the good news was that the young lady, Elizabeth Smart, was found alive. And I would like this Body to take a moment of silence and pray that all other children who are lost or have been taken away from their homes find their way... find their way back safely. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Thank you. The Chair would like to announce that we are looking at preparing an Agreed List. So, if you have a piece of legislation that you feel should be on an Agreed Bills List, please contact Mr. Tim Mapes or Mr. Bill O'Connor. Secondly, Members should be reminded to see these two gentlemen, as well, for their first and second

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

- priority for next week. Do it as soon as possible. The Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Joint Resolution #27, offered by Representative Currie.
- BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two houses adjourn on Thursday, March 13, 2003, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, March 18, 2003, at 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Hartke: "You've heard the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, until the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday, March the 18th. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'to the floor for consideration' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 121, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 197, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 222, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 548, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1251, Floor

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2386, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2481 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2527. Representative McGuire, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3225, House Bill 3440, House Bill 3674; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 1196, 1240 and 2413; recommends 'be adopted' House Resolution 92 and House Joint Resolution 14. Representative Collins, Chairperson from the Committee on Juvenile Justice Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills 1090, 1091 and 1182; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 2515 and 2853. Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 1107, 1489, 2291, 2837 and 2905; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills 1618, 2204, 2233, 2234, 2408, 2483, 2567, 2630, 2648, 2788, 2849, 2855, 3049, 3054, 3079, 3080, 3101, 3187, 3612, 3673, 3676 and 3677; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House 399. Representative Slone, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bills 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 3250, 3251, 3252, 3253, House Bill 3254; 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' House Bill 3186 and House Bill 3435. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2703, 2704, 2705, 2706, 2707, 2708, 2709, 2710, 2711, 2712, 2713, 2714, 2715, 2716, 3260, 3261, 3262, 3263, 3264 and 3265. Representative Joe Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2425; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1479. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 2381. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s:

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 3562; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2165, 2605, 2608 and House Bill 3452. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3001, Senate Bill 19; 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 219; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1256. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 9, House Bill 47 and House Bill 2282. Representative Morrow, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 2681, 2682, 2683, 2684, 2685, 2686, 2687, 2688, 2689, 2690, 2691, 2692, 2693, 2694, 2695, 2696, 2697, 2698, 2699, 2700, House Bills 3255, 3256, 3257, 3258 and 3259. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2717, 2718, 2719, 2720,

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

2721, 2722, 2723, 2724, 2725, 2726, 2727, 2728, 2729, 2730, 2731, 2732, 2733, 2734, 2735, 2736, 2737, 2738, 2739, 2741, 2742, 2743, 2744, 2745, 2746, 2747, 2748, 2749, 2750, 2751, 2752, 2753, 2754, 2755, 2756, 2757, 2758, 2759, 2760, 2761, 2762, 2763, 2764, 3236, 3237, 3238, 3239, 3240, 3241, 3242, 3243, 3244. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 370, 2200, 2866, 3506, 3551, 3553; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2540, 2542, 3429, 3507, 3508, 3549, 3554. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bills 1533, 2818, 3318, 3530; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1449, 2245, 2317, 2492, 3286, 3679; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2241, 2316, 2504, 2510, 2634, 3231, 3395, 3411, 3543; 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' House Bill 3520; recommends 'be adopted' House Joint Resolution #21. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 3628; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

1482, 2451, 2459, 2461, 2549, 2917, 2971, 2985, 2995, 3081, 3082, 3141, 3142, 3190, 3191, 3285, 3325, 3479, 3488, 3489, 3620, 3634, 3668; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 40, House Bill 277, House Bill 305, House Bill 520, 539, 1319, House Bill 2568 and 3313; recommends 'be adopted Short Debate' House Resolutions 85, 87, 91, 112, House Joint Resolutions 15 and House Joint Resolution 17. Representative Scully, Chairperson from the Committee on Commerce & Business Development, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 3209; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration & Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1461, 1567, 1573, 2231, 2274, 2809, 3040, 733, 24; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 64, 2280, 2348, 2553, 3311, 3406, 3671. Representative McKeon, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2339, 2577, 3398, 3405, 3406, House Bill 3636; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 15, 1161, 2456, 3048 and 3399. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 12, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills 1119, 2522, 2805, 3133, 3274; 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 1171; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 3088; 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' House Bill 3465; 'be adopted' House Resolution Representative Joe Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2425; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bills 515, 2442, 2453, 2473, 2478, 2529, 2536, 2841, 2842, 2843, 2844, 2845, 2858, 2860, 2926, 2928, 2931, 2935, 2965, 2976, 2979, 3066, 3072, 3085, 3086, 3090, 3093, 3115, 3117, 3127, 3215, 3218, 3341, 3343, 3386, 3492, 3501, 3528, 3540, 3610 and 3675; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 425, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1281, 1350, 1366, 1375, 1547, 1548, 2147, 2267, 2486, 2498, 2537, 2966, 2977, 3075, 3358, 3385, 3387, 3466, 3493, 3504, 3532 and 3556. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to

29th Legislative Day

3/13/2003

which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2955 and 3183. Representative McAuliffe, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1608. Representative McKeon, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2157 and House Bill 3396. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Thursday, March 13, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 2532. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."