35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Father Michael Cantos of the Saint Andrews Church in Chicago. Father Cantos is the guest of Representative Harry Osterman. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance."

Father Cantos: "Let us pray. Oh Lord, our God, You sustain the universe by Your power and by Your divine and almighty will, You govern the world. You created from one blood all nations of humanity that inhabit the face of this your earthly kingdom and assign to each its boundaries. conferred special blessings on this our country facilitated its development into the foremost nation of the world, a true champion of freedom and democracy, a haven for the oppressed and for those who look to live their lives in dignity. You preserved its freedom for more than two centuries keeping it safe through many wars and upheavals. Throughout this time of war and at all times accept our prayers of thanksgiving for our country. We seek Your blessings upon our President, all those in civil authority, for the men and women who serve in our armed forces and their families and for the safety of all those who peacefully inhabit areas of conflict. We ask Your intersession for the reconciliation of nations, the ending of hostilities and the establishment of peace in the world. We pray for the blessed repose and eternal memory of all those who have fallen heroically in the line of duty for

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

our country defending the ideals of freedom, justice and peace for all. Make us all worthy of the gifts of that freedom and aware of the responsibilities that flow forth from it. Preserve us in peace and concord and guide us to every good work that is pleasing to You. steadfastness to every authority and power in the nation and make them favorable and well-disposed towards the Godgiven rights of all Your people. Almighty God, bless the leaders of our land that we may be a people at peace among ourselves and a blessing to other nations of the earth. Bestow Your divine grace on all who exercise executive and administrative authority, blessing them with wisdom and grace in the exercise of their duties. Bless this Assembly to whom You accord the privilege to govern this small portion of Your earthly kingdom so that they might lead all Your children to live in a manner that reflects Your divine command to love and honor one another. Grant them courage, wisdom, foresight, charity and justice that with steadfast purpose they may faithfully serve in their offices and therein promote the well-being of all people. teach them to rely on Your strength and to accept the responsibilities to their fellow citizens, that they may elect trustworthy leaders and make wise decisions for the well-being of our society, that we may serve You faithfully in this generation and honor Your holy name for generations to come. Amen."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Bellock et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, today we shall be led in the singing of the national anthem by Veya Jones with the America's Kids after school tutoring program in Centralia. Ms. Jones is the guest of Representative Kurt Granberg."
- Veya Jones: "(Singing of the national anthem.)"
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative McKeon is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 117 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Chair recognizes Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, again, is Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Day in Springfield. My sorority sisters from chapters across the state are again here today to make sure that they learn about who their State Representatives and Senators are and also about the legislation that we sponsor. I'd like my colleagues to please help me to

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

welcome the women of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Incorporated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I got a point of personal
 privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Hartke: "It is my privilege today to introduce Ms. Jamie Bolander from Olney, Illinois. Ms. Bolander is... was crowned Miss Illinois Fair Queen on January 21 at the Illinois County Fair Convention. She is... she's won the competition of 68 other individuals vying for Miss Illinois County Fair Queen. And she's here today in promoting agriculture on Ag Day here in the State of Illinois at the State Capitol. She will be representing agriculture at all the county fairs all summer long throughout the State of Illinois. Please give Jamie a warm General Assembly welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may have your attention for one moment. As many of you know, I have been working on a program to support our troops overseas. Last week when several of us were boxing up packages to send to those troops the thought crossed my mind, what would happen if these boxes did not reach there intended recipients. You can imagine my sadness today when I woke to find that two members of my old unit that I

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

served in the Gulf War with were among the casualties in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Corporal Evan James from LaHarpe has died. Sergeant Brad Courthouse is missing. Ladies and Gentlemen, this war will not come without a price and someone once said that the only thing necessary for evil to win in this world is for brave men to sit by and do John F. Kennedy once said that any dangerous nothing. situation is tenable if brave men will make it so. brave men and women are not found hiding behind some peace sign at a Hollywood event, nor will they be found hiding behind an Oscar shaming the very President and the very fighting men who are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice so that others may live a freer life. There's nothing fictitious about the bravery of Corporal James or Sergeant Courthouse and the other fighting men and women serving in Iraq. And there is nothing fictitious about the justice of The only thing fictitious is the lives or the this war. world in which people like Michael Moore live. And the only thing fictitious is the cause that they pretend to support. If you will not fight a war against one of the greatest violators of human rights in the world, then whose human rights will you fight for? If you will not fight a war against one of the greatest violators of women's rights, then what women's rights will you fight for? If you will not speak... if you will not fight against one of the greatest violators of minority rights in the world, then what minority will you fight for? And if you will not fight against one of the greatest environmental terrorists

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

in this world, then which environmental cause will you fight for? This is not a war of an aggression. This is a war on terrorism, it's a war on jihad, it's a war on the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and it's a war to bring freedom and stability to a people and to a region of the world that have historically known very little of it. This war is gonna be fought and won by the blood and sweat of the men and women serving overseas and I think it's time that this country support our President and our troops in this just cause. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Chair recognizes Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. In the gallery today we have with us the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Ms. Dorothy Brown and some of her staff. They're down today, they had a breakfast for the Legislature. We appreciate her."

Speaker Madigan: "Chair recognizes Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This morning I am very proud to have with me Jay Kelley, who is from Princeville, and Jay is the State Chairman of the Future Farmers of America who are visiting our offices here today and in Springfield. Jay has done virtually everything there is to do in the FFA organization. He's a very accomplished young man and is looking forward to studying at the University of Illinois in the Department of Agriculture. And he is a true, true inspiration and I hope you have an opportunity to get acquainted with him through the day. Please help me welcome Jay Kelley."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Daniels, Chairperson from the Committee on Developmental Disabilities & Mental Illness, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for House Bill 3512; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1662. Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were reported, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' House Bill 2784; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Franks, Chairperson from Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 244. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Bradley, Chairperson from Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 373. Representative Delgado, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Iaw, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 506. Representative Reitz, the Committee on Chairperson from Agriculture Conservation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2943. Representative Mautino, Chairperson from Committee on Insurance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1648 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Collins, Chairperson from Committee on Juvenile Justice Reform, to which following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2545."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Is Mr. Black in the chamber? Where is he? Representative Kosel. Mr. Brady, are you seeking recognition?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to the Illinois General Assembly and to my colleagues the members... some members of the Bloomington-Normal Women's club, which is up here in the gallery. If they'd stand up and give us wave. Welcome to Springfield, ladies. Thanks for coming down."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jerry Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell, do you wish to call House Bill 2352? Okay. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Schmitz, do you wish to call House Bill 92? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 92, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 92 is dealing with the situation of fleeing and eluding. Right now we've got it covered where if you're doing 25 miles an hour over that should you be pulled over by the police finally after a chase you get a felony charge. This is gonna handle the people that actually do the speed limit, but still decide to go through three, four, five stop signs, stop lights, et cetera. This Bill hopes to address that issue. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Has Representative Younge voted? And has Representative Graham voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Wait. Is Mr. Wait in the Chamber? Mr. Black, did you wish to call House Bill 3488? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act concerning sports facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates the Downstate Illinois Sports Facilities Authority Act. It authorizes the authority to make loans for the purposes of acquiring, constructing, maintaining, or rehabilitating facilities in the State of Illinois. Obviously, it excludes the City of Chicago as they already have such authority. Provides procedures for the authority to issue bonds, provides that the authority may impose an occupation tax on all persons engaged in the business of renting, leasing, or letting hotel rooms in a city. That's how it will be financed if the electors of that city council approves said tax. But there's no state obligation. There's no local obligation unless the locals agree. The purpose is to try and develop some facilities that we just currently do not have and have not been able to attract

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

sufficient private interest in. Be glad to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you. Representative, I'm just curious as I'm listening to this. Is there a specific project in mind that we're trying to go... attract here?"

"There's a couple that have been discussed. University of Illinois, for example, has an ice arena and a... I don't know exactly what it is, it isn't an official hockey team, it's a club team, I believe. And they... of course, that's also been the home of many of the speed skaters over the years have won gold medals who trained There is some interest in pursuing another ice arena that could be used for a nonprofessional hockey team. This is not, in no way, intended attract to a professional sports franchise, the Cardinals, obviously, we don't have the population density to do that. But what we have found is that, excluding the University of Illinois facilities, most downstate communities simply do not have an adequate gymnasium, ice arena, or other facility... facility to attract an amateur athletic union event or team. that's... this is an exploratory device to see whether or not that interest may... may, in fact, be there."

Fritchey: "And... and I'm not saying this to derail this at all.

But, ya know, maybe I've listened to you enough over the
years that you... tend to grab your attention. You know,
being from the city we don't have to deal with a number of
these stand-alone authorities. I guess... why do we need to

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

create something like this, which really I see as a new taxing body to raise money as opposed... why couldn't this be done either through a coalition of municipalities or through at a county level or even through the state level, as opposed to creating a new authority, a new layer of government, and a new... a new entity that can go and levy taxes?"

Black: "Because the authority has worked so well in Chicago by its bonding capability. And this way you could have multi cities in a 30-, or 40-mile range decide the radius... excuse me, decide to participate in this. And then that hotel tax would retire the bonds for an amateur sports facility that they may all agree that they want to build. I don't know that anything is on the front burner. There has been some interest in it. And as people have come into central Illinois and downstate Illinois they have found that the current infrastructure just simply doesn't exist to attract an AAU team. There's been some talk about a Continental Basketball Association team but... I think one of those was in Rockford a few years ago. I think they tried one here in Springfield not long ago, but they had the facility. They had the Prairie Capital Convention Center. As I recall, neither of them met with success. Again, you've got to have the population density to attract a professional sports franchise and that's not what this is about."

Fritchey: "So this may be one of those cases by creating a new entity is actually a more efficient way to accomplish the goal."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "Yes. Yes."

Fritchey: "Sounds like a good idea. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor signify by voting... Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Black, I don't... I mean, this is a big Bill and I'm trying to read it and understand it. Is there... does this authority have the power to tax?"

Black: "No."

Hamos: "Okay. So, the authority has the power to issue bonds.

And what would repay the bonds?"

Black: "The language in the Bill is very clear. It would be re... repaid by a hotel/motel tax if approved by the governing body of whatever municipality or county was levying that tax."

Hamos: "Okay. I think... that's what I think I wanted to understand a little bit better. Since these seem to be regional facilities that impact possibly several counties or several municipalities, how would that tax be issued to repay the bonds? Can you just walk through the mechanics of that a little bit?"

Black: "Each municipality that wanted to participate would have to pass an ordinance. The ordinance would then be reviewed by counsel. If it... if appropriate and not challenged in a court and that certainly is somebody's right. As they did, I think, initially in the Chicago authority. Since we have precedent in Chicago, I would assume then that that tax would be levied in those governmental entities that have

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The bonds would then be issued by the approved it. authority to be retired by that local income stream and the municipalities would set up intergovernmental agreements with the authority to operate whatever facility they were building. The only thing that I'm aware of that has been discussed is the potential for an ice rink. The university has one that is quite... I don't know how old it is but it certainly isn't state of the art. The City of Danville, for example, has an ice rink but in a multi-purpose arena. You can't leave the ice down for long periods of time. There has been some interest by some people out of the... I'll get the wrong... wrong... the name wrong, I think it's the North American Junior Hockey League and if memory serves me right, they're headquartered in Indianapolis. And there has been some interest in a franchise for that amateur hockey situation. But right now, in central Illinois, there is not an adequate facility. As far as I know, that's what this is aimed for if the various towns and units of government are in agreement with it. absolute control over this, not the authority."

Hamos: "Well, I... I think you're talking about one ice rink and that may be very well and good right now, but we're passing a law here for all time. And I'm really just trying to understand the mechanics. So, if a sports facility is being built in an area in the middle of five different municipalities... I mean, it has to be housed somewhere. But if it's a small enough place that a local tax cannot fully repay the bonds, was it possible that they would have to

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

try to get additional municipalities or consortium or region or something to do that? Or..."

Black: "Absolutely. That's the..."

Hamos: "So what if... so what if..."

Black: "That's the point. That's..."

Hamos: "So what if four of them pass something and one doesn't?
Would that just be part of a finance plan?"

Black: "Representative, if... if they couldn't get agreement within a region, bond council would simply not let the bonds be sold. If you don't have the revenue stream to retire the bonds, as the Chicago Sports Authority Act, obviously you're not gonna be able to sell the bonds. So, if there is no agreement between the cities of a region or within or across the county line, then nothing will come to fruition."

Hamos: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the sleeping giant for economic development is tourism. And this would just be another tool in an arsenal that we could use to help develop tourism within our state. And I salute Representative Black for bringing this forward rather than dealing in a knee-jerk reaction every time some small municipality wants to create one of these. I think it's long overdue and I'd ask you to vote 'aye' on it."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

wish? Has Mr. Parke voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 82 people voting 'yes', 32 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Granberg. Is Mr. Granberg in the chamber? Mr. Novak, did you wish to call House Bill 370? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 370."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 370, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 370 as amended is the… it's an issue that… well, it's a burning issue around the State of Illinois, so to speak, but it is a.m. it's become a public health issue over the years. We've... in years passed we've managed to put a Bill on Governor Edgar's desk, unfortunately, he vetoed the Bill. I have carried this initiative for a good number of years and this time it's very similar to the one I passed last year out of the House with a pretty substantial majority. However, an Amendment was put on it to exempt the Metro East areas, those counties in Southwestern Illinois that fall under the EPA's rules as nonattainment as far as air quality is concerned. The Bill directly focuses its responsibility to the Pollution Control Board to promulgate rules and regulations including fines for people that do open burning, banning leaf burning and things like that. There's a... In the northeastern area of Illinois in the Cook County and in the collar counties, most of which by

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

zip code fall under the nonattainment areas. Not every collar county in its entirery... in its entirety falls under the nonattainment rules where individuals in automobiles or individuals that own automobiles and trucks, for that matter, have to have their vehicles tested for vehicle emissions. There's an exemption for farmers for open burning. There's an exemption for firefighters for using dilapidated homes for training purposes. So, I'll be more than happy to entertain any questions. It's become a very, very big, public health issue. If you live in northeastern part of Illinois realize that a lot communities that have grown over the years have swallowed up areas and now are contiguous to other communities that, let's say, for example prohibit leaf burning and then a new subdivision comes along right next to the community and grows and continues to grow and then it incorporates but then it contin... then it allows its people to do leaf burning. And when the fall comes and these communities are so contiguous to each other, one community burns, the other one doesn't allow it, the smoke Wafts entirely through the other communities disrupting young children that have asthma and the elderly people that have respiratory illnesses. So, I'd be more than happy to entertain any questions and I wish for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "Representative, is there a particular reason why the Metro East area has been removed? That's a nonattainment area."

Novak: "Yes, I know most of it is, Mr. Black, but talking to the chairman of the committee, it was their wishes there is some... there was an opt out provision in this Bill. This is a very modest Bill."

Black: "All right."

Novak: "Let me just... let me just explain. If this Bill becomes law, a mayor of a community in a nonattainment area and the city council still have the right to pass an ordinance to opt out of this law. Ya know, so...

Black: "So this..."

Novak: So there were a number of mayors in the Metro East area that wanna continue to burn."

Black: "All right. Is there anything in this Bill that preempts Home Rule..."

Novak: "No."

Black: "...in those nonattainment areas? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Mr. Novak's legislation. In the early '90s I was the Chief Sponsor of a very similar Bill when it passed which, as Mr. Novak said, was vetoed by Governor Edgar. That particular Bill was a real study in grassroots politics. People from all over the state whose children were affected with smoke in the air, children that has asthma, some who had children who unfortunately had passed away due to asthmatic

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

situations that were made worse by leaf burning, came to me and we did a very good job working the floor. Unfortunately, Governor Edgar at that time made a serious error in vetoing the Bill. This is an important environmental Bill and I would urge your support."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Bradley voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 91 people voting 'yes', 25 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Washington, did you wish to call House Bill 277? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 277, a Bill for an Act concerning the deposit of state moneys. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 277 is a Bill... the genesis of the Bill was created by myself along with the Woodstock Institute. It is the original first piece of legislation that I was able to attempt to deal with since I've been here. This Bill is developed around the CRA investment policy, which is the Community Reinvestment Act. The following organizations to date have already adopted it in Lake County. The policy's been adopted by the City of North Chicago Community College of Lake County, the Lake County Community Action Program, the North Shore Sanitation District, Lake County and Waukegan

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

And I'm proud to say it's also several other states including: New York, Louisiana, Massachusetts and Nebraska. This is a win-win Bill. It does not require any reporting responsibility for additional financial institutions and is therefore not a regulatory burden. Bill 277 reinforces community reinvestment financial institution without substantially adding to the responsibility of state agencies. And basically what I just said, is that this Bill says to the taxpayers of Illinois that all of us here are gonna work to make sure there's an even playing field and everybody in the state pays taxes, I hope, and everybody should benefit evenly for paying those taxes and that communities who find themselves financially neglected should not be done so. The bank has an obligation to make sure that communities throughout the state benefit evenly by the taxpayers money that we put in the taxpayers' coffers. So, that's the genesis and the essence of the Bill. And I ask for due consideration of support by my colleagues for 277."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 134. House Resolution 134.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mr. Clerk. Mr. Mr. Joe Dunn. Mr. Dunn, the Clerk advises that the Resolution has already been adopted, but Mr. Dunn you can speak to the Resolution. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Dunn: "Please join me in welcoming our state varsity girls champion basketball team, the Naperville Central Redhawks and coach Andy Nussbaum. They're here with us in the gallery today. Girls, please stand up. Our community is very proud of this team, they're a great example both on and off the court. Thank you for joining us today in the Capitol."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel. Is Representative Kosel in the chamber? Did you wish to move House Bill 2104? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill? 2104."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kosel, has been approved."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. This particular Amendment takes a part of the School Code, Section 105 5/7-2c that is very specific to Cook County, to my district and removes it from the School Code or.... And I would ask for the approval."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Is Mr. Wait in the chamber? Mr. Wait. Mr. Dunkin. Is Mr. Dunkin in the chamber? Mr. Dunkin, did you wish to move House Bill 3429? 3429. Gentleman indicates he does not wish to move the Bill. Mr. Flider, did you wish to move House Bill 3048? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3048, a Bill for an Act relating to procurement. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Representative Flowers. Mr. Franks, did you wish to move House Bill 209? The Gentleman indicated he does not wish to move the Bill. Is Mr. Granberg in the chamber? Representative Kelly on 1415. Lady indicates she does not wish to move the Bill. Mr. Lang, 89? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to move the Bill. Mr. Lang, 89? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to move the Bill. Representative Ryg, on House Bill 3061. Did you wish to move the Bill? The Lady indicates she does not wish to move the Bill. Representative Yarbrough, did you wish to move House Bill 1352? 1352. Mr. Clerk, is there an Amendment? Has it been approved by the Rules Committee? Okay. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1352, a Bill for an Act in relation to human rights. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Yarbrough, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This Amendment to 1352 says we're inserting the following after transactions, 'while recognizing the need for mixed-income housing.' And we're also inserting that this will 'prohibit the consideration of source of income in connection with any housing development project where 25 percent or more of the units either (i) are owned by public housing authority or (ii) receive rental subsidies authorized under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or other local, state or federal rent subsidies or benefits.' I've been working with some of the folks from the south suburbs who wanted me to try to limit the percentages of Section 8 Housing and so that's why we put this Amendment in. And I'm open for any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Parke: "Representative, is this federal money under the... is this under the HUD Act?"

Yarbrough: "Pardon me? No, this..."

Parke: "Is this federal money?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Yarbrough: "...the Bill 1352 is going to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act."

Parke: "Okay. Why is the Association of Realtors and the Chicagoland Apartment Association opposed to your legislation?"

Yarbrough: "The realtors are opposed to this Bill because they don't see it as... they think that the landlords are going to be required to rent to people with Section 8 vouchers. My Bill is about discrimination against people who have vouchers or any other form of payment aside from cash."

Parke: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I will just inform you that there is a lack of agreement on this legislation, there are opponents: the Illinois Association of Realtors and the Chicagoland Apartment Association are opposed, unless something can be worked out with them. And I would respectfully ask the Body to either vote 'present' or vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Yarbrough, where is... who would take complaints about this discrimination?"

Yarbrough: "Pardon me?"

Mulligan: "Who would be the... where would the area be for just complaints about discrimination?"

Yarbrough: "Who would take the complaints..."

Mulligan: "Right."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Yarbrough: "...about discrimination? I guess it would be the...
since this is amending the Illinois Human Rights Act, I
guess that's who would take the complaints."

Mulligan: "Is that part of the legislation?"

Yarbrough: "Ya know, I'm having trouble hearing you."

Mulligan: "Is that part of the legislation?"

Yarbrough: "Yes, it is. This... I'm presenting the Amendment today, this is not the Bill."

Mulligan: "Okay. And the Amendment just covers...?"

Yarbrough: "The Amendment just covers in areas when people have more than 25 percent of Section 8 Housing they would be excluded from this Bill."

Mulligan: "And what area specifically is that?"

Yarbrough: "One of the areas would be the southern suburbs, the western suburbs, even the City of Chicago would be included."

Mulligan: "So, who are you applying this to then?"

Yarbrough: "Everyone."

Mulligan: "Except for all the areas that you mentioned."

Yarbrough: "Anybody who has over 25 percent of Section 8

Housing or housing choice vouchers, anybody who has more
than 25 percent would be excepted."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Amendment, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The question is on the Amendment. Those for the Amendment vote 'yes'; those

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

opposed to the Amendment vote `no'. Mr. Parke. Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why do we have a Roll Call?"

Speaker Madigan: "You had been speaking in opposition to the Amendment..."

Parke: "Well..."

Speaker Madigan: "...which lead me to believe..."

Parke: "...I understand that. We're gonna wait until the Bill comes then on for a final vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Okay. Well, we're into it..."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "...we're into the Roll Call now. Question is on the adoption of the Amendments. Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 76 'ayes', 36 'noes'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. But a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill as amended and has not been filed."

Speaker Madigan: "The Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Younge. Wyvetter Younge, did you wish to move House Bill 2598? 2598. Lady indicates she does not wish to move the Bill. Is Mr. Wait in the chamber? Mr. Granberg. Representative Flowers. Representative Eileen Lyons. Chair recognizes Representative Yarbrough. Representative Yarbrough, are you seeking recognition?"

Yarbrough: "Yes. Point of personal privilege."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Yarbrough: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly,
I'd like to draw your attention to our State President from
the NAACP, Mr. Cleveland Jefferson, right above my head.
Would you give him a welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Munson."

Munson: "I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Munson: "I'd like to welcome in the gallery today the Boys and Girls Club of Elgin 2003 Youth of the Year, T'airre Jay and her sister Kenesha and mother Renita Crenshaw."

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

Speaker Hartke: "On second priority on page 36 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1373. Representative Lyons. Eileen 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."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1373 merely codifies the Supreme Court ruling in regarding depositions in criminal cases. This has passed out of this chamber over two years ago with overwhelming support and I would ask that it would... your support again. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1373?

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

'Shall the House pass House Bill 1373?' All in favor

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 30 on the Calendar... excuse me, on page 34 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 548. Representative Berrios. Representative Berrios. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, for which reason... what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Brauer: "Today is Ag Day here in the Capitol and we have five different schools, which I would like to introduce. First of all is the ag students from Petersburg-Porta, they're up here in the crowd, like to recognize them if you would. And also Athens, Greenview, Lincoln and Mount Pulaski. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield on Ag Day, your State Capital. On page 8 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2890. Representative Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2890, a Bill for an Act concerning weights and measures. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Department of Agriculture certifies scales around the state to make sure the weights

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

and the measures are correct. Just as you would buy a gallon of gas, you see a sticker on the pump that guarantees that you... if you buy a gallon of gas you get a gallon of gas. Right now there's no teeth in the law that says that the department can stop someone from weighing things if they don't pay their fees, the fee for certifying the scale. And those fees run like up to fifty pounds like twelve dollars, fifty-one pounds to two thousand, twenty-five dollars and over two thousand pounds is a hundred and twenty-one dollars, those fees are set by rule. And this Bill does not set any fees, it simply says the department can actually shut down the scales if the people don't pay their fees. The next fee increase by rule is done in 2004. And I would ask for your support in the passage of House Bill 2890."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2890? Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2890?' 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 104 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 36 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1182. Representative Collins. Representative Collins. Out of the record. On page 39 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 3620.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Representative Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3620, a Bill for an Act concerning open meetings. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. This Bill simply requires that if you have an open meeting for a school board and if someone or that public body makes a recording that it's made available for the public to review it."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3620?' All 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 96 Members voting 'yes', 21 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 39 on the Calendar appears House Bill 3589. Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3589, a Bill for an Act concerning stem cell research. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3589 creates the Stem Cell Research Act.

 Many of you know that the Federal Government has made some

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

decisions about funding for stem cell research and how they feel about it and is a... Recently, the State of California has drafted law stipulating their state policy permitting and promoting research involving human embryonic stem cells. This Bill is modeled after that, so that we can try and get private funding for research back in the State of Illinois. Right now, California is the only state that is applying for that money 'cause they're the only state who can. As many of you know, there are volumes of research and volumes of work that have been done on life-saving efforts regarding stem cells. And I believe that the State of Illinois should also try and attract private money for these efforts. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, don't some of our universities always...
already do this from... to some degree?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry."

Parke: "I said, don't some of our... isn't it true that some of our universities are already using stem cells for research?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm not sure to what extent they do, if they do at all, Representative."

Parke: "Could... if this passes, then could someone use the stem cells from live, aborted babies in stem thells from... cells from live, human embryos?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Feigenholtz: "I don't believe so."

Parke: "Well, the interpretation... is believes that that is true, and that might be your interpretation. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. Even though California is the only state to do this, that doesn't mean that Illinois should be doing this. If somebody jumped off the bridge in California, should we jump off the bridge, also? I don't think so. And in fact, it is our understanding that stem cells from live, aborted babies and stem cells from live, human embryos can be used for this. So, we rise in opposition to this legislation and we would suggest that... let California do this. I don't think Illinois should be setting this kind of public policy."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, as I understand it, Federal Law prohibits any kind of stem cell research that could lead to cloning of a live, human being. Isn't that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. There's nothing about cloning or permitting cloning in this Bill."

Lang: "Well, but as I understood the previous speaker, they're concerned about creating live, human beings. Is that correct?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Feigenholtz: "There's... this Bill does not authorize or at all even allude, merely allude to the fact that we should be clo... doing human cloning."

Lang: "All right, thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, putting politics aside and all kinds of red herrings, I think we have to recognize science. I think we have to recognize that some of the stem cell research that has been done in this country has been startling. Stem cell research can save lives, it can cure disease, we can do a lot of good for the citizens of our state and of our country. My family has had some experience with stem cell issues and I can tell you that this is a Bill we need to pass. Illinois needs to be in the forefront in America at making a statement that when scientists can provide us a major breakthrough that can save lives, particularly at a time that we all talk about in our reelection brochures how important health care is to us, I think it would be a serious mistake to not support Representative Feigenholtz in this Bill. I think it's a very important piece of legislation and I urge your 'aye' votes."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Reitz: "Sara, we... I've been trying... I had a Bill on human cloning, to tr... to ban human cloning, we were working on that for a number of years. Last year we spent quite a bit of time in trying to make sure that we... that we address the concerns of the research that's going on, try to make sure that we took care of those and we weren't able to accommodate everyone on those. We want to make sure that we don't impede research that's going to help in diabetes and Alzheimer's or the other afflictions that are out there. But, have you... in your Bill, does it include any language that will ban the cloning of a human being?"
- Feigenholtz: "No, there's no specific language. But it is certainly not the intent of the Sponsor of this Bill or the proponents of this Bill to endorse human cloning, Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Okay, would... would... as this moves through the process or in the Senate, would you be able to accommodate that?

 Maybe find some language and could put that in... put that in to make sure that we do not clone a human being with this.

 And unfortunately... we've... ya know, we've already seen the effects across the waters that we have problems with that."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, honestly, I think that, you know, you have a Bill that articulates exactly what you're talking about that's moving through the process. And I certainly really want this to have... this Bill to have... it's something that you and I can talk about when I'm done debating it. I... I need to think about whether or not I

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

want to put an Amendment on this Bill in the Senate. But on..."

Reitz: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...but on the record, and for legislative intent,

I'd like to say that it is not my intent or the intent of
the author of this Bill."

Reitz: "Right."

Feigenholtz: "People who have an interest, as Representative Lang articulated, in extending the lives in the people they love, or wishing that they could have extended the lives of people that they loved, and... and be able to access as much research that can be applied to extending those lives. So, as far as adding any language to the spirit of this Bill, it's something that I would have to think about and... But I am certainly not supportive of human cloning and that is not the intent of this Bill."

Reitz: "Okay, appreciate that. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Reitz: "I appreciate the intent, ya know, and we... we definitely don't want to impede any type of research to... to help with the afflictions that we have out there and the concerns that we have and... and they do tremendous things in the research area. I will oppose this Bill basically because I... I don't think it closes the door enough to make sure that aborted fetuses aren't included in this. And then I... and so I'll respectfully ask people to vote 'no' on this. But I appreciate working with the Sponsor and if we can do... accommodate that, I'd appreciate it. Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative Feigenholtz, currently, is there any law talking about what happens when you go through fertility treatments and who has the authority to decide what happens with unused embryos from fertility treatments?"

Feigenholtz: "No, there is not."

Mulligan: "So, in other words, if you're undergoing fertility treatments, you... you don't necessarily have control over what happens to unused embryos if you move along after having children? Who then has the... or do they destroy them forever? What... what happens? Although... I know your Bill provides for the determination by the individual, which I think is correct, rather than to have it unspoken."

Feigenholtz: "Right. Current law does not, Rosemary. The... but this... this provision in Section 15 does."

Mulligan: "So, then the individual would have the option of determining what happens with their own..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct. That's right."

Mulligan: "Okay. Also, I noticed in here that it prohibits the purchase or sale of embryonic or cadaveric fetal tissue?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Is that not currently addressed in law in Illinois?"

Feigenholtz: "I... I'm sorry, what?"

Mulligan: "Is that not currently addressed in Illinois either?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Feigenholtz: "It is not."

Mulligan: "So, you have several really important issues in this Bill. Okay. It also provides for liability or... or a penalty in procuring, furnishing, donating, processing, or distributing. So, it would actually prohibit someone for doing this for financial benefit."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So, the only thing you're doing is establishing a code that would look forward to research here in Illinois from many of the institutions that we have that are certainly interested in doing that, and from the large medical center..."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...that we're trying to establish in Illinois, to challenge places like Texas and other places in the country."

Feigenholtz: "Correct. And as you know, Representative Mulligan, we've been spending every Thursday morning listening to agencies and the problems that they are having and we spend... with dollars. And the simple fact that we, by virtue of what happened at the federal level, are unable to even consider attracting those private dollars that could be moving science along in the State of Illinois is problematic, which is why we should do this."

Mulligan: "All right. So, my understanding of what your Bill does is it certainly provides for certain categories of law and legislation in keeping people from doing things that would certainly be inappropriate, and illegal then in

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Illinois. And then furthering stem cell research, which is one of the most progressive research in solving many problems that we have, diseases and other things and then allowing Illinois to be in the forefront of doing research in that area. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Mulligan: "I... If I were you, I would've strongly objected to some of the terminology used in this sta... debate about aborted fetuses and... which has nothing to do with what's happening in this Bill. And I think it's regulated much better by your Bill than it was previously."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

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

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this Bill... we've heard some very interesting comments about this Bill, but I think we need to think about the economics of what's going on in the State of Illinois. We spend a lot of time trying to figure out how to get federal match, and we should also spend a lot of time trying to attract private dollars so that Illinois can be on the cutting edge of science and we could treat people appropriately with research that's available. And so I ask you all for an 'aye' vote on this very important Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3589?' All those in favor... signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Scully. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 60 Members voting 'aye', 56 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Moffitt: "Rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker, this being Ag Day we've introduced a number of groups and people, I'd like to draw attention of the Body to the balcony where former State Representative Ron Lawfer and his wife, Pat, who is one of the greatest spokespersons for agriculture and continues to be, is watching what we're doing. Welcome back, Ron and Pat. Good to have you here."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome back to the General Assembly,

Representative. Representative Eddy, for what reason do
you seek recognition?"

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, among the ag students we managed to sneak in a group from Hutsonville High School of the economics class and I'd like to welcome them and have the Members welcome them to Springfield. They're sitting up in this area."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield, Illinois.

 Representative Collins, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise a point of recognition. We have students from Marshall High School in the audience. Could you all stand. They're from the Chicago Ag School, as well."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to..."

Collins: "Thank you all for coming out."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol. We're proud to have here. Representative Parke, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

- Parke: "I would like to say that I am disappointed in the Chair maintaining the board open for such a long period of time and I just wanna say that I don't think it's the way that you normally do your job and I didn't think that that was appropriate. And I'm just sorta letting you know that... that I was disappointed that you kept the Roll Call open so long."
- Speaker Hartke: "So noted. On page 35 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 548.

 Representative Berrios. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 548, a Bill for an Act concerning pest control. Third Reading of this House Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 548 amends the Illinois Pesticide Act to allow prosecution of retailers and wholesalers who insist on selling or distributing illegal pesticides or insecticides, such as, 'Chinese chalk' and methyl parathion, two very poisonous chemicals that affect the nervous systems of children in particular and can cause death. The Bill calls... sorry. The Bill calls for, in the case of a retailer, a Class A misdemeanor for the first time offender and a Class 4 felony for a second or subsequent violation. In the case of the wholesaler, the Bill calls for the imposition of a Class IV felony for the first offense and a Class III felony for second or subsequent offense. I'm open to any questions and I'd ask for your support on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, is this the Bill that you presented in committee and ServiceMaster objected to?"

Berrios: "Actually, ServiceMaster did object, but they objected to the first draft of this, now that it's been amended they don't object to it at all."

Parke: "So, now they're neutral on the Bill?"

Berrios: "Yes."

Parke: "Do you know of any opposition to your legislation?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Berrios: "There is no opposition."

Parke: "Thank you. I appreciate your working with people to make a good Bill good. Thank you."

Berrios: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Since no one else is seeking recognition, Representative Berrios to close."

Berrios: "This Bill will help the children in the community and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 548?' 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 the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 36 on the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 1400. Mr. Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning civil no contact orders. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1400 creates the Civil No Contact Order. What this does essentially is expand the purview of protections for an individual who is a victim of sexual assault and gives them a civil remedy

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

against the perpetrator. There is no opposition to this Bill and I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1400? Representative Parke. He declines recognition. Since no one else is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1400?' 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? Have all voted who Mr... Have all voted who wish? Representative Yarbrough. 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. On page 37 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2329. Representative Graham. Representative Graham. Out of the record. page 36 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1088. Representative Jefferson. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1088, a Bill for an Act in relation to court reporters. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All this Bill does is take the court reporters out of the Supreme Court judges' office and puts 'em in control of the judges of the Circuit Court Office. It's a pretty simple Bill and all we're doing is just making sure that Supreme Court judges don't

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- have any say in this that they would come under the jurisdiction of the circuit judges. It's a good Bill and I would encourage an 'aye' vote. I would..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I originally presented this in committee and I wanna thank our colleagues in the House who worked with us to make this a better Bill, Representative Parke, particularly for adding... becoming a cosponsor in committee, as well as Representative Tenhouse and McAuliffe. This is a Bill that the courts want and it makes sense. And I'd urge everyone to vote 'aye'. Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm proud to stand in support of House Bill 1088 and compliment the Sponsors and in particular, a fellow by the name of Don Brandon for the good work they've done on this."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, Representative Jefferson to close."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a good Bill. I would urge everyone to support this Bill. It's going to do the things we need it to do. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1088?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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', 1 person voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let's back up. On page 37, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2329. Representative Graham. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2329, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2339... 29 is a shell Bill to increase the MAP grant. We don't know what the budget is gonna be, but I'd like to keep the process open and keep this issue alive. So, I'd like for your support to send this Bill to the Senate."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You said that there will be a cost to attach to this, what is the cost?"

Graham: "We don't know the cost, like I said, this Bill has been shelled so that we can keep the... this Bill alive. We will determine after we see the budget what the increase will be."

Parke: "This is... you said this is a shell Bill?"

Graham: "It's been shelled."

Parke: "You've shelled this Bill?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Graham: "Yes."

Parke: "Okay. Ladies and... To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Parke: "Okay. I do have a question first, though, with the Clerk. Has Amendment #1 been adopted?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

Parke: Okay. Okay. So, now it is a shell. Ladies and Gentlemen, we do not know what the end result of this legislation will be. The Sponsor is continuing to work on it and that's good, but we need to make sure that you're careful on how you vote on this legislation until we see the final form of it. So, be prepared to judge the underlying objective here if you wanna vote for it, but you may not know what it will look like in the final form. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2329?' 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 80 Members... 79 Members voting 'yes', 19 Members voting 'no', 19 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 36 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1272. Mr. Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. On page 35 on the Calendar

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

appears House Bill 386. Representative Novak. Out of the record. On page 36, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1195. Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. On page 36 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1251. Representative Slone. Representative Slone. Out of the record. On page 34, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 318. Representative Yarbrough. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 318, a Bill for an Act in relation to tobacco products. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 318 creates the Display of Tobacco Products Act. It requires that all tobacco products must be displayed behind the sales or service counter. The purpose of the Act is to insure that children do not have access to these problems without the assistance of retail establishment. A violation would be not less than a hundred dollars and no more than one thousand dollars. We adopted a Floor Amendment to address some of the concerns of the retail merchants. And I'm open for any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion.

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill came before us last year and was defeated. I spoke in opposition then, I rise to speak in opposition today. The reasons are very simple. I

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

won't digress, you know I'm a nonsmoker. I prefer not to be around those who do. I always request a nonsmoking room when I travel. And I do not allow anyone to smoke in my office in the Capitol because I thought that was the law, but obviously the last time I went over to the Senate chambers I find that the Illinois Clean Air Act doesn't always apply to Members of the General Assembly. But let me tell you why I think this is a bad idea. Now, if you like the "big box" stores, the Kmarts, the Wal-Marts, the Sam's, they have... they're gonna have no problem with this Bill whatsoever, they have the money to build a huge separate area with its own cashier, lots of really snappy advertising to sell cigarettes, snuff, cigars, chewing tobacco, the whole nine yards. So what does this Bill do? This Bill, for those of you that are still lucky enough to live in a neighborhood and particularly those of you... some of you who live in Chicago who have a neighborhood store and I have a few left in rural Illinois, although not very many, I remember those fondly, Harry's bread and milk store, Sid's Grocery, they're just little places where you go in and a ma and a pa is trying to make a living selling some milk, some bread, some condiments, maybe some sandwich meat and maybe have a display right by the cash register where they may sell cigarettes. So, if the intent of this Bill is to make it less palatable for children to get cigarettes, I would submit to you that that is... that does not do... there's no way this Bill is gonna do that. What this Bill will do is to enrich the "big box" stores who can

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

afford to sell tobacco products in their own department and advertise the heck out of 'em every day, in every way that's legal and undercut the price of a carton or a package of cigarettes by any other retailer in the area. And if you don't believe they aren't mass merchandisers and excellent marketers, just look at their ads, just go in the store and see how they operate. But what this Bill does is to tell some couple maybe that's... maybe that is immigrated to the Unites States and they buy a small grocery store on a street corner in Chicago or a small little convenience store on a street corner in my district and they sell 50 or 60 items. When I was a child we used to go into these... we... we were... we liked them because we could buy penny candy. Those days are gone, but some of those little stores still exist and all you're gonna do is to take that couple who are trying to make a living buy selling convenience items like milk and bread and donuts and maybe some sandwich meat and maybe try to make a dollar or two off the sale of a legal and lawful product, you're gonna take that business away from them because there is no room in these little ma and pa operations to move all their tobacco products behind the counter. They simply don't have the space and they don't have the money to build the space. Ya know, these stores have been in existence for years and I don't know why we as a Body seem so intent on putting them out of business. This is a legal and lawful product and all you're going to do if you vote for this is to enhance the profit of the Wal-Marts, the Kmarts, the Sam's. Coming

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

into town the other day, I even saw a whole store, the Discount Tobacco Shop, that's all they sell, great big store, standalone, that's all they sell is tobacco products. They're gonna love this Bill, because the more mom and pop operators that you put out of business by making them forgo the selling of a legal product because they don't have the room or they don't have the money to remodel their little bitty neighborhood store, you just enhanced the bottomline of the huge corporations that are much more effective at pushing tobacco products than the mom and pop operator ever thought to be or would ever want to be. This is not good public policy. I thought the Governor in his State of the State said we wanted to be friendly to business. This Bill's friendly to business, it's friendly to big business, I mean really big business, but it takes that little independent operator and you all have them in your neighborhoods or did, just trying to eek out a living and takes another lawful product that they can sell now, takes it out of their store because they can't meet the requirements of this Bill. Now, that just doesn't make any sense to me at all. And I've always found that the small store, the neighborhood store where the chances are pretty good the owner or the wife or the spouse or the child who work in that store is gonna know everybody in that neighborhood, you come in there to do mischief, you come in there to shoplift a pack of cigarettes, they're gonna be on you like stink on a June bug. And if they can't catch ya I'll guarantee ya they probably know your momma or

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

your daddy and they're gonna call your mommy or daddy. That isn't gonna happen at Kmart, that isn't gonna at Wal-Mart or Sam's, they don't care, they've... they've got the loss factor built into their profit. For heaven's sakes, if you're so worried about cigarettes and all of that stuff, do like I do, just don't smoke, but don't tell a mom and pop operator that you've gotta spend five or six thousand dollars or find the room to hide tobacco or you can't sell them. That just doesn't make good retail sense. It's hard enough in neighborhoods, small and large across this state, to keep a small neighborhood business going. Why would we wanna accelerate anything that would put more of them out of business and drive that business to the huge monolithic retailers who make a fortune off of the fact that the mom and pop operators are being driven out of business day after day after day? This isn't about tobacco, it isn't about the ease of access to tobacco, what it is about is putting small retail operators who can't afford to meet the mandate in this out of business. That's what the real issue is and that's why I intend to vote `no'."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fritchey."

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

Fritchey: "Everybody in here knows how I feel about smoking, you know how I feel about tobacco, they know how I feel about tobacco and kids. With all due deference to the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

previous speaker, this isn't about big business and small business, it doesn't matter if you come from the city or the suburbs or a rural area. Listen, a block from my house I've got a mom and pop store, down on the next street I got another little store. When you walk in the door here you don't check your common sense at the door you bring it with you when you sit down. I'd like all of you to think about the little stores you have in your neighborhood, they all have the ability to put tobacco products behind counter. This isn't about banning the sale of cigarettes, this isn't about making life tough for small business, this isn't about whether this state is pro-business anti-business, it really has nothing to do with how you feel about the ultimate issue of smoking. This is simply doing a very simply and reasonable thing, you're gonna sell cigarettes put 'em behind the counter. Kids will take cigarettes, we know that. Restricting access to the tobacco products, making it harder for them to get their hands on it, making it harder for them to... refraining from having their... in their face will reduce kids from smoking. Folks, I gave you some of the stats on this last time and I won't belabor the point again. We're talking about a product that is more addictive than marijuana, that is more addictive than cocaine, that is more addictive than alcohol. Kids start smoking, a third of them will become regular smokers, a third of them will die. That's fact, that's not debatable, that's not conjecture, that's not rhetoric. You wanna keep them from smoking. Kid takes a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

pack of cigarettes, that first cigarette could lead to a lifetime of smoking, that could lead to a lifetime that's cut short by smoking. This isn't about putting small stores out of business, this isn't about putting unreasonable restraint on them, it's about putting sto... the cigarettes behind the counter. Again, picture your neighborhood, picture your neighborhood stores, I don't have stores that I know that don't have counters, I don't care if you're talking about a big store or a little store. small little store front grocery store in neighborhood they've got counters, I go to pay, I go to the cash register that's at the counter. All we're saying, take the cigarettes from in front of the counter put it behind the counter. Please people, ya know, no red herrings here, no misdirections, this Bill is about one simple thing, take the cigarettes from the front put 'em to the back. It's not a city Bill, it's not a country Bill, it's not a rural Bill, a suburban Bill, it's not a big business/small business issue, it's about protecting our kids in a very reasonable way without impacting business, without having a negative impact. Nobody's bottomline is going to be affected by this Bill. We're asking them to be more responsible in how they display their products. Ya know, you don't have guns out on a rack, you don't put cigarettes out on a rack. Take the cigarettes and put 'em away. Please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Washington: "I rise to support this Bill, but I wanted in my very capable senior colleague, deference to Representative Black, I quess in this... with this Bill it's like beauty that's in the eye of the beholder. Two people can be looking at the same thing and see it a little different, but I respect his opinion. But I know, in my neighborhood the way I was reared up and the way I saw, I think this Bill is about accessibility. And though my colleague spoke of it being a legal product, but there's one word that I would think that he want to add with it, it's a legal, lethal product to the user. And I think, just like you would be in a gun display situation if you were in a gun store, they don't have the guns where you can reach up, touch 'em, grab 'em, play with 'em, you have to be a certain age based on the retailer assuming that you can even handle a gun. So, I think that with this particular Bill it addresses access and I don't think tobacco, like a gun, is lethal and we don't want young people to have access or be tempted to wanna take something that may harm them. So, I stand and rise in support of this Bill. Thank you."

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

Froehlich: "To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Froehlich: "According to our analysis the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and the Illinois Petroleum Marketers Association are no longer opposed based on the Amendments, so I just like everybody to be aware of that. Even Philip Morris liked that second Amendment. So, I'd urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since my good friend and colleague from Lake County used my name in debate, let me respond to some of the things that I've heard here. grew up in a small business, my grandfather ran it, my father ran it, now my brother runs it and my nephew is learning how to run it, more than 70 years. At what point... at what point are you Members of this august Body gonna stand up and say, I don't want the free enterprise system, I don't like it, I don't agree with capitalism, I'm going to regulate every aspect of everyone's business. Now, if you're gonna get yourselves worked up into a lather about what products should be hidden from view and what products shouldn't, then why don't you just drop in a Bill to say there will be no cigarettes sold in the State of Illinois, none. Drop in the Bill. Drop it in. Don't tell me you're gonna do it, do it. Now, in the meantime, tell me how you're gonna fill the \$7 billion hole in the budget that you're counting on from the cigarette settlement and the \$450 million in cigarette tax revenue you're counting on for fiscal 04, most of which goes to education. Where do

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ya... where you... where you gonna draw the line, folks? You walk into a liquor store, now you wanna talk about something that might be lethal, let's go into a liquor store. Every conceivable display of alcoholic beverage is out in the open on display, some of it with cutouts of bathing beauties, body builders, all of the accoutrements of advertising that say to kids and adults, if you drink this you can look like this, wow wee, if you drink this you're gonna have a party, oh boy. Where do ya go? you gonna say, uh huh, all alcohol has to be hidden behind the counter or hidden under a blanket, all alcohol advertising has to stop, can't be on television. God, why would you watch the Super Bowl if you couldn't watch the Budweiser ads, it's usually the best thing on the game. I've been here too long, Mr. Speaker, but I rise in opposition of what I see, a continual walk down the path, telling people in this state, we don't care if you work 18 hours a day in your little neighborhood grocery store or retail store, we don't care if the products you sell are legal, we don't even care that we get hundreds of millions of tax dollars from the products you sell, we're gonna tell you how you can sell 'em, where you can sell 'em and under what conditions you're gonna sell 'em. You tell me where we draw the line. I'd much rather see some of the dirty DVD's and VHS movies behind the counter, if you wanna know the truth about it. You walk into any "big box" retailer, look at the cutout advertising that exists for video discs and VHS movies that you can rent. I'll guarantee ya they

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

don't have cutouts of Winnie the Pooh. Everywhere you look in these stores, Girls Gone Wild, Coeds in New Orleans, wow wee, rent this one kids, this'll get ya fired up. All I want is from somebody on this House Floor to someday stand up and tell me how far are you gonna go to regulate every aspect of everybody's life. Either you're gonna agree with free enterprise and capitalism or you're not and if you're not, drop in a Bill to say so. Quit just nibbling away at the corners, quit trying to take away everybody's right to make a living. If you're not happy with the product they sell, then outlaw it. As an old history teacher, the only thing I would ask you to remember, prohibition worked, didn't it. When we outlawed alcohol, that worked, didn't it. You're all too young. The old prohibition worked like a jewel, worked so well they finally passed another Constitutional Amendment to repeal prohibition. Don't kid yourself, folks, this is about some mom and pop operator trying to make a living. Now, why would you stop at cigarettes, soda pop is not healthy, soda pop rots your teeth, soda pop can eat away the lining of your stomach. Let's take all the soda pop and make it be sold behind the store... behind the store counter. Boy, that behind the store counter is gonna be bigger than the store. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence, but I also appreciate the opportunity my family has had to run and operate a business and try to make a living and it gets harder and harder and harder every year for the small business operator to succeed. If ya'll wanna work for Wal-Mart, if

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ya'll wanna work for the bankrupt Kmart, ya'll wanna work for the Sam's Clubs and all of the huge box retailers that's fine if that's what you wanna do. That isn't how I grew up, that isn't how I want this world to end up. And don't you think for one minute that the "big box" retailers don't love this Bill, 'cause they'd just as soon sell all the tobacco products in the State of Illinois and not let the mom and pops sell any of it. For once, just somebody tell me how far we're gonna go. Alcohol, advertising for DVD and violent videos, you let me know, 'cause I'd rather do it in one Bill than to come out here and watch you piece my rights away one inch at a time. If you're gonna kill me, kill me quick, put a bullet in my head, pull the trigger, but don't kill me by just taking little bites out of my free enterprise system, a little bite here, little bite there, little bite here until there are no more small businessmen and women left. It's up to you."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Kelly: "I just wanted to make the comment that I was raised in a mom and pop grocery store and my grandparents and my father who took over after kept all the cigarettes behind the counter and all adults had to ask them for the cigarettes that they wanted to buy. So, I stand in support of this Bill and I also stand in support of the comments made by Representative Fritchey."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Biggins: "Does your Bill deal with obesity at all?"

Yarbrough: "I'm sorry?"

Biggins: "Obesity, the number one killer among kids in America today."

Yarbrough: "No."

Biggins: "Does your Bill address obesity?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Biggins: "Well, now, you can go into stores and they can see all this food, children very young, particularly the very young children, the ones most harmed by the lethal selling of sugar-filled and junk-filled products and your gonna allow... your Bill's gonna allow the kids to still have access to all of that display and to go home and purchase that at any age. And your Bill doesn't address anything about that, the number one killer of children in the United States today."

Yarbrough: "Representative, cigarettes are age restrictive, I don't think candy and gum and other products like that are."

Biggins: "But you can make 'em that way, because if you have the power to tell somebody where they're gonna put their stock in their store you can tell everybody else where to put their stock. Next thing you'll wanna do is put blinds over it so nobody can see the kind and demand that you know the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

pack of cigarettes, the brand that you want when you purchase it. I mean, it just does not end here. Busybodies with nothing else to do with their time but support legislation like this, bad legislation, harmful to business, you cavalierly toss out anybody that has to comply with this law that's gonna hurt their bottomline, well that's their problem, it's certainly not yours."

Yarbrough: "Representative..."

Biggins: "I vote... I recommend a 'no' vote."

Yarbrough: "Representative, does that mean you're..."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion?"

Yarbrough: "...against my Bill?"

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Please be brief."

Fritchey: "As my name was used in debate I'd like to address what's going on here. We've got some intelligent people on both sides of this Bill and we have people that I think are very sincere in their comments on both sides of this Bill. Again, this is more a commonsense issue than anything else. The previous speaker to try to talk about this issue akin to having candy out there for kids and obesity being a killer of children. I mean, folks, with all due respect, this is an issue that is, I mean, it's silly and it shows you the lengths that they're gonna go to to try to oppose this. Candy is not killing kids, candy is not age restricted, you don't have to be 18. We're not telling people how to run their businesses. The Gentleman from

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Vermilion would have you think that this Bill, which is a very straightforward and simple Bill, is gonna unravel the fabric of American business as we know it and that's not the case. We're not telling people how to set up their store, we're not telling them what they can and can't sell. What we're saying is you have a product that children are not allowed to legally buy that you shouldn't be selling to We know that children take tobacco products from stores. Is this Bill gonna stop that practice? It may not stop it, I'll tell you what, it's sure as hell gonna make it a lot harder for it to happen. If these products are behind the counters, the kids are not gonna get to it. Folks, this is not about whether you're pro-business or anti-business, this isn't about whether you're for big stores or mom and pop stores. We're not gonna drive all the local businesses out of your community and have them replaced by Wal-Mart, that's not what this does. You heard from the other speaker, she grew up in a mom and pop store, she knows that this can be done. Again, you all have these little stores, use common sense, don't... if you're against the Bill, you're against the Bill and I understand that and as I said, I respect the opinions of people on both sides, but don't be against this Bill and hide behind some convoluted excuse. Don't say, gee, I voted against this Bill because I'm in favor of small business, that's not what this is about. Don't say that you are against the Bill because we're gonna regulate every aspect of business, again, not what this does. Do you want to make it harder

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

for kids to have access to a product that they are not legally entitled to purchase or have? Forget about how you feel about the underlying issue of smoking, whatever the product is, this is age restricted. We put a lot of exemptions in here so we don't hurt small business. heard Representative Froehlich say that the merchants are neutral here. We're not gonna hurt anybody. The retail merchants are a very strong, powerful, vocal advocates for their members. They're not gonna be neutral on a Bill that hurts their members. And that's probably the most telling proposition that's come up here of all. You have the Representatives telling you that this is bad for business, but the group that is out here on behalf of business, it's their job, they exist to protect their members, they're saying, ya know what, we're neutral because this Bill, as drafted, it's not unreasonable, it's not an unreasonable imposition on our members, it doesn't hurt us. If the retail merchants say it's okay or that it's not gonna hurt them, don't be bough... swayed by the arguments of somebody else telling you that they know better than the industry knows itself. This is not an anti-industry Bill, it's not a anti-tobacco Bill, it's not an anti-small business Bill, it's let's try to keep this product away from kids. Plain and simple."

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

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the spirited

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

debate on this Bill. Ninety percent of the stores across this state already comply with what we're trying to do today. Ninety percent of all smokers start as early as 12 years old and shoplifting cigarettes is how they get this legal but lethal product. Banning these self-service displays will not eliminate youth tobacco use, but it's an excellent step towards reducing it. It's time to close this loophole that allows children such easy access to tobacco. And I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 318?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please vote your switches. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Molaro. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 45 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jones. Lou Jones, are you recognition? Okay. She declines recognition. On page 36 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1195. Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1195, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire protection. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1195 creates the Fire Department Promotion Act. This is a Bill that has been reintroduced this year. We've previously debated this Bill and it passed last year with 83 votes, but it did not see the light of the day in the Senate. The Bill requires municipal fire departments and fire departments operated by a fire protection district to make promotions and conform with procedures set forth in the Act. I would be happy to answer any questions regarding the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 1195?

Chair recognizes Representative Bost."

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

Bost: "Representative, I know there's been a lot of confusion about this Bill and there's been some things that have been said that aren't necessarily factual. Does this require the individual fire departments to go strictly on a seniority basis on these?"

O'Brien: "Absolutely not and that's a wonderful question, Representative Bost, I'm glad you brought that up, because it does not. Actually, this is a Bill that provides some uniform guidelines for departments when they have their promotions policies in place. And on Section 20 of the Bill, page 5, under promotion list Section (b) says, 'a person's position on a preliminary promotion list shall be determined by a combination of factors which "may" include any of the following: (i) the person's score on the written

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

examination; (ii) their seniority; (iii) the person's ascertained merit, (iv) the person's score on a subjective evaluation.' So, they may use that and it is simply permissive, it is not required and it's not seniority based only."

Bost: "Thank... thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Bost: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill simply says that when a person is moving up through the ranks of our fire departments they can have a clear target on what they need to do to get the promotions that are available to them. And that promotion cannot be changed... those promotion requirements cannot be changed midstream on them based on something they may have done in a community as far as getting involved in someone's political campaign and some retribution might have occurred or these type things. All this does is, is set clear guidelines. It's fair, it's right. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "I just wanted to ask if this Bill removes the rule of three, whereby the management can make a promotion selection from the top three individuals on the promotion list?"

O'Brien: "Can you repeat your question, Representative? I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Bellock: "Does this Bill remove the rule of three, whereby management can make a promotion selection from among the top three individuals on the promotion list?"
- O'Brien: "I don't believe that it does, but it provide in here that they use a combination of four. So, if those three people had the top score with a combination of those four factors then certainly that they can be utilized and promoted that way."
- Bellock: "Is the management allowed discretion to evaluate on character and leadership or is it strictly on the other qualifications?"
- O'Brien: "Well, they have a subjective evaluation that they can... is one of the combinations of factors that can be used and that would... I would imagine on the subjective evaluation their character and their leadership skills would come into play during that evaluation."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative Pankau, the Lady from DuPage."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor yields."

- Pankau: "Mary K., are you aware of any other states that require their local governments to bargain over promotions within the fire departments?"
- O'Brien: "I'm not aware of other states that have Bills similar to this, although there may be."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Pankau: "Would this kinda be a first? I mean, if we enacted this in the state, would this be a first across the nation?"
- O'Brien: "I don't... I don't know."
- Pankau: "Okay. Second question, would you allow your staff to bargain with you over how your promotion decisions are determined?"
- O'Brien: "If... actually, where there's a collective bargaining unit they would have the ability to do that and I would certainly do that and actually we do that now."

Pankau: "And will that practice continue or what?"

O'Brien: "Well, the..."

- Pankau: "In this Bill, that practice continues, this can be bargained?"
- O'Brien: "I'm sorry, can you repeat that? I'm having a hard time hearing over here."
- Pankau: "I'm sorry. In the future if this Bill passes, that would continue?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Pankau: "And you could continue to bargain this factor?"

- O'Brien: "This wouldn't have any impact on the collective bargaining agreement."
- Pankau: "Okay. The current promotion system, how did that come about, I mean, was that negotiated?"
- O'Brien: "I think in some places that it might be and in others it is not."
- Pankau: "Okay. Thank you very much. I have gotten... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Pankau: "I have gotten probably seven to eight of my municipalities that have wrote me against this Bill. They feel that it's infringement on their area. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Hassert: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Hassert: "Representative, is there a companion Bill in the Senate like this that you're aware of?"

O'Brien: "An identical Bill?"

Hassert: "Yeah."

O'Brien: "Not that I'm aware of."

Hassert: "So, this originated starting here and you're moving
 it to the Senate, I assume."

O'Brien: "Yes."

Hassert: "I assume this Bill's gonna get the requisite amount of votes to get out of here. I would just hope that the negotiation between the Municipal League and... and the fire unions continue on as it moves over to the Senate, 'cause I do think there is some room for negotiations."

O'Brien: "And Representative Hassert, I just spoke with several members of the Associated Firefighters and they have been in meetings and they've indicated to me that they will continue to negotiate as this moves. If we're lucky enough to get the requisite number of votes and it moves to the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Senate, then they will certainly continue that negotiation."

Hassert: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Chair recognizes

Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to ask the Body to vote 'aye' on this Bill. As you can see on the Bill, it's a bipartisan Bill. And as the brother of a former, no longer employed battalion chief in the Joliet Fire Department, I heartily recommend your 'aye' vote. And thank you very much."

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

O'Brien: "I would just urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The ques..."

O'Brien: "Thank you all very much."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1195?' 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 89 Members voting 'yes', 21 Members voting 'no', and 7 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Molaro, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Molaro: "Well, thank you, for all the applause, but... I... I was act..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "I might remind the Members in the gallery that demonstrations are not allowed in the Illinois House."
- Molaro: "Act... actually, I was rising to... I walked off the floor at a very inappropriate time and I'd like the Journal to reflect that had I been attentive, been in my seat, I would've voted 'yes' on House Bill 318."
- Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes. On page 37 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2216. Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2216, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Continuing on the order of firefighter issues, this is the pension issue which I have been working with the Associated Firefighters of Illinois on regarding some enhanced benefits for surviving spouses and children of firefighters. These issues are currently in negotiation with the Municipal League, as well. We feel it's important, however, that this legislation continue on in this Session. The provisions of this Bill particularly would provide for a annuity for surviving spouses of firefighters of 100 percent of the salary of the firefighter or 100 percent of the annuity. This would bring firefighters into parity with police officers in the state. It would also provide for an annual 3 percent

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

compounding or COLA for surviving spouses and for children of firefighters. With that I think, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2216?

Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, in talking with some of the local firefighters yesterday, it appears that widows who are currently getting a pension would not be included in this, but would be left aside."

Smith: "I'm sorry, Representative Mulligan, could you repeat that, regarding current..."

Mulligan: "In the mad rush for everyone to get on your excellent Bill."

Smith: "Yes. Would you like us to add your name?"

Mulligan: "It is my understanding that if this were to pass and to be signed by the Governor that currently widows who are getting a pension would not be included."

Smith: "That is correct, yes."

Mulligan: "And they gave me a number that they thought there were approximately 300."

Smith: "I don't have that number, Representative Mulligan..."

Mulligan: "I think it would be interesting..."

Smith: "...300, I think..."

Mulligan: "I think it would be..."

Smith: "...that's probably low."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Mulligan: "...interesting if the Bill were to pass to take a look at the amounts that are currently being received by widows who would not get an increase. And I would also be interested to know if they would be able to get the COLA, though?"
- Smith: "Yes, Representative Mulligan, they would be eligible for the COLA, the 3 percent annual cost of living allowance would apply to all surviving spouse annuities."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, even though they would not go up to the amount that they're deceased spouse got, they would be eligible for the COLA?"
- Smith: "That is correct. Right."
- Mulligan: "All right. And then it is my understanding that the top amount after 20 years is 50 percent of your salary?"
- Smith: "That is correct. Right."
- Mulligan: "So, then the widow would be eligible for only 50 percent of her spouse... or his... his or her spouses salary would be only 50 percent?"
- Smith: "No, under this legislation it would be a hundred per...
 it would be the same."
- Mulligan: "It'd be a hundred percent of 50 percent."
- Smith: "A hundred percent of the... of the firefighter's annuity, right."
- Mulligan: "Okay. And that after between 20 and 30 if you continue to work you'll be eligible for 2 1/2 percent more than fifty percent?"
- Smith: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mulligan: "If you continued to work between twenty years and thirty years you could add two and a half percent up to a certain percentage?"

Smith: "That is correct. Right."

Mulligan: "And the widow would then be..."

Smith: "That's the current system."

Mulligan: "...then the widow would then be eligible for that, too."

Smith: "Right."

Mulligan: "And when... when are you able to take the retirement?

If you've worked 20 and you're not 50 yet, would you have
to wait 'til you're 50 to take that or to a... what age would
you be eligible?"

Smith: "With 20 years you'd have to be age 55."

Mulligan: "Okay. And if the person retires before 55 and doesn't take their pension yet, what happens to a widow if the husband dies before they actually are able to access the pension?"

Smith: "They... they would still be eligible."

Mulligan: "At the age of 55, also?"

Smith: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

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

Smith: "Just to clarify, Representative Mulligan, on the last point, the spouses would be eligible automatically, not at age 55. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would ask for a favorable vote. This is important pension legislation

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

for the firefighters in the downstate firefighter pension systems. This is for surviving spouses and children of firefighters. This brings parity to them with what police have currently. This... by passing this legislation today we will encourage the negotiations to continue between the Associated Firefighters and the Municipal League. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2216?' 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 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 2 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rose, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Rose: "Thank you. I'd like to ask the Members of the General Assembly to join me in welcoming three members of the Charleston Fire Department, one of 'em I went to high school with, up in the gallery. Thank you for being here."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to the General Assembly. Page 36 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1251. Representative Slone. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1251, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1251 is an initiative of the Illinois Municipal League and the various county organizations. It would expand the power of municipalities that with the agreement of their relevant county would exercise their zoning powers beyond the municipal boundaries. This is similar to an agreement that we already have that is currently limited to Peoria County and functions between the City of Peoria and Peoria County very successfully. Other counties are interested in doing this. The Bill would change the population limits to permit that. And I would ask for your 'aye' votes."

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

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to say on House Bill 1195 I want to be recorded as a 'present' vote if the record could reflect so."

Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will reflect your wishes. Is there further discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Black. Mr. Black. Good morning."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Black: "Representative, what happens in the case where a municipality has a zoning ordinance, but the county has none?"
- Slone: "Mr. Black, my understanding is that if... excuse me, if the... if the municipality has a zoning ordinance and the county has a zoning ordinance this could apply."
- Black: "All right. I... the ... my home county of Vermilion does not have any county zoning ordinance whatsoever and it's been discussed and it has been a very emotional debate for a number of years and some of these smaller communities in the county, I think, one or two may have adopted a zoning ordinance, others have defeated a zoning ordinance. I think, Danville, the county seat is the only community that has a, well, not the only community, but one of only two or three that has a comprehensive zoning map, if you will, in Vermilion County. Now, the people who live on the outskirts of Danville within that one and one half mile radius or right on the edge are always very nervous that the City of Danville will somehow be able to reach out beyond the one and one half mile radius to enforce a zoning ordinance. And what I'm trying to make certain of is that if the county has no zoning ordinance, what prevents the city from somehow being able to extend or expand it's zoning buffer?"
- Slone: "The... the coun... both the county board and the governing body of the municipality would have to adopt this agreement, this would be pursuant only to an

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

intergovernmental agreement between the two local governments."

Black: "Would there be..."

Slone: "I'm not sure if that addresses your question."

Black: "Would there be any way that a city... I'm just trying to think, again, of my own home county and those are the people who send us down here. I believe the Village of Catlin has a zoning ordinance and Danville has a zoning ordinance, but I don't think those city boundaries are contiguous. I could be wrong, but is there any way that... that two municipalities could have an intergovernmental agreement and then regulate unincorporated territory between the two municipalities?"

Slone: "Maybe, but this Bill would not have any effect on that.

This would only address an intergovernmental agreement between a municipality and its county."

Black: "Well, you can make an intergovernmental agreement between two municipalities."

Slone: "I'm sure you can, but this doesn't address that situation."

Black: "Where... where... Is there any language in the Bill that specifically would prohibit an intergovernmental agreement between a municipality another municipality, a municipality and a township, a municipality and a special taxing district?"

Slone: "I don't believe so, Mr. Black. What the Bill does in terms of what it literally, physically does to the statute is to simply remove the limitation on population size that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

currently confines the availability of the section to Peoria County so that other counties that are interested in doing this but don't fall within those population parameters may go ahead and do that. Specifically, I believe there's an interest in McLean County in adopting a similar law."

Black: "All right."

Slone: "But they can't do that in McLean County currently because they don't fall within these population parameters that are in the existing law."

Black: "Is the Amendment still on the Bill that you had filed to clarify the ability of a township zoning ordinance to object to a request for a variance?"

Slone: "That Amendment has been withdrawn, Mr. Black, and the reason for that is that it was brought to my attention after the committee hearing and I... I had requested and spoken to the townships and asked if they would please put this on in the Senate when there would be an opportunity to discuss it in committee. If it comes back with it from the Senate we'll concur in it, if we pass the Bill in the first place."

Black: "In other words, the Bill in its current form does not address the concern, the very legitimate concern, that many township officials have in being able to protect their ability to go to a county board with a zoning variance. You're expecting that to be put on in the Senate?"

Slone: "We anticipate that that will go on in the Senate, yes."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "All right. Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Black: "I've been here long enough to know that I never try to anticipate what the Senate will do. I would just simply point out that the townships wanted the Amendment that was not put on the Bill, because when there currently is a request by an entity to violate a zoning ordinance of the township the township may force the county board to approve request, not by a simple majority, but by a This three-fourths vote. Amendment that the Representative chose not to add to the Bill would certainly an Amendment that would enable township zoning commissions not to lose any current ability that they have. In the absence of this Amendment, I cannot on behalf of the township officials who have contacted me, vote for the Bill in good conscience. I... I have no particular quarrel with zoning. One of the things I looked at when I bought my house many years ago was that it had good zoning, I didn't particularly wanna build next to something that would become a 24 hour a day factory two or three days... two or three years after I bought the house. But the township officials feel very strongly that without the Amendment that the Sponsor withdrew they're... they lose a certain degree of protection. I can't in good conscience vote for a Bill assuming that he Senate will add that Amendment to I've been here long enough to know I never assume anything when the Senate is involved. I remember one year,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mr. Speaker, I think you and I were here, one of the Senators went out on groundhog day and saw his shadow and they didn't come back to Springfield for six weeks, but that was a long time ago. But I can't in good conscience vote for a Bill that leaves this chamber that is more or less dependent upon an Amendment that may or may not be added in the Senate to protect the rights of township zoning commissions. So, on behalf of the township people who have contacted me, I intend to vote 'no' on the Bill."

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

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would not wanna leave the misimpression that the township officials are against this Bill. My understanding with respect to the agreement and the discussions that I had with their lobbyist is that since the Bill... since the Amendments were not presented in committee and were not available to me as the Sponsor in committee that they would address these in committee in the Senate and they did agree to having this withdrawn and presented in the Senate. Municipal League, the United Counties, the Metro Counties remain in favor of the Bill and we would certainly agree to have the township Amendment on here should it survive the Senate, which is... was pointed out is not always something we can guarantee. I don't believe there is any opposition to this Bill and I would appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1251?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes';

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 88 Members voting 'yes', 29 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 34 on the Calendar appears House Bill 300. Representative Mathias. Out of the record. On page 38 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2782. Representative Myers. Representative Myers. Out of the record. On page 33 on the Calendar appears House Bill 93. Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 93, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We got to the s's I see. House Bill 93 came to me from a local police officer in my department who... when they work on their MBT computers in their car they type in the license plate and it just gives the make of car and it gives the year of the car, sedan, et cetera, it doesn't give the color of the car and they thought it'd be easier if they knew what kind of color car they're looking for. That's what this Bill addresses where they require the Secretary of State to include the color of the car on the title. Be happy to entertain any questions."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 93? Chair recognizes Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative Schmitz, I see you've amended the Bill.

I remember when it came to committee and we had some concerns with it. Can you tell us what the Amendment does?"

Schmitz: "The Amendment will only require that the color of the title be... the color would be updated on the title at the time of title change. So, if you were to repaint your vehicle next week you would not have to rush back to the Secretary of State's Office to have the title updated and pay that additional fee again."

Franks: "So, we'd save taxpayers the \$65 fee I presume each time that they pained their vehicle. Correct?"

Schmitz: "That's correct."

Franks: "With the Amendment has the Secretary of State now gone neutral on this Bill?"

Schmitz: "I don't know."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I think you've..."

Schmitz: "I'm just getting word right now they're still opposed."

Franks: "They still are. Okay. Well, I think you've done a lot work on this, so thank you."

Schmitz: "Thank you, chairman."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Schmitz: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 93?' 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. Novak. Mr. Reitz. 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. Have all voted who... On page 37 on the Calendar, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 1547. Mr. Wait. Out of the record. On page 33 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 121. Mr. Watson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 121, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire equipment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wait."

Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 121 creates the fire equipment exchange program. It allows one district to donate equipment to another district without the threat of liability beyond willful and wrongful intent. It is an agreed Bill and it is a result of Representative Moffitt, Representative Smith's work on the House task force. I would be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 121? Seeing that no one is seeking... Representative... He's

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

declined recognition. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 121?' 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. On page 24 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2996. Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2996, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered Representative Pihos, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Pihos on Floor Amendment #1."

Pihos: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This House Amendment is in response to the promise I made to the Human Services Committee. Instead of implementing a new sunset date for the KidCare Program it was suggested that the date be repealed altogether and this is what Amendment does to House Bill 2996."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2996?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 22 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2772.

 Representative Saviano. Mr. Saviano. Out of the record.

 On page 30 on the Calendar, on Second Reading appears House Bill 3486. Representative Bailey. Representative Bailey.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3486, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page... Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, on the Bill before us, our file has a note that this Bill was presented in committee by Representative McKeon. Representative McKeon said the Bill would be held on Second Reading pending some kind of an agreement between... that the... pending an Amendment that would bring the threshold back to 50 employees. That's our understanding, that's what staff has written on the file. If... if I'm wrong I apologize, but if we're not wrong we would expect the Bill to be held on Second."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bailey, your response."
- Bailey: "No, that was not the agreement, Sir. And if I'm not mistaken, I spoke with Representative Parke on this yesterday."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Black: "Representative, you didn't make the agreement,

 Representative McKeon made the agreement, presented the

 Bill for you."
- Bailey: "Representative, I'll move it back to Second in order to clear this matter up."
- Black: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 3486?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3486 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second Reading to the order... for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Slone, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hartke: "State your point."
- Slone: "I'd like to welcome the St. Mark's Catholic School from Peoria which is here visiting today. They're in the gallery, please welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capital, Springfield,
 Illinois. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill
 2577? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2577?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2577 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. On page 12 on the Calendar, on Second Reading,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

appears House Bill 2215. Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Brosnahan. Out of the record. On page 2 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 9. Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. On page 12 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2265. Representative Davis. Steve Davis. Out of the record. On page 2... On page 7 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 1256. Representative Giles. Out of the record. On page 5 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 465. Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 465, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Jakobsson. Leave that Bill on Second Reading. On page 30 on the Calendar, on Second Reading appears House Bill 242... 3427. Representative Kelly. You have an Amendment to adopt to the Bill. Out of the record. On page 28 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 3298. Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3298, a Bill for an Act concerning the comprehensive health insurance plan. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mautino on the Floor Amendment #2."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Floor Amendment 2 deals with creating a new category within the state's Comprehensive Health Insurance And these... this would impact those who are affected by the Trade Adjustment Act, for example, many of our steel mills. In my case it's the Hennepin Steel Mill, Representative Mitchell had Northwest Steel and Wire. A lot of those companies which the workers lost their jobs as a result of foreign trade. What this would do is allow the... those employees to be considered federally eligible and they could join in our CHIP Section 15 Program. That basically allows them to come in without any preexisting conditions and also says that if there ar... there is continuation of coverage they may opt out of the COBRA coverage. This is... the Federal Government will then pick up 65 percent of the cost of the premiums for these 10 to 15 thousand Illinois citizens. And also, we will become eligible for about \$2 million from the federal pool of funds towards our CHIP Program. That's what it does. Appreciate your consideration."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "Representative, I won't ask for a Roll Call and I'll even vote for your Amendment if you just do one thing for me, instead of saying the Federal Government is gonna pick up 65 percent of the premium cost would you just please say the taxpayers are gonna pick up 65 percent of the cost, 'cause it all comes out of our, ya know, federal taxes come out of my left pocket, state taxes come out of my right pocket, local taxes come out of my back left pocket and some of the taxes I haven't even figured out yet come out of my back right hand pocket. I wish we'd get out of the habit of saying that it's federal money or state money, 'cause that somehow makes it sound like it's free, it's all taxpayer money. Right?"

Mautino: "And what you say is correct and in this situation if you are familiar with the CHIP Program and how it works those premiums are structured at about a hundred and thirty-five percent of what the industry average is. So with this, those people who were stuck and had to continue their COBRA coverage may have been paying \$315 in premiums, what happened at that point, is those who were young, healthy, could buy coverage somewhere else did. That leaves you a pool that can't get insurance anywhere else and their premiums went to 12 hundred, 15 hundred, 25 hundred dollars per month.

Black: "All right."

Mautino: So this is an... this is an option that'll help out those folks. I do appreciate your point."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "I understand all too well, Representative, because when you said young and healthy neither one of those apply to me..."

Mautino: "Or me."

Black: "...and if I was... if I was not in the group policy, I am uninsurable on the open market and I think the CHIP Program has been... has been well run. We've had some financial problems with it, as you know, but it has done the job of the insurer as la... of last resort. And it has really helped some people, there's no question about that. And it is not a giveaway program, because as you said..."

Mautino: "No, it's..."

Black: "...that premium is in fact above the standard premium.

So, if we can accommodate more people through the wise use of tax funds I don't have any problem with that. I congratulate you on the idea."

Mautino: "Appreciate that."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3298?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 5 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 520. Mr. Miller. Representative Miller. Out of the record. On page 25 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

appears House Bill 3060. Representative Ryg. Representative Ryg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3060, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ryg, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to offer an Amendment to House Bill 3060 which covers brain injury coverage. The Amendment would require that the Department of Insurance would conduct an analysis and study of the costs and benefits derived from the implementation of the coverage requirements."

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

Representative Pankau, you care not to address this issue?

She declines recognition. Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3060?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'... saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Myers, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Myers: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Myers: "With us in the gallery today are 18 students from Western Illinois University who are enrolled in a class

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

called Inside State Government. They are here today to observe the House and Senate legislative process in action, as well as to meet with Legislators, state agencies and lobbyists. They are accompanied by two faculty members of the honors college. So, would you please join with me in welcoming them to the House of Representatives, they're up in the gallery."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to your State Capitol. On page 13 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2376. Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2376, a Bill for an Act concerning health care. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Parke: "Staff has informed us that there's supposed to be an Amendment placed on that Bill before it moves to Third."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative, I'm glad you asked about that Amendment. There was supposed to have been negotiation between the hospital and the nurses association and that fell through."

Parke: "Well, did you make an agreement to hold it until the negotiation was held?"

Flowers: "I did..."

Parke: "Well, then..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Flowers: "...and now it's over."

Parke: "...I don't know how you can move it then."

Flowers: "No, I did, I did. I made the promise that I would hold the Bill until the negotiation was over. The negotiation is over."

Parke: "Are you saying you have an agreement between the two sides?"

Flowers: "Representative, I didn't say that I would hold the Bill until both sides agreed. I said I would hold the Bill and there will be the negotiations and we have negotiated with the hospital association."

Parke: "Representative, our staff analysis said that you would hold the Bill, that was your agreement in committee, that you would hold the Bill until there's an agreement between the two sides. You do not have an agreement between the two sides and if you just wish to not commit to your word..."

Flowers: "Oh, Representative, Representative..."

Parke: "...that's your call, but I would say that..."

Flowers: "...Representative, please..."

Parke: "...when you make an agreement..."

Flowers: "...if you were not in the committee..."

Parke: "...when you make an agreement..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Parke: "...that you need to be able to do that."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers, would you allow Representative Parke to ask the question and you can answer it."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Parke: "I'm only pointing out that if you make an agreement all of us know that when we make an agreement that we have an obligation to fulfill the agreement. The Representative has always been a Lady of her word and I would just say that because you cannot get them to work out at this point does not preclude you from not holding the Bill on Second Reading. You certainly are the Sponsor, you can do whatever you wish."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. With all due respect to my colleague over here, I am, I will be, I will continue to be a woman of my word and my word was that I will agree to negotiate. There's no possible way that I would ever say that I will hold my Bill until all parties agree because therefore the party that I'm making this commitment to does not necessarily have to agree and so therefore I could never move my Bill forward. What I did do was promise that I will continue to negotiate, but now I'm not going to allow anyone to just pull the rug from under me because they don't want to give into... or we don't want to give in to each other."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you. I appreciate the point that the Representative is trying to make to all of us, but we all go through this and if there's an agreement made then we expect... this Body expects you to fulfill the agreement. The agreement was that you would not move the Bill until both sides agree to it. Now, if you don't wanna do that,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that's your call, but it doesn't preclude you from an agreement made in committee."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I said and I will continue to say that I promised that I would negotiate in good faith and that's exactly what I did."
- Speaker Hartke: "Let me make a suggestion. Representative Flowers, Representative Parke, would you please two get together and decide what to do with this piece of legislation as we move on with... the Bill is on Third Reading at the present time. Mr. Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe I need to negotiate with the Lady, I'm only pointing out what our staff analysis said. She is the Sponsor. She is now is moving it to Third Reading, it cannot be amended. That's her call."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 8 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 1507. Representative Flowers." Mr. Clerk read the bill.
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1507, a Bill for an Act concerning jury trials. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Fritchey: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Fritchey: "I'm very happy, along with Representative McCarthy, who has some friends in the gallery, I'm happy to count them as friends and constituents. We have Jack Percival, the principal of St. Andrew's School, as well as a number of his students. I'd like to welcome them down to Springfield everybody."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. On page 12 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2215. Representative Brosnahan. 2215. Out of the record. On page 34 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 300. Representative Mathias. 300."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 300, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 300 deals with Internet services that can be provided by counties. Basically, what the Bill says is that any county may provide Internet access to public records maintained in electric... electronic form. This acsays... access shall be provided at no charge to the public. However, any county that provides these public Internet... Internet access records, maintained in electronic form, may also enter into a contractual agreement for the dissemination of that same electronic data in bulk or compiled form. Basically, this Amendment was added to the original Bill to make it an agreed Bill between the Metro Counties Association, the Press Association, and the Illinois State Bar Association.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The language is basically identical to the language used now by the Illinois Supreme Court for the release of their electronic information. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that there's a fee increase involved in this. Is that correct, Representative?"

Mathias: "It's not a fee increase. Basically, a county would have the right to, in cases where there's information that's not right now available on the Internet where the county would have to, in effect, manipulate and compile data on a... for a, let's say, a commercial user, they have the right, under this Bill, to enter into an agreement which obviously there will be a fee paid."

Parke: "A fee."

Mathias: "Yes, there will be fee paid to the county."

Parke: "Okay."

Mathias: "But it was, basically, this is a new fee."

Parke: "And this is a new fee that's not been there before?"

Mathias: "Right. But it will be with..."

Parke: "So, it is a fee?"

Mathias: "It is a fee with commercial users."

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a fee involved. However it's applied is... we could discuss later. But that in itself does not always make it a bad idea, but I think every Member needs to be aware of what they're voting for. Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Meyer: "Representative, you indicated that Floor Amendment #2 removes opposition. Does it remove all the opposition that was voiced on this Bill, specifically the Illinois Press Association, State Bar Association, Illinois Broadcasters Association?"

Mathias: "As far as I know, this removes the… in fact, this was language from the Press Association and the Bar Association. I know… no one has come to me… no one else has come to me to say they're objecting to this language. It's my understanding this is… that this is in agreement, in fact, the language came from them."

Meyer: "Thank you."

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

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

This is an initiative out of the e-government study that was completed in terms of a response to customers requests for service over the Internet. Counties have invested significantly in improving the technology that allows them to put records on the Internet. And so, Representative Mathias has included all the provisions that they've asked for. The opposition has dropped their position and I think this is a good thing in terms of good customer service from local governments."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Delgado: "Representative, I know the previous speaker just mentioned that the opposition was removed. Can you help clarify from my position the IVI, the Illinois Voters...

Independent Voters, are their inquiries satisfied? Are they opposed to this Bill?"

Mathias: "I have not heard from them, so the only people... they are no longer opposed."

Delgado: "They are no longer opposed? And this will permit though a fee to be applied for each inquiry?"

Mathias: "I'm sorry. I cannot hear you."

Delgado: "This will require a fee on each inquiry..."

Mathias: "No, it will..."

Delgado: "...our taxpayer will have to pay or has that been removed?"

Mathias: "It's basically for commercial users where the information is not now available on the Internet where they have to manipulate different data bases and provide information to, let's say, a commercial user so that they can... well, do it, obviously, use it for their business purposes."

Delgado: "So, the individual... so, an individual taxpayer is not payin' for it."

Mathias: "No, if..."

Delgado: "The individual taxpayer... Is this for commercial use?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mathias: "That's right."

Delgado: "This is companies."

Mathias: "Yes."

Delgado: "These are people who have the money who can do this."

Mathias: "Yes."

Delgado: "And it's not our taxpayer who's already payin' their taxes for this who have to pay another fee?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Delgado: "So, our constituent does not have to go in and be charged a three or a five dollar fee?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Delgado: "Sounds like a good Bill."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Delgado: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Since no one is seeking...

Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Sullivan: "This in no way stops an individual from accessing data base... the website at the county to look at certain information, whether it be assessment information, whether it be tax bill information, in no way would there be a fee charged to that individual. This Bill will allow the county to charge commercial enterprises that are presently taking this information, compiling it and sending it out and making a profit on the information. It's information that we are going to make in certain formats for these

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

people and that's the only thing that this does. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

Mathias: "Again, I think this is good government where through the use of the Internet the county gains because they can gain some funds from these commercial users. The commercial users gain. I think it's a win-win situation. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 300?' 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? Please vote your switches. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman. Representative Flowers or Monique Davis. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 75 Members voting 'yes', 36 Members voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, at my age this late in the afternoon I don't whether it's a point of personal privilege or an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your inquiry."

Black: "So, do we split the difference?"

Speaker Hartke: "Split the difference."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "All right. Mr. Speaker, I looked over to the left and I see a GI Joe figure wrapped around a microphone cord with a qun."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Black: "And the gun is pointed right in my direction. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, you do."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect if anything needs to be put behind the counter, it's GI Joe with a gun pointed at me. I'm getting a little nervous. At least she could point it somewhere else."

Speaker Hartke: "That may be debatable."

Black: "And ya know, I won't let my grandchildren... I won't let my grandchildren play with GI Joe or have any of those violent figures. And she not only has one, but she has two over there. Both of them pointed... well, one is pointed towards the Speaker, so I guess that's okay."

Speaker Hartke: "We're one equal opportunity. Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify that those were two guns pointed in that direction, not one. And they are... this is for everyone in the House. First and foremost, we wanna support our troops, so we thought it'd be nice to have GI Joe. Mine's a midnight... thank you. Army Ranger, midnight mission. And I don't... I'm not exactly sure which one. I think hers is a Marine, GI Joe, Marine version. And also, these can be conveniently directed in any direction, as in the Chair if

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

we adjourn a little bit too late or any other direction we would like. But also at Chapin Rose there who has a Raggedy Ann and Andy Bill, I think, coming soon. So, I know GI Joe's a little upset about that. But anyway, that's about it. Representative Black, so if you're on good behavior you have nothing to worry about."

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

Mulligan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that she wasn't... Representative Mendoza was not trying to replace GI Joe for Raggedy Ann as the state doll, because I'm just... that the author come... that the author of Raggedy Ann books comes from Illinois is really important. And although we may be making a lot of money on GI Joe figures, Raggedy Ann is an institution that's been around for a long time."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rose, do you have a comment on that?"

Rose: "No."

Speaker Hartke: "He declines recognition. Representative Black, you were not recognized for that remark. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair is preparing to move to third priorities. We will be calling Bills on Second Reading, moving those Bills to Third. So, be prepared and as usual we'll be going down the Calendar alphabetically, the best I can. On page 6 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 1208. Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1208 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Acevedo, has been approved for consideration."

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

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move for adoption of House... Amendment #1 to House Bill 1208. And for any questions I'd like to defer to my colleague, Representative Dan Brady."

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

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Speaking to Floor Amendment #2 on House Bill 1208. Representative Acevedo and I were running a very similar Bill. Representative Acevedo's Bill dealing with the homemade drug paraphernalia and my intent was also..."

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse me, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Excuse me, 1."

Speaker Hartke: "Floor Amendment #1."

Brady: "Floor Amendment #1. And that particular Amendment deals with the inclusion... including into this Bill manufactured drug paraphernalia that is sold for no other purpose than just that, drug paraphernalia and is disguised and masked under tobacco product. And that is in essence what the particular Amendment does. And it piggybacks onto the Representative's Bill, now dealing with manufactured, as well as homemade drug paraphernalia products. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1208?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Brady."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brady on Floor Amendment #2."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 is associated with the particular Bill 1208 and that particular changing strikes the word 'peculiar' and adds the word 'associated with'. The intent of this is to change, it broadens the scope of items within the meaning of drug paraphernalia. And I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding it."

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

Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Will the Sponsor of Amendment #2 yield?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Black: "Representative..."

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "...ya know, I've never under... I've never thought I was the brightest bulb in the pack, but these two Amendments don't mesh."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Brady: "Excuse me, Representative, #1 was the Amendment that should've been tabled, it's #2, which I had spoken to earlier, was the Amendment that dealt with the particular change in the wording, as well as including manufactured products as drug paraphernalia."

Black: "What... what's the intent of the Sponsor? Does he intend to table Amendment #1 at some point?"

Brady: "Yes. Yes, he will do that, Representative."

Black: "All right. So, it isn't your intent that we vote on...
that we attach both Amendments to the underlying Bill?"

Brady: "That's... #2."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "What's behind door #2."

Black: "You just have to work with me a little bit."

Brady: "I... no, I understand."

Black: "So, it's number 2? Okay. Thank you."

Brady: "It was a little confusing for myself, Representative..."

Black: "Thank you."

Brady: "But I think we're there now."

Speaker Hartke: "Excuse... excuse me, Mr. Brady, Mr. Black.

Representative Acevedo, I think the proper verbiage here

would be for you to table Amendment #1."

Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #1 from House Bill 1208."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Brady."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brady on Amendment #2."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask for a favorable vote for Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Since no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1208?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 15 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2522.

 Representative Berrios. Representative Berrios. Out of the record. On page 3 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 176. Representative Bellock. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 176... House Bill 176, a Bill for an Act concerning animal cremation services. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bellock on Floor Amendment #1."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a Floor Amendment to House Bill 176. It's a technical Amendment that clarifies the purposes of what a companion animal is.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Does not include livestock or animals from shelters or other no-kill shelters."

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

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

'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill

176?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed

'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 26 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 3113.

 Representative Boland. Representative Boland. Out of the record. On page 30 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 3479. Representative Flider.

 Representative Flider. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3479, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Flider, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Flider on the Amendment #1."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment simply would change the language of the Bill so that a college which would be prohibited from selling a student's name or address or telephone number would simply... the language of Amendment #1 would be... would create a change so that the word 'selling' would be changed to 'provide'. So, this language simply would prohibit the community from providing

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

rather than selling, which was the original intent of the legislation. I'd encourage your support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3479?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 8 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 1484.

 Representative Flowers. Out of the record. On page 15 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2498. Representative Giles. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2498, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 4 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 3343.

 Representative Jakobsson. Out of the record. On page 17 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2636. Representative McGuire. Out of the record. On page 16 on the Calendar... Representative Brauer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Brauer: "I have a Gentleman standing here in front of me that I've looked up to for a long time and today happens to be a very special day in his life, it's his birthday. I don't think of this Gentleman as old, I think he was... I think of him as chronologically gifted. Raymond today is 59, I think we should wish him a happy birthday."

Speaker Hartke: "Well, happy birthday, Representative Poe. On page 16 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2573. Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. On page 24 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2935. Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan. Out of the record. On page 4 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 310. Representative Mendoza. Susana Mendoza. Out of the record. On page 23 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2779. Representative Novak. Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading, on page 23, appears House Bill 2816. Representative Phelps. Out of the record. Mr. Novak, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Are we moving Bills to Third Reading?"

Speaker Hartke: "Yes."

Novak: "Yes. Can... with deference to the Chair, could we go back to 2779 and move it to Third, please?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Novak: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hartke: "On page 23 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2779. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2779, a Bill for an Act concerning the distribution of electricity. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading appears House Bill 310. Representative Mendoza. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 310, a Bill for an Act in relation to labor. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mendoza on Amendment #2."

 Representative Mendoza on Amendment #2."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 says that upon the request the department shall provide to a third party employer a list of entities registered as day and temporary labor service agencies. The department shall provide on the Internet a list of entities registered as day and temporary labor services. That way people would know which labor agencies are already registered with the state and which ones are not. Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #2? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 310?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Mr. Phelps, did you wanna hear 2816? Out of the record. On page 15 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2489. Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2489, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications carriers. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 3 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 221.

 Representative Slone. Representative Slone. Out of the record. Out of the record. On page 23 on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, appears House Bill 2866.

 Representative Reitz. Representative Reitz. Out of the record. On third priority, on page 38, on Third Reading, appears House Bill 2450. Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipalities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2450 is an initiative of the Illinois Municipal League. And basically what it does is it repeals a posting requirement. What it does is we found out that there's language in the Illinois statutes that is duplicative whenever we're talking about the Open Meetings Act. And I would just answer any quest... be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2450? Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, did Illinois Press Association have any concerns about this Bill?"

Bost: "Not that they expressed in committee."

Black: "I'm not sure I understand this. If I understand what the Municipal League is saying, they used to be able to discuss ordinances behind closed doors, but the Illinois Open Meetings Act abolished that practice. So, therefore, they wanna change the old code. What..."

Bost: "No."

Black: "...what are they changing?"

Bost: "No. From what I... no. It's from my understanding is, is all we are simply doing is getting rid of this old statute because now under the Open Meetings Act this is already covered. And so we're just..."

Black: "What's al..."

Bost: "...cleaning up..."

Black: "...what's already covered?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Bost: "The... where this piece of legislation was in the statute, it required the open meeting and required the notification and it required that some paper... that paperwork be filed. And basically, what this does, is it... they already file this paperwork or they... just a moment. The state... the Open Meetings Act already does everything that this Bill says we need to or this language says we need to do. So, all we're doing is cleaning up existing language."

Black: "Representative, I was confused before I got up to answer the questions, you've done a masterful job of making this even more confusing."

Bost: "Anytime I can help."

Black: "I'm still not sure whether or not... what does the Bill actually do and what are we correcting?"

Bost: "It repeals language no longer necessary."

Black: "It says they... it says they don't have to do what?"

Bost: "It repeals some language that is no longer necessary."

Black: "What precise language are we repealing?"

Bost: "We are repealing Section 4-5-13."

Black: "Ahh, well. And that says... does that language specifically say that a... you can discuss resolutions or actions of the city council in private?" Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Hartke: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Are we still in the State of Illinois or are we in the state of confusion?"

Speaker Hartke: "I was not listening to the debate between..."

Black: "That's why I called on you, I could tell. That's a, ya know, look, pay attention, you're the..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hartke: "Are you confused?"

Black: "Very."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Bost, are you confused?"

Bost: "No, I'm not confused, but I'll tell you what we could do if the Representative would like, we can take it out of the record, we'll go and get that specific statute and we'll look it over."

Black: "Could we... could we..."

Speaker Hartke: "You're the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Bost, is that what you care to do?"

Bost: "Yes, that's..."

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

Black: "Could we... could we include the Speaker in that meeting as well?"

Speaker Hartke: "You could try. On page 36, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 1375. Representative Burke. Representative Burke. Out of the record. On page 34 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 132. Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. On... Let's go back to page 36, Third Reading, House Bill 1375. Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act in relation to victims of stalking and domestic violence. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Burke."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Burke: "Oh, I beg your pardon, Speaker, would you please take this out of the record? I think there is another Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Are you..."

Burke: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Hartke: "...in the state of confusion?"

Burke: "I am."

Speaker Hartke: "Okay."

Burke: "I beg your pardon."

Speaker Hartke: "Take this Bill out of the record. On page 37 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2311. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. On page 34 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 259. Representative Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 259, a Bill for an Act in relation to credit and debit cards. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 259 is one of several measures that we have seen and will see dealing with the issue of identity theft. What a lot of people don't realize is more often than not when you have issued a credit card fraud it's not the result of your credit card being stolen or your wallet being stolen as much as somebody getting the information contained on your credit card off a receipt that you may throw away, that you may discard that they may cross... come across some place. All of us have receipts and we're all cognizant of this fact.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

You look at that receipt, it has your full credit card number on there, it has your name, it has the expiration date and it really gives everybody what they need to start off on the path of identity theft. What this Bill does and there's no objection to the Bill is starting in 2005 it would require retailers to display no more than the last four or five digits of the credit card. It gives the merchants the adequate information that they need. There's an exemption for small businesses that handwrite out the receipts. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "Sponsor will yield."

Parke: "Representative, just one quick question. Have you resolved the opposition from the Illinois Bankers Association?"

Fritchey: "I'm sorry, Representative, I didn't hear that."

Parke: "I said, did you resolve the opposition that the Illinois Bankers Association had to your Bill?"

Fritchey: "Well, as a matter of fact there was a very significant Amendment to the Bill which came from not just the IBA but from a coalition of financial institutions and with that Amendment, as I said and I meant, I know of no opposition to the Bill including the IBA."

Parke: "Thank you."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Fritchey: "I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 20... 259?' All those in favor signify by saying... voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Millner, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Millner: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Millner: "I'd like this chamber, if you would, to welcome the president of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, Doug Hayse from Morris, Illinois, accompanied with Russ Laine, the vice president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. On page 38 of the Calendar, on Third Reading appears House Bill 2450. Representative Bost. Let's go back there. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill... House Bill 2450 has been read a third time, previously."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. After speaking with Representative Black and explaining. The Section 4-5-13 simply is language that was passed prior to the Open

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meetings Act. This is at the request of the Municipal League to remove it so that they don't have duplicative language and they know which way to actually react with the law."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2450?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'... Representative Mathias. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2450?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. page 33 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 13. Representative Coulson. Out of the record. Representative Mathias, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mathias: "I would just like the record to reflect that I would've voted 'yes' on House Bill 259."

Speaker Hartke: "The Journal will reflect your wishes."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "On page 33 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 13. Representative Coulson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 13, a Bill for an Act concerning teacher incentive and mentoring programs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 13 creates the Quality Teacher Incentive and Mentoring Law and provides grants to school districts. Ιt is subject The Amendment is from the Illinois... IEA. appropriation. And would encourage a 'yes' vote, because I do believe we need to make sure that in our mentoring programs that there is some direction to the Illinois State Board on how they set up the mentoring programs. Some of that money is currently in the budget and if it stays in the budget for next year I believe that they need to have some direction in how to set up those mentoring programs. And that's what House Bill 13 does. I can answer any..."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 13? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 13?' 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... Mr. Granberg. Mr. (sic-Ms.) Graham. Representative Graham. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

page 37 on the Calendar appears House Bill 1577. Mr. Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk... Mr. Mathias. Out of the record.

On page 38 on the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading,
appears House Bill 3058. Representative Pihos. Out... out
of the record? Out of the record. On page 39 on the
Calendar there appears House Bill 3386. Representative
Rose. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3386, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3386 allows the court to find a child... an abused child if that child is under the age of 18 years of age and is found in an environment where crystal methamphetamine is being manufactured. I agreed to hold this on Second until an Amendment that removed all language concerning a burden shift for criminal court cases that Amendment was adopted. This only applies in civil cases and what it does is it allows first responders to a crystal methamphetamine laboratory, it gives them the freedom to go ahead and remove that child from that environment where that laboratory's being operated by their parent. I would ask for an 'aye' vote and move this Bill be passed out of the House."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "To the Bill."

Fritchey: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the issue of methamphetamine creation and development and sale is a growing one that we're dealing with in this state. The residue that's created by the production of this pervades every aspect of a house. It gets on the walls, it gets in the fabrics, it gets in the rugs. It's a very extensive problem and somebody that subjects a child to that environment is as guilty of child abuse as someone that does any other physical harm to a child. This is a great Bill. Ya know, as we deal with these new issues of drugs, we have to deal with the surrounding issues that arise with them. Ya know, meth is a different animal than some of these other Bills... some of these other drugs because of this very problem. do have to cognizant of this. I commend the speaker on taking the lead on this thing, as a prosecutor he knows the problems that this can cause. Anybody that cares about cracking down on these issues, anybody that cares about child abuse in any of its forms really needs to come out and support this. Thank you."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Crystal methamphetamine is one of the most dangerous substances known to man. The anhydrous ammonia, that is quite frequently stolen from a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

farmer's field, if that's breathed and inhaled it can literally cause the lungs to collapse. To give you an example, I had a Mattoon police officer who last year in my district knocked down the door of a methamphetamine manufacturing lab, breathed in the anhydrous ammonia and spent six weeks in the hospital. That's how dangerous this stuff is. It's also highly flammable. It's an incendiary device. Earlier this year we passed a Bill classifying it as an incendiary device. If a minor child is present in a lab being operated by their parent, this is child abuse. And I would urge an 'aye' vote. And thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3386?' 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 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hannig in the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 115 for Representative Moffitt."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 115, a Bill for an Act in relation to fire protection. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this is the last of the package of Bills

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that the House task force presented. The package developed after the 22 hearings in the task force appointed by the Speaker. This... we passed similar legislation last spring in... to create a revolving loan fund at zero interest for the most needy fire departments in the state. creates the mechanism whereby we would have a place where we could administer the program. The State Fire Marshal would... would actually administer it. And the money would be kept and dispersed by the Rural Bond Bank. And then yesterday that Amendment made it the Rural Bond Bank and added the two fire districts, township districts This is... an idea that received Representative Bost's. strong support as we held those hearings around the state. It's not a giveaway program. It's a self-help program. And we think this could be a huge benefit to our fire districts, fire departments around the state. Be happy to entertain any questions that you might have."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 115. And on that question, Representative Smith is recognized."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I simply rise in support of this legislation. This is, as Representative Moffitt said, perhaps the crown jewel of our task force from last... from the last General Assembly. This is a program that I think is very much in need. And those of you who have talked to your fire departments, whether they're municipal or fire protection districts, know about their many needs. And this I think is an excellent

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

opportunity for us to create a program to help firefighters who put themselves in harm's way each and every day for us and for the rest of our constituents. This is an innovative approach to allowing them to create some of... or to purchase some of the equipment that is very difficult for them to do, particularly for the small rural volunteer fire departments that have a hard time generating the necessary revenue to make these major purchases. encouraged that just this afternoon the Governor has made some very positive comments about this very program. I'm hopeful that we can... we can see this come to fruition this Session. I commend Representative Moffitt for his unending dedication to this issue. And I know he's worked on this particular Bill for a number of years. I'm pleased to be a cosponsor. And I'd ask all the Members to support this legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "And so now, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1161."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act concerning unemployment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 1161 is an agreed Bill that will change the Unemployment Insurance Act. Will provide that the Department of Employment Security will have the ability to with consumer reporting agencies information to third parties on a individuals wage and employment history. What this allows is a perspective employer or credit agency could access work electronically rather than having to go back to the... the person's previous employer, they could do it employment security. It would be done with the written consent of the applicant credit or employment. happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1161. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 93 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin on 1165. Are you ready for that? Representative Colvin. Representative Colvin, are you ready on House Bill 1165? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1165 will in effect create a new commission. The commission will be entitled the Computer Equipment Disposal and Recycling Commission. And what the intent of the Bill is and what it's intended to do is to create a commission to deal with disposal... the proper disposal of personal computers once they've run through their use life. Personal computers right now have a number of contaminants if not disposed properly, such as mercury and lead and hard plastic, which if not disposed of properly can cause serious problems to the environment when they fill up in different landfills around the state. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote and I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1165. And on that question, Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Representative yield?"
- Speaker Hanniq: "He indicates he will yield."
- Meyer: "Thank you. Can you tell me what the cost of this is going to be?"
- Colvin: "There is no cost associated with the actual creation of the commission, the only cost that we may incur is if the commission members met and had to travel. So, at anything less than normal or routine expenses would be the only cost associated with the commission."
- Meyer: "Well, what exactly is the commission going to be commissioned to do?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Colvin: "What they... what we hope to accomplish here is that the commission members or the committee members will come up with a comprehensive plan for the proper disposal of computers that have run their use life, so that they don't end up in landfills with exposed lead and mercury and hard plastic. It's really an environmental friendly type of Bill as it relates to the proper disposal of a lot of harmful chemicals and elements that could end up in waterways and landfills. So, at this point, the... one of the biggest states that's doing it right now is the State of California. They have recognized the problem with old computers and how they end up in landfills with exposed lead and mercury being the two chief contaminants in landfills that can cause a serious problem."

Meyer: "Well, there are... there are a lot of pieces of equipment that are used in homes and manufacturing and other facilities that have metal content to them and who knows what could be in 'em as a part of the prod... of the manufacturing process. Why is it that you're picking out computers in this case as opposed to cameras, as opposed to a whole lot of different other things?"

Colvin: "Well, I don't know for a fact if it's a question of whether or not automobiles and I'm sure how you dispose of a used automobile has different significance, as well. I would imagine that at some point the recommendations and it's important that I point out that this commission when we make recommendations in terms of how you dispose of these equipment, in fact, would probably give people with

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

used cameras some indication of how those items will also have to be disposed that have made... maybe have lead. So, it could be a situation where we learn how to dispose of other elements or other electronic equipment that has some of these same elements, not just personal computers."

Meyer: "I'm still trying to put this together in my mind as to why we need this. Why can't we just tell what... what possible components of a computer..."

Colvin: "Could you..."

Meyer: "...or any other piece of..."

Colvin: "I can't hear you."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, it's very loud in here. Representative, what I'm..."

Meyer: "Representative, what I'm trying to get... to understand is why we're picking out this one item. Do you have some type of data that says computers are causing a great deal of a problem in our landfills or...?"

Colvin: "Actually, this Bill was... the reason I brought this Bill forth is because it has caused problems in other places where they have dealt with it. The State of California, the State of Georgia and they have done exactly the same thing as a result of computers being in landfills where you have exposed mercury, exposed lead and they have high count... and some of these products have high concentrations, particularly computers that were manufactured prior to the year of 1990. So, it is a big problem, especially when you take into account that just about every household in the country now and different

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

businesses and governments will throw out thousands and thousands of computers in a year. So, the problem it's not a question of why did I just pick out this one single element, the problem is we're talking about thousands upon thousands of different people who throw out computers, governments throw out thousands of computers a year. So, it's not like people are throwing out tens of thousands of cameras where the problem would be so great, but the problem with personal computers is they become so prolific in our society that over time it will create such a large problem."

- Meyer: "I would understand one of your comments during your response there was that it's mainly with computers that were manufactured prior to the 1990s. Is that correct?"
- Colvin: "No, this would deal with any personal computer or computer... or computer... manufactured computer component that ends up being tossed out into the trash and how it's properly disposed of so that we limit the exposure of lead and mercury and other harmful elements."
- Meyer: "Again, you referenced computers that were manufactured prior to 1990, I was trying to determine what the essence of that comment was."
- Colvin: "The essence of me... of what I said relative to 1990 is that the levels of lead and mercury in computers manufactured prior to 1990 are far greater than what they use in computers today. However, those elements are still being used in the manufacture... manufacturing of personal computers, hard drives and other computer components."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "Do you also... did you plan to have studies done on other types of equipment, radios, televisions on and on you can just start naming them one after another after another? And I'm still trying to find out why it is we've decided computers are gonna be the... the hot button that we're gonna measure and we're gonna solve the problems of some of these contaminants just by zeroing in on computers."

Colvin: "Well, I think of all the com... of all the different electronic elements that you just named, I think there's probably far greater number of computers than all of the rest of those elements put together, number one. Number two, if those elements exist in some of those other components that you just mentioned, I believe that this commission in terms of how they deal with how you dispose of these elements would also benefit those other... those other components that you mentioned in terms of how you properly dispose of those, as well."

Meyer: "Well, I don't know if I would agree with you that there are more computers in the world than there are radios and television sets, seems like I've got one computer in my house but of course one in my office here, but I've got numerous radios and television sets, not to belabor that point. Whe…"

Colvin: "But I would suggest though..."

Meyer: "Where did..."

Colvin: "But I would suggest if you did you have... if there were elements of lead or mercury in your televisions that this commission, in terms of how you dispose of those elements,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

would also benefit in terms of how you dispose of televisions or microwave ovens or whatever it may be."

Meyer: "Well, that's somewhat of a stretch, I think. But where did the genesis... what was the genesis of this Bill?"

Colvin: "Actually, I found this Bill on my own volition from an article I read in the <u>Wall Street Journal</u> over the summer."

Meyer: "I..."

Colvin: "And basically..."

Meyer: "I'm sorry, I couldn't understand that."

Colvin: "I found this Bill basically from an article I read in a publication, it may have been the Wall Street Journal, as it related to the problem in California and how they addressed the problem and later finding out the State of Georgia has exactly the same program, where they put together a commission in terms of how they deal with the disposal of computers before they end up in landfills and breaking down those elements and making sure they properly dispose of the lead, properly dispose of the mercury and other harmful elements that could cause a public health problem if it ended up in landfills, seepage into waterways and it's very important, I think. I don't think anybody here would argue with the fact that trying to provide protection in the way of public health is one of the main reasons we're all here."

Meyer: "Well, you referenced programs in two other states now.

Why didn't you take the approach of recommending a program as opposed to another study done on the relevance..."

Colvin: "Well, quite frankly..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "...of this..."

Colvin: "Quite frankly, what they did in those states came out of the fact that they formed commissions to study the problem as it relates to landfills in California, as it relates to landfills in Atlanta."

Meyer: "Well..."

Colvin: "I think more than anything, I kinda view this problem as a public safety issue. Now, we all, I think everyone here understands the danger of exposed lead, in particular in a landfill environment where it's not biodegradable, where it would sit there for years and years and years causing... which could potentially cause a problem as it relates to seepage into waterways and what have you. think as we've... what we've learned about lead and exposed mercury and we've seen plenty of Bills dealing with those elements and the danger that they've caused and many of us here received literature on the dangers of lead poisoning and mercury poisoning that it's important that we deal with this issue before it becomes a serious, serious problem. There is not too many pe... places in the world right now where you can't find a personal computer and as a result and as they run through their use life and end up in landfills when people throw them in their garbage can and it ends up God knows where, I think it's important that we address that. Just like in the mid '80s when we addressed the problem with disposable plastic and we came up with all these different programs for recycling, I kinda view this in the same way."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "Well, Representative, perhaps you will find relevance to the disposal of other things besides computers. I certainly wouldn't quarrel with you at all about wanting to determine how we can better clean up our environment. But thank you for your responses and I'm sure the Bill will pass and I'm sure I'll be supporting it."

Colvin: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Boland."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Boland: Bill and commend the Gentleman for bringing it forth. we all know, what happens in the environmental area in particular is that long after a problem has developed then we recognize the damage that's been done and we come back in and we're trying to find solutions to it and it's often very, very costly. We are almost always reactive to environmental problems in particular, often problems in general. This is a proactive approach. This is getting us ahead of the horse. We're getting ahead of the train here and being able to look at what are the problems, how do we deal with them, what's going on, how much environmental pollution could this be causing, how much mercury is getting into the environment from this disposal? now, I doubt that any of us have probably thought about this issue, maybe we've read an article, as I have, as obviously, the... the Sponsor has. But ya know, we kinda let it go at that and we don't really move on it and do anything until much, much later and then we come in and we say, oh, we've got this big problem, what are we gonna do?

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

All this mercury and other materials are... are in our landfills, they're being dumped in other places, it's causing a great public health problem. It's causing an environmental problem. Ya know, this is what happened with Ya know, lead was in our gasoline, lead was in our paint, it was in our homes, it was in our buildings, and so forth. And we can say the same thing about asbestos now. Ya know, we never got ahead of the problem, this is an approach that is really is highly commendable, because it's getting us out in front of the problem before it becomes so massive that we've gotta come in here with multimillions of dollars and all kinds of studies and all kinds of actions to take care of it. So, I would hope that all of us vote 'yes' on this and that the commission comes back with the report in due time so that we can begin to take action on this. It's time for the Land of Lincoln instead of always being the-drag-behind state that we actually be the leading state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, I rise in support of this Bill. Representative Colvin's got a very fine piece of legislation. Eco waste is the next century... this century's number one environmental problem. The disposal of the waste that we all have in so many different places from our phones to our televisions, our computers at home, multiples, not just one washing machine every ten years, but maybe the new computer every two years and then what do you do with the old one and there aren't places to put

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

they could be very harmful to because the environment, the contamination of lead. Other states have tried and done some minor legislation, Massachusetts and California are two of them. Other states are looking into There's a supply of legislation available on the web to see what other states are doing, I'm sure the commission will look into this if it's established. It's really a There are some companies in the United major concern. States that are shipping their used computers to China to dispose of them, because they don't have regulations in China for the disposition of 'em all and it's creating a problem with the water system in China. So, it's a major problem in the United States. It's only growing as we pur... continue to purchase more of these goods. It's a fine idea, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, there's language in your Bill about how these... these people... this commission will be appointed. I assume that that language is moot if the Governor's proposal continues to advance, then all this language will just be removed by the Governor's action. Correct?"

Colvin: "I'm sorry, Representative, I can barely hear you."

Black: "Well, the Governor..."

Colvin: "Could you..."

Black: "...the Governor is advancing legislation to say that he and he alone will appoint members of commissions and will

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

determine whether or not they are paid. Now, your Bill has language in it that says how all of these people will be appointed. I assume that if the Governor's Bill progresses through the House and the Senate and since it's his Bill I'm sure he will sign it into law, then the language in your Bill about who we'll appoint how many people of the commission, I am sure will be null and void. Correct?"

"Two points on that. One, I think what's most important here is that this commission is enacted so we can deal with the serious problem. In terms of how these individuals get appointed is not as important to me as the fact that we begin to work on a very serious problem as it relates to computer disposals. If the Governor's Bill is successful in passing through the House and the Senate and being signed into law, then my Bill would probably adjusted accordingly, in fact, it would be subject to that law and as a result, ya know, I don't think I'll lose any sleep over the fact that the Governor appointed the members of the commission as long as those members of the commission are capable in working towards coming up with a reasonable and commonsense solution to dealing with the disposal of computers."

Black: "Well, I just wanted to make sure you understand that..."

Colvin: "I'm aware of the Governor's legislation."

Black: "...the Governor is proposing that he and he alone name all these commissions, what if he doesn't agree with ya?

All these other commissions were established by law, what if he just wipes this out?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Colvin: "Again, it's not the thrust of my Bill that the Governor has the sole authority or not to appoint the commissions, the thrust of my Bill is that we deal with the disposal of used computers."

Black: "Okay. I just didn't want you to get crosswise with the Governor. Whatever. Thank you."

Colvin: "I appreciate your concern, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Novak: "Marlow, this is a good idea, I'm glad you thought of it. We had a Bill last year on recycling computer parts because of the problems that you pointed out. In addition, not only the mercury, but it's the cathode ray tubes, a lot of these old... old monitors become real cumbersome and burdensome and you just... you just don't wanna... seems like you don't wanna throw 'em in the landfills and there's a lot of recycling possibilities with old computers. But you might wanna consider when this thing gets over to the Senate, instead of forming a commission, I mean, ya know, if it runs... if it butts heads with the Governor's boards and commissions reorganization proposal, you might wanna just consider an in-house task force within the agency of the EPA to do the same thing. You just might wanna think about that."

Colvin: "That's an excellent suggestion."

Novak: "Okay."

Colvin: "Thank you, Representative."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Novak: "Okay."

Colvin: "I think that's excellent."

Novak: "But it's a good idea and I think everybody should support this Bill. You know how quick technology changes, you can buy a computer one day for a thousand dollars and three weeks later you see the same thing in the... in a... in the <u>PC World Magazine</u> that it's half the price and it's already outdated, so we know how quick technology jumps and advances with respect to, ya know, microchips and all the other technological advances in the computer age. So, it's a good Bill and everybody should support it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin to close."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill and I have to agree with Representative Boland and his comments in terms of what we're trying to accomplish in being out front and dealing with the problem because... before it becomes so serious that, ya know, once again we're being reactionary. This Bill, I think, just speaks to a cleaner and safer environment. And I urge everyone to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 110 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hultgren, for what reason do you rise?"

Hultgren: "Point of personal privilege."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."
- Hultgren: "I would request that the record reflect that it was my intention to vote 'no' on House Bill 1195. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Journal will so reflect your intentions.

 Representative Stephens, for what reasons do you rise?"
- Stephens: "On behalf of the Speaker, Representative Hannig was not recorded having voted on the last Bill. And I'm pretty sure... while the board didn't indicate it, I'm... I'm pretty sure that you favored the Bill. And I'd just like the record to reflect that along with other downstaters, conservative and liberal alike, Republicans and Democrats, good guys and bad guys, you wanted to be with us."
- Speaker Hannig: "Absolutely. Thank you, Representative Stephens. Representative Kelly, for what reason do you rise? Representative... Representative McGuire, for what reason do you rise?"
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was in the powder room and I did not vote. I would like to be recorded as an 'aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, the Journal will so reflect your intentions. Representative Kelly, for what reason do you rise?"
- Kelly: "I also would like to be recorded as an `aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you. Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Same story, I should've been an 'aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Just got to hit those switches. We'll all try to do better. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2425 for Representative Capparelli?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2425, a Bill for an Act concerning currency exchanges. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In a time when people are trying to cut costs and save money, House Bill 2425 is exactly what the summary says. It amends the Currency Exchange Act to allow currency exchanges to meet the bonding requirement under the Act, allowing members of statewide association to buy and purchase a blanket board (sic-bond) up to \$2 million for all those belonging to the association. I don't know of anyone who would oppose of this. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 2425. Is there any discussion? On that question, Representative Parke is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Parke: "Representative, is there anybody in opposition to your Bill?"

Capparelli: "Not that I know of, no."

Parke: "Representative, I want you to know I like your Bill and I'm gonna vote for it."

Capparelli: "That's... that's great."

Parke: "Well, I just wanted you to know, Representative Capparelli, that you do have good legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

all voted who wish? 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 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 3440 for Representative Lyons?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3440, a Bill for an Act concerning vaccinations in health facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3440, as amended yesterday, provides that facilities licensed under the Life Care Facilities Act and the Nursing Home Care Act must document evidence of vac... vaccination for in... influenza and pneumococcal diseases for each resident age 65 and over to be completed by November 30th of each year. It also requires that residents who are admitted between November 30th and February 1st of any year should also be inoculated, unless, of course, any resident who refuses the shot has that right to refuse or if they're medically contradicted (siccontraindicated) certainly will not be given the shot. addition to that, should the Center for Disease Control determine that there's something else that has to be done they would fall under the changes in the law that would be as... as disclosed by the Center for the... for Disease Control, if it's not the dates that we're talking here of

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

November... November 1st. So, this is an initiative of the AARP, Association of Illinois Senior Care Centers. It's also been passed in 21 different states, including our neighboring states of Kentucky, Indiana, and Michigan, the sunbelt states of Texas, Florida, and Arizona. So it's a protection for our senior citizens of age 65. We amended it, of course, to make it Medicare eligible so there would be no cost to... to the facilities or to the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I certainly hope you can help me and pass this vote for the senior citizens in Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3440. And on that question, Representative Parke is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Parke: "With your Amendment have you removed all the opposition or does the... is the Illinois Health Care Association still opposed to this Bill?"

Lyons, J.: "Representative Parke, the Illinois Healthcare
Association is still stands in opposition to this. I think
the nature..."

Parke: "Can you tell the..."

Lyons, J.: "...the nature of their opposition, if I can anticipate your question...

Parke: "Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Representative, is the liability issue that they Lyons, J.: perceive as could be a problem in the event that there'd be a problem with the batch of the inoculation that came, which according to trial lawyers who have also looked at this said, well, if that'd be the case they would certainly not have any liability. It would be on them on the shoulders of the... of the producers of the vaccination. And the other issue would be if a patient is wrongly inoculated by somebody who does work for a nursing home, while there should be some recourse for that type of a problem. So, I... my understanding of long-term care association's opposition is the liability issue. I might want to point out for as many years as these laws have been on the books, according to our records, we don't have any record of anybody ever being sued at the personal level or at the national level for wrongful inoculation or for wrong... for whatever made up the inoculation... the inoculation to be the wrong substance."
- Parke: "Yeah, but, Representative, if, in fact, they had a bad batch and people died wouldn't that put them almost out of... that prob... that could put them out of business."
- Lyons, J.: "Well, it would put the pharmaceutical producer out of business. But there would be no lia..."
- Parke: "Well, yeah. But they administered it."
- Lyons, J.: "They shouldn't put liability in the person who gave the shot. These are the pneumonia shots and the influenza shots that many of us receive every year. It's a proven program that has been successful not only here in Illinois

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

but across the country. And now we're trying to make this a... a requirement for seniors in nursing home facilities."

Parke: "So, you removed the... you lowered the rate from 65 to 60?"

Lyons, J.: "No, we took the rate up so the Medicare would kick in. We..."

Parke: "From 60 to 65."

Lyons, J.: "We took it from 60 up to 65."

Parke: "Okay. All right, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, I don't think anybody can fault the underlying legislation but it... it does put the... some people involved in the Illinois Health Care Association at tremendous risk, which they will probably end up having to buy some additional insurance and try and provide some coverage. So, it's a shame that the Sponsor could not work out some kind of a common ground with the... with the content of his Bill and... and that association. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Slone."

Slone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he will yield."

Slone: "Representative Lyons, can you tell me what would happen in an instance where a nursing home resident was unable to give consent to the inoculation?"

Lyons, J.: "Well, there are the medical records that are kept in the nursing homes. And... and this inoculation would be added to those records so my... you know, should assume nothing on this, Representative Slone. But my guess would be that... that there is provisions in here where if there is

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

a... a warning or an issue by a doctor that this person should not be receiving these shots, that that should be on record with the whole. Now somebody, of course, who's fully cognizant can always refuse the shot, as some... some of us choose not to get it. But in the case of somebody not being able to make that decision, I think the intention here would be that there would records that you'd have to get authority from somebody who could make a informed decision on this."

Slone: "Okay. So, like a relative or maybe that person's physician would have to give consent on their behalf? I just... the Bill..."

Lyons, J.: "Ricca"

Slone: "I don't know if the Bill even deals with this."

Lyons, J.: "I can hardly hear you, Ricca, I'm sorry."

Lyons, J.: "Does the Bill… would a relative say, somebody who has, you know, power of attorney for health care or maybe their physician be able to consent?"

Lyons, J.: "Well, I... not knowing the... how current law addresses that, somebody with power of attorney, and we can refer to our attorneys here, I think does make that decision for somebody who's not able to make that decision on their own, that's the purpose of power of attorney."

Slone: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

"Representative Lyons, I'm asking the same questions along what the last Representative asked. My concern is someone who would un be... who would be unable to make that determination on their own would get the shot. earlier '90s, late '80s AIDS victims who were given flu vaccines, some of them died from it. Now, how... how would you determine if someone was not able to make that decision? I mean, I think you would have to have... would that be by administrative rule? Or who would make the determination on how you would decide who would make that decision and how it would be in the record, rather than give someone that wasn't really lucid the shot without asking anyone or just consulting records that maybe their doctor or family member should have the first say-so on whether they should get that shot or not?"

Lyons, J.: "Well, Representative Mulligan, I... I... I don't know if I'm qualified to answer that question on... with any authority. My... my knowledge of nursing home operations... I would hope that if somebody is not there to make a decision somebody would not just arbitrarily go around and start giving them influenza or pneumonia shots without somebody's permission who has next of kin or a medical doctor who would be involved with that person if they deteriorated to the position where they no longer can make decisions like that. I would hope that between a family or if not a family, a medical attending physician or a doctor that's been assigned to the home or whatever would make that decision. But I don't... you know, with the existing

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

situation now, I... I couldn't, with authority, answer that question for you."

- Mulligan: "Well, I think also... one of the Representatives before also asked about liability for nursing homes. And yet, it seems like this... that your Bill leaves out covering them against liability, but also is not very clear-cut on who would make that decision. Now, if it's made by... by rule, I would think we could handle it by making it by rule. But there should be some provision there that delineates who would make that decision for someone that might not be able to make a good clear-cut medical decision about whether they should get that shot or not."
- Lyons, J.: "Representative, I... I'm not opposed to, if this thing goes to the Senate, to try to address some of these issues at this point in time. I mean, I think we can get a responsible Sponsor over there that would... it's a good question. It's a good point. I'm not disagreeing with your concerns here."
- Mulligan: "Do you have someone in the Senate that's going to pick this Bill up that you could..."
- Lyons, J.: "I don't have anybody in particular who's gonna pick this up right now. But..."
- Mulligan: "Would you put a memo in the file that says that that's a... this is an issue that needs to be addressed?"
- Lyons, J.: "Pardon me, Rosemary?"
- Mulligan: "Would you put a memo in your file and send it over to whoever picks the Bill up that this is an issue that should be addressed?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Lyons, J.: "I... I agree with you completely and I'd be glad to accommodate you on that. It's a good issue that should be addressed before this goes to the Governor's desk or beyond what we're gonna do here today."
- Mulligan: "All right. I thank you."
- Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Lyons to close."
- Lyons, J.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill has passed in 21 different states, as I mentioned earlier, including three surrounding states for us and many of the sunbelt states. The questions on... that have been addressed here are important ones and things that I would like to get answered as much as the people who asked them here today. And we'll certainly do so when this thing goes to the Senate. But I would ask for your favorable consideration on this Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Mr... Representative Hartke, do you wish to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 20?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 20, a Bill for an Act amending the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. all know, we have some real serious teacher shortages in our state. When I went to college we had all kinds of people becoming teachers. We had more teachers than you could count. But today we have teaching shortages not only in different geographic regions of Illinois, but also even in areas where we have enough teachers we have shortages of teachers in designated areas of discipline. House Bill 20 is part of a... an approach to find more teachers. know, we passed a Bill out of this chamber last week making it easier for foreign-born teachers to continue to stay here and teach while their citizenship is pending. Bill would create a teaching scholarship for those who choose to teach in designated shortage areas if they... for five years. Now we have some programs today that require they do it for one year, which would ala ... enable people to get the scholarship and, after one year, leave teaching. The average length of the life of a teacher in our system is about three years. This would require teachers to teach for five years in an area designated by the state board that was an area of need, whether it be by geography or whether it be by discipline area. And if we are true to our word that education is important and true to our word that we need more teachers to teach our children in areas of Illinois where there are shortages, we have to do something to encourage people to stay in the system. And this is an important Bill for that reason. It's part of

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

our process of improving education in Illinois. And I would ask for your votes."

Speaker Hannig: "The... the Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 20. And on that question, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Parke: "Representative, do you have any idea what this is gonna cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "Well, I think I can see from over here, Representative, you have a fiscal note in your hand. The fiscal note says it's going to cost \$30 million but it is not going to cost \$30 million. The fiscal note is based on an estimate. And it's based on an estimate that 25 percent of the college students who might be eliqible will avail themselves to this program. But of course, we know that won't happen because today most teachers don't teach more than three years, that's first. And this would require five years. And no one's gonna make that commitment and they'd have to pay the money back and it wouldn't cost the treasurer any money anyway. The second reason is, today we have a very small program in Illinois to encourage people to teach in discipline areas where there are shortages. And there are only 291 people who've availed themself of that scholarship. So the estimate of \$30 million is grossly overstated."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Parke: "Okay, let's cut it in half, \$15 million. Let's say it's \$15 million. What tax increase are you gonna sponsor to pay... provide the \$15 million, Representative?"

Lang: "Well, I would say that even 15 million is overstated, but let's assume any..."

Parke: "It's 10 million."

Lang: "Let's assume it's \$1.98. The point you want to know is..."

Parke: "All right. What tax are you gonna sponsor for \$1.98?"

Lang: "...how are we gonna pay for this. That's what you want to know, right?"

Parke: "Well, I want to know what tax you're gonna sponsor."

"We're going to pay for this because we have to reprioritize spending in Illinois. We should not start from the assumption that all... everything we spend money on we're gonna continue to spend money on and then we have to find new money to fund the program. It's up to us in this chamber to prioritize our spending. And we have said, you have said, and I have said, and the rest of us in this chamber and across the rotunda have said that educating children is the most important thing we do in Illinois. We spend millions and millions of dollars on education. And I would submit to you that this amount of money, whatever it is, must be expended because we have areas of Illinois, and your colleagues on your side of the aisle from rural Illinois and my colleagues on my side of the aisle from rural Illinois and in other places, will submit to you that they simply don't have enough teachers.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

We have to find ways to get teachers teaching in our system if we're gonna improve education in Illinois."

Parke: "Representative, what are we gonna do with the other teacher scholarship programs that we passed, the ITEACH, which is out there and the... the SETTW, the Special Education Teacher Tuition Waiver Program? What are we gonna do with those? Are we gonna just pass those, too and just keep it? Repre... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, nobody can find fault with the Sponsor's Bill. I mean, it... it does... it does solve a problem. But I need to know where we're gonna take the money from. If we provide the money for these programs and we have all these... these two other programs, now we're gonna have a third program, where is the money gonna come from? This state is broke. When are you going to start realizing you cannot keep passing these kinds of legislation? Well intended, good ideas, but now you're gonna do is your gonna put it on the desk of the Governor. Governor, you're gonna have to veto these Bills. You can't pay for these Bills. continue to do that. I mean, I don't envy this Governor because all these are gonna be stacked up. Tens and hundreds of millions of dollars of Bills we've passed already this Session are gonna be on the desk of the Governor and he won't have money to pay for it. Keep passing 'em. Keep passing 'em. You can go and put out your press release and say what a good boy I am or good birl I... girl I am, I passed these legislation. Well, it's disingenuous 'cause we don't have the money to pay for it.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

When are we gonna start thinking about the taxpayers of this state? Ladies and Gentlemen, I will be voting against this because I don't believe we can pay for it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the... the..."

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "...Sponsor yield? Thank you. Representative, I don't necessarily disagree with what you're attempting to do here at all. But I don't quite understand how some of this works. Amendment #1, can you explain that to me?"

Lang: "Amendment #1, Representative, was a... a technical Amendment that, in essence, requires that the money not be paid to the recipients but directly to the university..."

Meyer: "All right."

Lang: "...so that we don't have an accounting problem trying to get money back from... from the recipient."

Meyer: "Well, who... who is going to give the money back if the reciprient... reciprocant doesn't follow through with their obligation? Where is that money coming from? It's coming from..."

Lang: "ISAC is to create rules to deal with this issue. So, the person... if the person doesn't graduate they're gonna have to pay the money back. If they don't teach for five years in the area... in an area designated by the State Board of Education they're gonna have to pay the money back."

Meyer: "What is that mechanism? Is that money going to be paid back by the university or is it coming back directly from the student to the state?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Lang: "Well, ISAC would come up with rules to do that. But my presumption is that ISAC would have a mechanism in their rules to go to the person who benefited from the scholarship and say, hey, you gotta pay us back."

Meyer: "And again, where is that money going to be paid back to? The school so they can reimburse the state or the student would have to..."

Lang: "We allow I... sorry."

Meyer: "...pay it back..."

Lang: "We allow ISAC to do that by rules, Sir."

Meyer: "What do you envision? I... I guess I'm concerned, Representative, with who's gonna be on the hook? The school or... or the... the student?"

Lang: "The student. The student is responsible if they don't

(A) complete college, or (B) teach for five years in one of
the designated shortage area they have to pay the money
back. The university is not on the hook."

Meyer: "Well, I'm not so sure that I trust rules to make up...

make up... to... to actually put that concept into being. I... I

would like to see that strengthened, perhaps, over in the

Senate because, again, I expect this will pass. And I'll

probably be supporting it but I am concerned that we don't

go down the road of... back when I went to school I... I

borrowed a fair amount of my college tuition through

federal programs and took ten years to pay it back and paid

it on schedule and retired that debt. But I know there are

a lot of student loans that have never been paid back.

People have found a way to walk away from it, leaving the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Federal Government holding the bag. And of course, as you well know, the Federal Government is all of us. So, my... my concern is that we really tighten this up to the point where we make sure that we get the money back from students. If I can go on to another subject area. Today I start at a school that's credited through this program. And... and I say, okay, fine, I'm going to take advantage of it. At what point do I sign up for this area to... to say I'm going to teach there for five years?"

Lang: "The... well, this would be part of the rules ISAC would set up. But the way it's vi... envisioned is that you tell ISAC up front I'm gonna do this and upon graduation ISAC gives you a list of places to choo... not ISAC but the Board of Education would give you a list of places to choose from. Now, there... there's gonna be two different lists. One is gonna be a list based on geography, tea... school districts that just simply don't have enough teachers. One list is gonna be based on discipline. So it could be a school that has plenty of teachers but they need a biology teacher or they need a French teacher or whatever it might be. So, then they would choose. Now, I was asked in committee whether it meant that these people had to teach in one place for five years. And, again, ISAC would have rules but my... my vision of this is no. My vision of this is as long an area... an area of shortage, people ought to be able to move around within the system."

Meyer: "Okay. Well, you... you have prospective answers to my questions. I thank you for answering that 'cause that was

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the next question I was going to ask. The other area that I'm concerned with is today I agree to teach in a certain area and, of course, it goes on the list... it's a part of a list and a hundred other people commit to teachin that area also and now next year that area is fully staffed and it's no longer on the list. Does that mean that I would have to move to a different area that was... was on... on this list of understaffed geographic areas?"

Lang: "Well, presumably, if a school district says they need a biology teacher and they hire you, they're gonna continue to need a biology teacher. But if they would decide they no longer need one I guess there are two remedies. One is, ISAC would have rules and say go to the State Board of Education, they'll tell you somewhere else you can teach. Or, we don't wanna, I don't think, burden these people too much. If... if the shortage area closes up, through no fault of their own, I don't think they should be penalized and I would expect that would be part of the rule."

Meyer: "Well, that is what I'd hoped to hear from you, Representative. And, of course, as you move forward at the Bill I... I'm certain that you'll probably... I believe you're on JCAR, if I'm not mistaken. But you'll probably have input on it. I... I certainly believe that would be very, very fair. I think that you've answered my basic questions on... on this legislation. I thank you for those answers."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kurtz."

Kurtz: "Mr. Speaker, will the..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, the Sponsor will yield."

Kurtz: "...Sponsor yield, please? Speaking of teachers, there are quite a few around. In my district the referendum do not pass and in District 300, 200 teachers were fired right off the bat. And I'm afraid that's going to happen more and more. So there will be teachers around and I would just like to apprise you of the fact that maybe we better start at the... the real root and try to fund education the way it should be funded, from the state. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In any other given year I would've support this wholeheartedly, coming from an area... not only from my area but all over the state. I think the Bill is right. Unfortunately, it's like so many Bills we're trying to deal with right now, it's a... it's a cost. It's an increase when we don't even know where the Governor's budget's going, we've haven't seen the Governor's budget. We... we know that we've got a hole, we don't know how to fill it. But yet, we keep passing out legislation that the... the amount of money that we're spending just keeps going up and no one has... has figured out how to cure the problem yet. I... I just will... will say that though I support the idea, I believe in the idea. A 'present', until we see what's gonna actually happen with our budget, is the appropriate way to go on this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I'm hearing on the floor is that most people think this is a great idea. I hear

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

some issues about cost. First, the cost is not that great given what we spend on education. But more to the point, we craft the budget of the State of Illinois. We... we're gonna decide where to cut it. We're gonna decide what the priorities are. Yes, we're gonna get a plan from the Governor but in the Governor's State of the State Address he told us that he wanted to create teacher scholarships to deal with shortages in areas. So the Governor's gonna cover this issue. If he doesn't we should. Many of us come from districts that need teachers. Many of us come from districts that need teachers in different areas. cannot come to the House Floor and in good conscience say that we care about the public school children of Illinois if we don't provide them enough teachers. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 20 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 85 voting 'yes', and 6 voting
'no', 25 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received
a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Wyvetter Younge, are you ready on 2601? Mr.
Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2601, a Bill for an Act in relation to East St. Louis area economic development. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Younge."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2601 would re... reenact the East St. Louis Development Authority, which would do development in the East St. Louis area, in East St. Louis, Brooklyn, Venice, Washington Parke, and Centreville. There would be a small cost in reference to it. The cost that would be needed to hirer an executive director to get the agency started. There would be ten members of the board and the mayors of the various cities involved would be on the board plus the director of DCCA and the Illinois Finance Development Authority. The authority would have the power to issue bonds but only after other agencies that issue bonds have been asked to do so. The authority would not have the power to tax, it would not have the... the power to engage the full faith and credit of the State of Illinois. And... and that's it. This... this instrument is badly needed in the East St. Louis area and I ask your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2601. And on that question, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady indicates she will yield."

Stephens: "Representative, I thought I heard you say this reenacts the provisions of the Development Act. How long has the East St. Louis Development Act been on the books?"

Younge: "The East St. Louis Development Authority was repealed on the 1st Ju... 1st July, '98."

Stephens: "After... now help me out here. I... I don't remember when... when it started."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Younge: "It started about two or threes years before that."

Stephens: "And what was the reason that it was not re...
reenacted? Can you des... I'm trying to re... refresh my
memory, I'm sorry."

Younge: "Right. I... I really don't know specifically why it was repealed. It had been in operation a very short time and started its work. I do know the... the lapidation and deterioration of the East St. Louis area has continued to progress and it's important that we do something about it now."

Stephens: "Thank you. This... this is separate from the oversight committee for the city council, isn't it?"

Younge: "It... it is a separate entity, yes."

Stephens: "All right. In its previous life did it... was it able to issue any bonds?"

Younge: "No, it was not in... in existence..."

Stephens: "Did it... was it able to hire any personnel?"

Younge: "It... it hired an executive director."

Stephens: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Younge: "It hire... hired an executive director..."

Stephens: "Speaker."

Younge: "... but it did not have..."

Stephens: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Could you... could you give the speakers a little attention please? Representative Younge."

Younge: "To answer the question, it hired... the authority hired an executive director but the... it had not issued any bonds."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Stephens: "Do you expect a budget of state funds for this agency?"

Younge: "I will make a request to the appropriations process for a small amount for the salary for first year of the executive director in somewhere in the neighborhood of, say, \$75 thousand or something like that."

Stephens: "And... what? Excuse..."

Younge: "I say somewhere in the neighborhood of maybe 50, 75 thousand dollars to hire an executive director."

Stephens: "How do you get a job like that?"

Younge: "Well, a... a person..."

Stephens: "I... I'm sorry, Representa... I'm sorry. I didn't mean to be... be... In 1998, when the agency sunsetted, the last request, I believe, was for \$160 thousand. Is that what we're thinking about now?"

Younge: "Yes, that was the request, but in view of the financial woes of the state it would probably be important to be more conservative than that at this point."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Stephens: "You know, I don't know a Representative, and certainly including myself, that works harder for their district than Representative Younge. And I think she should be commended for that. The… but the harsh truth is that a lot of times the ideas that she's put forth with all the best intentions have been taken advantage of back in… in the district. I... I wish to work with her. I think that an East St... a development authority in our region of the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

state is appropriate. I believe we have one already that encompasses East St. Louis into the rest of the… the region. I think we should work through that authority. They do have bonding authority and they have quick-take privileges. We come before the Legislature every year and reestablish those quick-take authority. Representative Younge, my pledge to you is to work with you. This Bill's gonna get out of here. I hope you understand why I'm voting 'no' and I appreciate you answering my questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Rep... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor will yield."

Meyer: "Representative, I... I would... again, I... it was very hard to hear what some of your responses to the previous Representative were. What amount of money do you envision requesting as a part of the budget for this?"

Younge: "What I will talk with the appropriations process about is enough to retain or hire an executive director to begin and... and to set up the agency. And what I said was that I thought that between 50, 75 thousand dollars would be the appropriate amount that... to hire a person who has development skills who has been in the development field. And so that was what... what I said, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "One of my concerns was you said, 'maintain and... and hire.' The maintain part is the part I'm concerned about because that would... I would believe that would include office space and staff and things like that, in

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

addition to the salary of the executive director. Do you intend to ask appropriation for that amount of money also?"

Younge: "I... I think that the request should be limited to... to the staff. And I... I think the point is for the agency to have funds to run on until the development fees come in.

An agency such as this authority could... can be self-sustaining from development fees but the question is the initial setup, Representative."

Meyer: "Prior to... prior to this, when the previous development authority was abandoned due to being inactive, what has changed, in your mind, that would take it from an inactive status to an active status so that it could begin to generate enough money to support itself?"

Younge: "Well... more land has been cleared in the area involved here. There is more development opportunity because there is more dilapidation and deterioration. There is more of an opportunity, I think, for commercial and industrial development and residential development with the... I think that the urge... the need is greater and more... basically because the loss of population. I think that the factors which caused the need for this authority have multiplied. And it is needed more today than... than it was in the past. I think the getting of titles together, land, banking and accumulation, getting the land ready for development is... is needed now. And so, the... the need has grown. The time has proved the theory correctly."

Meyer: "But what has the population done in terms of increasing/decreasing in this area?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Younge: "In... in this area... for example, East St. Louis, there were at one time 127 thousand people that lived in East St. Louis. Today there are 31 thousand."
- Meyer: "Is that population pretty stable at this point or is that pop... is that number go up and down or is it trending downward yet?"
- Younge: "There is a loss of populations from the '90 census to 2000 census. The surrounding communities have also lost population. And... and that is another factor which causes the need for this authority."
- Meyer: "Well, Re… Represe… Representative, could you amplify on your statement… again, it was very noisy in here with one of your earlier responses concerning bonding authority. Will this… will this group or organization have bonding authority?"
- Younge: "Yes, it would have the authority to issue revenue bonds but only after it had asked other agencies that can issue bonds to do so first. If no agency takes the authority up on its request, then it can then issue the bonds."
- Meyer: "But what is the limit of their authority? What will the limit of their authority be?"
- Younge: "I know the... I think that the time period is 20 years.

 I don't know the... the limit of the authority."
- Meyer: "Could you repeat that? Again, I'm... we're having a hard time understanding or hearing it over here."
- Younge: "I don't think that there is a limit in the Bill of the authority to issue bonds."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "I can't hear."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer, could you repeat your question."

Meyer: "Yes. Representative, I apologize. Again, the noise has been too great for us to hear. You have a very soft voice, Representative. And my question is, what is the limit of bonding authority that you would be granted through this passage of this Bill?"

Younge: "Representative, I don't know the answer to that. I will seek out an answer and if there is no limit in the Bill I'll correct that in the Senate."

Meyer: "Well, certainly I... I believe that with a... and again, if you'd just follow through with by reasoning, what you're asking us to do is to reinitiate a... an authority that in the past is proven ineffective for whatever reason. And I know that your area is very much in need of this development, but the history of it has been that it hasn't worked out in the past. Now you're before us with a Bill that would, as it's written currently, would give you unlimited bonding authority. And even though they'd be revenue bonds, revenue bonds might be very, very hard to sell. But given the circumstances of development there... but even so, it... it is unlimited and that should be taken look at in consideration as we this legislation. Representative, I... I would echo what the previous Representative has said that there's nobody down here that works more tirelessly for their district than you do. I... I question whether what you're bringing before us today is

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

actually gonna work and it's a great deal of concern because, again, we're looking at expenditure of even a small part... portion of funds at this point. If it doesn't work this time, you'll be back again next year with additional costs. My concern is that we don't see large amounts of money requested through the budgeting process, certainly we have input to it. But, quite frankly, on a line-to-line basis, sometimes it's kind of hard to... to really control what is in that... in that budget. Thank you for your responses."

Younge: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Holbrook: "Representative Younge, did this group that existed up before... didn't it not meet? I mean, did they... didn't they stop meeting and that's why we didn't renew this, I thought?"

Younge: "I don't..."

Holbrook: "I thought they didn't come together and never meet."

Younge: "Yes, they came together and had meetings. They... they met for a year or more and worked on projects."

Holbrook: "Back in the eighties or nineties?"

Younge: "In the nineties."

Holbrook: "Nineties, okay. There is no..."

Younge: "It's the... the development process takes a number of years. And it was not, in creative... and in reality, long

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

enough to complete the development process. This is really what occurred."

Holbrook: "There's no appropriation in this Bill. If we pass this Bill and there is no appropriation, will this authority go ahead and meet and will the cities fund it? Will the towns all chip in a little and... and get this thing going if the state decides not to..."

Younge: "I'm sure it will receive funds from... from private foundations and from other sources."

Holbrook: "So this... this Bill does not lock in a financial source for it at this point? It'd be up to the appropriation process or up to the... the cities or private entities to help get this going, like we do with our Southwest Illinois Development Authority that's funded through its bond receipts, is that correct?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Holbrook: "All right. Thank you."

Younge: "Sure."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Younge to close."

Younge: "I ask for your support in this very important matter."

Speaker Hannig: "And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 80... 79 voting 'yes', 32 voting
'no', and 5 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
passed. Representative Rita, for what reason do you rise?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Rita: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Rita: "I'd like to recognize that we have up in the gallery the township officials of Illinois and township officials from out the state have their topics stated, they're gonna be down here. I'd like to welcome 'em."

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Molaro, are you ready for House Bill 1364? Mr. Clerk, would you read that Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a pretty straightforward Bill. Has to do with the... General Assembly's scholarships. Basically what it ... the way the law is now, you have to nominate someone on or before the first day of class. And what's happened to me over the last 10 or 11 years, 12 years, and I've talked other Members, that what invariably happens... University of Illinois and Western and Northern, thank God, are... are very desirable schools to get into. So what happens is, a lot of people are waitlisted. They go to other colleges, try to get in. Since some of the children... some of the young adults that are admitted to those colleges call up and say that they're not going in. So what happens is, you can register about... I'd say it's 10 days or 2 weeks after the first day of class. So, they are called and they've said okay, you can come into U of I or Western Illinois and they

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

go and they register but it's after the first day of class. They contact our office and they say, 'oh, by the way, I've been accepted. Can I be part of the scholarship?' So all this does is allow us to nominate someone at the last day of registration, which is usually anywhere from a week or ten days after the first class begins. So this just puts that back to the nominating process from the first day of class 'til about a week or ten days later. There was no opposition from any of the universities. And basically, it just helps us help kids that are... are actually admitted to the school after the first day but before registration closes. And I would answer any questions if there are any."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1364. And on that question, Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Hanniq: "He indicates he'll yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative Molaro, currently, if a student seeks a scholarship and is given that scholarship, what is the deadline date?"

Molaro: "It's the first day that class begins for that semester."

Davis, M.: "Currently, it's the very first day..."

Molaro: "Right."

Davis, M.: "...that the class begins for that semester. So your Bill would ask that we can give that scholarship two weeks later?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Molaro: "Yeah, ap... approximately two weeks later. Most... most schools' registration about ten days after the first day of class. Some do go out to about two weeks but that would be it. So you either extend it ten days or two weeks."
- Davis, M.: "So it... it would make more sense to say that on the final day of registration that the scholarship could be submitted to the state superintendent, is that correct?"

Molaro: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "Okay. I see nothing wrong with this Bill. I think it's an excellent idea and I think it will allow more students to be beneficiaries of an education in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "Do you agree that we should continue the scholarships in the future?"

Molaro: "Well, first of all, that has nothing to do with this Bill. And if that question is ever asked me... asked of me whether or not voting on the Bill, I don't know which way I would vote. But all I'm saying is that if we continue to do scholarships it makes sense to me that we do them on the last day of registration, not on the first day of class."

Meyer: "I... I guess I was looking at it from the other angle that if those that disagreed with continuing doing scholarships, why would we care if it was extended or not?"

Molaro: "Well, if we're gonna have them, which is a whole different question, and I assume they'll... I don't know what

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the Governor's Budget Address is gonna say about that, I don't know if there's gonna be other Bills called before the General Assembly, then we can all vote as to whether or not we think we should continue 'em or not. The Governor will speak out on that. Leadership on both sides of the aisle will speak out on that. And we'll certainly have a chance to do that. All this says that if we're gonna do 'em this makes a heck of a lot more sense. So as far as I'm concerned, even people who would like to eliminate the waivers should vote for this because if we're gonna have the waivers we might as well do it correctly. This has... this is not a referendum on whether we should have waivers or not."

Meyer: "Un... under this Bill... again, would you go through it... we're looking at the date that the class actually starts?"

Molaro: "No, the... the way the law is now... if, let's say... well, let's look at university... University of Illinois at Champaign. And their first day of class is September 6th, I don't know, I'm making this up, and it's September 6th. As of right now, the law is that we, in the General Assembly, must have to nominate someone by September 6th. Okay. But what has happened to myself and other Members that I've talked to, because of the fact that U of I is so difficult to get into, sometimes kids that are accepted to the University of Illinois will go elsewhere and they'll tell the university on the 4th or the 5th that they're no longer attending. So some of the children in our district who were waitlisted by the U of I are then called or sent a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

letter and say even though classes started September 6th, we have late registration 'til September 16th. You can now come into the university and register before September 16th. So these are children that are now being told they're accepted into the U of I. So I would not want to preclude them from being able to call our offices and say, 'hey, I have now been accepted. I'm registering on the 16th.' I go, 'okay, I'll nominate you for a scholarship.' But presently we're not allowed to do that. This would give us the opportunity to do that because we're changing the deadline from September 6th 'til September 16th."

Meyer: "Would that mean that the nomination paperwork would have to be received at that university by the end of that... by that last day of registration? Or would there be a grace period after that so that on the last day of registration they now determine there's an opening and now you would want to submit that paperwork... you may not know until the last day of regi... registration that that opening even existed."

Molaro: "Yeah, no. This would be... this will be the actual last day of registration. We can't really go beyond that because I... I just didn't think it would make any sense. We... we're looking for this extra ten days. Most students are notified by the first day of class that they've been accepted but they're given a week to come in and register. And I just thought this made sense."

Meyer: "I... I believe that one of the things that we've experienced in the past is that the nomination form hasn't

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

actually been received, we've wanted to fax it down. And... and we had to really argue a long and hard time before they would even receive... accept a fax, even though it was by no fault of ours that the mail system didn't work as timely as it was necessary. Would you make a provision for allowing fax of that data?"

Molaro: "Well... well, sure I would. I mean, the last thing we want to do... and this is why this problem rose. The last thing I want to do is tell some student that I'm gonna nominate 'em for a scholarship and they go out and have a great celebration, it's one of the only ways that they can go to school is through this. And then because they received the fax a day late they no longer can take the... get the scholarship. That... that would be un... unfortunate. But this is a certainly a step in the right direction, this Bill. I..."

Meyer: "Well, the reason I asked that question, Representative, is my... my analysis indicates that while the university systems and... and the State Board of Higher Education have... have taken no position on the Bill, which I guess I understand, but they certainly haven't addressed that question. And I was wondering if you had had that kind of conversation..."

Molaro: "No."

Meyer: "...with them on it..."

Molaro: "I have not."

Meyer: "...in terms of timing."

Molaro: "I have not."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "Okay. Well, those that wish to do away with the scholarship program may want to consider how they vote on this legislation. I thank you for your answers."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"You know, the... when the Representative brought this Bill before the Higher Education Committee, of course, my prior... my... my main concern was that he was not bringing legislation to abolish these waivers. The Illinois General Assembly scholarship waivers are one of the most unique items that we have dealt with in... in this... in this Body. It... it purely creates an opportunity for individuals that lobby... that lobby our district offices that's in our legislative areas that see... is another outlet in which they seek opportunities and ways to... to educate themselves, to get higher education, to come to a legislative office to inquire about educational opportunities. That's what our offices should be about. And first of all, I'm just glad that this is not a piece of legislation before us today that... that will abolish the waivers to the state universities so that our children can have a opportunity for higher education. Secondly, there are... there are situations in which individuals... there's various circumstances that individual's waiver may come in late or have to be late. I know one of the examples I gave in committee, I had a prime situation where a young man had about three universities on hold that he was... he had

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

applied for and he had had interviews with two, had visit one of the schools, and was trying to visit the other two schools to make a determination exactly which university that that individual wanted to go to. And so, in that particular situation that individual was still waiting on a university to respond as to what university that he will be accepted at, one... one of the state universities. And so, this legislation, I believe, addresses that issue. always circumstances that is outside the norm. And this is... this piece of legislation, I think, has been drafted well, will address that issue. I think it's... it's badly needed. I am sure that each one of your legislative scholarship committees who conduct these practices of... of awarding the scholarship waivers has came upon scenarios in which a scholarship waiver was late in... in process... or late in the process of being granted. So, I urge a 'aye' vote. I think this is a good piece of legislation that address a well-needed situation. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro to close."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the comments. Again, I... I just want to reiterate that this isn't a referendum on scholarships. That will be coming forward and we can all speak on that. This is just to say that if, for whatever reason, they do stay this would right certain wrongs that are out there and just make the program better if the program stays. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1364 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 voting 'yes', and 24 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1468."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1468, a Bill for an Act in relation to energy conservation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

"Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm proud today to sponsor a Bill, along with Representative Eileen Lyons and Feigenholtz, that responds to those constituents who ask us what we can really do about high home heating House Bill 1468 establishes a uniform statewide bills. Energy Efficiency Building Code for all new construction, this applies to new construction only. The Capital Development Board would create minimum code requirements and would make available the implementation materials to architects... engineers, architects to local jurisdictions. The energy efficiency is really about the building envelope, they call it, which is primarily insulation and windows. This is where using energy-efficient products can make a huge difference in terms of energy costs of home... home heating savings. In fact, we're estimating up to \$250 a year can be saved. There's a small increase in the cost of the home but it's quickly recouped with these annual

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

energy savings. I know you have some questions so I will be available for questions. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 1468. And on that question, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "The Lady will yield."

Winters: "Representative, there... in our analysis appears a comment that any construction that was done with a building permit... that requires a building permit would also be subject to this. Could you give the legislative intent of whether this would be used for renovation of existing buildings or not?"

Hamos: "Well, Representative Winters, while I do not know exactly what's within the International Energy Efficiency Code I can tell you that this Bill specifically says on page 2, line 3, that this applies to the construction of all new residential, commercial, and industrial buildings in this state. The... the paragraph you're referring to has limits the application of this Act to only those communities which use a building permit process. Some very small communities do not even require building permits and this would not apply to them."

Winters: "So... so this would apply only if you're in a jurisdiction which requires a building permit and then also would only apply if it's for new construction, either an addition or a new building but not for renovation of existing structure."

Hamos: "That is my understanding."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Winters: "Could you make a pledge that over in the Senate, as far as you can pledge, that you would encourage the Sponsor over there to insert language that would clarify that? Our feeling was that the applicability... the language in there is not strong enough to make sure that it only deals with new construction."

Hamos: "Okay. Thank you."

Winters: "I saw your head nod, I didn't..."

Hamos: "Yes."

Winters: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Meyer: "First of all, Representative, I would thank you for your Amendment that included the City of Chicago under this legislation, in addition to the rest of the state. And that was one of the issues that came up as a part of the debate in the… in the question/answer session in the hearing. And I... I would recognize that you did work with us on that and I do thank you for it. However, at the time I... I voted 'yes' to help you get this out of committee, to... to further on the debate on the issue. I indicated there were some other concerns that I had in addition to that. If I could just take a minute to talk about some of those concerns."

Hamos: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the questioner. Can you please get the attention?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "Could we have some quiet in the chamber, please?"

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, as a part of the... the interchange in committee I indicated that even though I was voting 'yes' to help you with getting that out of committee at that point I wanted to carry on the debate in the... on the House Floor on some of the other concerns that we discussed in addition to the Amendment, which you took care of. If this legislation becomes law, how much can the average homeowner save during a month in energy costs?"

Hamos: "Well, in... in one very compelling study that was done using a real scientific research, there was an analysis of two different houses, one in Aurora, one in Springfield. And it was... this was for a sort of typical 2 thousand square foot home. And in that United States Department of Energy study it was estimated that the annual cost savings for the Aurora home would be \$261 a year, and for the Springfield home, \$208 a year. We think this is a really good return on the added costs of making these energy efficiency improvements, which are a grand total, using that same study, of \$11 hundred to \$18 hundred for the new improvements. So you quickly recoup that in energy savings."

Meyer: "In this legislation, we're dealing with the... the Energy effici... Efficiency Building Act. How does that tie in with the normal building codes? Is that a part of a... the building codes that a community would adopt? Or a county

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

or township or whoever would adopt? Or is... is this the whole ball of wax there?"

Hamos: "As far as I understand how building codes work at the local level, many of our communities over the years have adopted a building code called BOCA. And BOCA is now merged with the group that is putting out this Intel... this International Energy Efficiency Code. So they are now part of the same group. This Bill would now have, if passed into law, would have the Capital Development Board creating rules for the municipalities and they would add these into their BOCA codes, as long as they were not inconsistent with the State Law. They could be more stringent but not less stringent than that International Energy Efficiency Code."

Meyer: "Well, prior to joining the Legislature ten years ago I spent ten years on a village board in a fai... fairly sizable community in... in Illinois. And... and we had adopted the BOCA code. And I don't have a quarrel with the BOCA code and I realize it's part of this but if I recall correctly... and I wouldn't say that I'm an expert on BOCA codes by any stretch, but if I recall correctly, BOCA did... had a lot more to it than just energy efficiency."

Hamos: "Yes, that's correct."

Meyer: "And my... my question is, here you're asking us to adopt, on a statewide basis, a energy efficiency component of BOCA but you've forgotten the rest of the BOCA code as it... it deals with the construction. And it seems like we're kind of piecemealing... are... are you coming back to us next year

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

with another aspect of this or another component or is this it?"

Hamos: "Well, Representative Meyer, I'm working on the Energy Efficiency Code, along with many of the people in this chamber, because home heating bills are such a very incredibly important part of an average family's household expenses. And this has very direct relationship to utility bills, home heating costs. There are other aspects of home construction that I'm sure might be useful to change, but it certainly doesn't have that same direct payoff for our constituents about something that's affecting them today. The... the BOCA code that our municipalities have adopted has one chapter dealing with energy efficiency... or energy... energies. This would replace that one chapter."

Meyer: "How... how much... well, to me it still seems like your piecemealing this. But because you've only addressed one aspect of the BOCA code you want everyone in the state to adopt at least the... a certain year's BOCA code and... and yet you've left off all the... all the rest of 'em. But how... how much money is this going to cost the State of Illinois to implement?"

Hamos: "How much money is this going to cost the state is the Capital Development Board has not given us a fiscal note that it's going to cost them anything. Now, that's because this... this particular International Code Council has 100 people right here in Illinois who are wanting to go out there and help implement this. There is software that's..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear a word she's saying at this point."

Speaker Hannig: "Could we please have some order in the House?

Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "I'm sorry, I interrupted her in her response..."

Hannig: "Okay. Representative Hamos."

Meyer: "...'cause I just absolutely couldn't hear it."

Hamos: "I'd... yes. Ladies and Gentlemen, the question was how much does this cost. And I'd like to talk about that because it's an important part of what our opposition is saying too. The cost to the state is, we think, minimal. The Capital Development Board would be ... would be instructed under this Bill to promulgate rules and put them out there for the municipalities. The software has already been developed. The materials have already been developed. There are 13 different municipalities already using these materials. There... the International Energy Council, which happens to be located in Illinois, has a hundred people who are available, ready and willing to go out and offer technical assistance. That's the state cost. The cost to the homeowner, under this energy... United States Department of Energy study, would be a grand total of 11 hundred to 8 hundred dollars for energy efficiency materials that, over the lifetime of a house or over the thirty years of a mortgage, is really a minimal increment. The savings, however, are the energy savings, which are immediately. Two hundred-fifty dollars a year, each and

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

every year of the $\infty...$ the lifetime... over the lifetime of that home."

- Meyer: "You've chosen the Capital Development Board to be the administrator of this compliance. Why did you choose the Capital Development Board?"
- Hamos: "I think that's a fair question, Representative Meyer.

 I think they're a group has been working on this for a long time. They were working with a group called the Illinois Building Commission, that's a commission that, I think, together they recommended the Capital Development Board, that's because they deal with buildings. So I guess that they're not required to give out grants under this. Really, they're just required to develop rules and to offer technical assistance to municipalities. It could be other agencies, too, but nobody has come forward with any other approach."
- Meyer: "Is the Capital Development Board familiar with the codes that you're... the... this energy code that you want to see enforced statewide?"
- Hamos: "If they're not, I wish they would be because it's also very important that we passed the law... a Bill earlier, Representative Novak's Bill, that would have us use this energy efficiency standard in state buildings. So Capital Development Board is actually probably the perfect agency. It should know what's going on at the state level and could then offer technical assistance to municipalities."
- Meyer: "Well, one of my concerns is that when we have asked them what the cost would be they were fairly unfamiliar

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

with the cost factors and if they're going to be the administrators then you would hope that they would be familiar. My concern is that they're not familiar and we're asking the... the entire state to conform to a... an Act that they're going to administer. And that is a concern to me. Certainly, with... do you know if that agency has been depleted by early retirements? Do you know what the Governor's planning to do in terms of staff for it?"

Hamos: "You know, I don't, Representative Meyer. We have a new administration, as you know. There's some turn over issues right now. This Bill does not take effect for one year upon becoming a law. So we would certainly expect that in the year it could... the agency could be geared up to offer this kind of technical assistance."

Meyer: "Now, I... I've been told that the City of Chicago took a full two years to implement this... this same criteria into their codes and... and we're giving the entire state one year. They certainly... man... many parts of this state are not as sophisticated in their staffing as the City of Chicago is. Happens to enjoy a great deal of expertise, I... I believe. And you're asking a lot of communities to come from ground zero to a hundred percent in one year."

Hamos: "Let me respond to that because actually the City of Chicago was the very first city that implemented an Energy Efficiency Code. So they had to deal with all of the startup problems that it takes to start with a new code. Thirteen other municipalities have done that now in less time. And the truth is, as we get more geared up it will

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

become more avail... all the materials will be more available. There is now software which puts the materials issues on a checklist and makes it very easy to comply with this. That software was not available at the time that the City of Chicago was doing it. So it's getting more and more in use and the materials will become more and more available and the cost will come down as those materials are used."

Meyer: "Well, what is the penalty that you have in your bill for municipalities that don't comply or cannot comply because of no fault of their own, just because a lack of expertise that's out there to hire to help them administer this."

Hamos: "We don't have any me... any penalties."

Meyer: "So, in other words, this is just a hope... I hope you comply with this? Are there any penalties at all? They don't... they don't qualify for certain grants, things like that?"

Hamos: "I don't think we included that, Representative Meyer.

I think, as with any other laws that we pass, we expect municipalities to... to be part of the system and part of our process. And I'm sure they would comply."

Meyer: "How... how does this affect affordable housing in the state? Certainly there's an... a push to make more affordable housing in various communities. And I think a lot of communities would like to see more affor... ways to put more affordable housing in their communities. Yet,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

we're increasing the cost of this construction on a per home basis."

Hamos: "Well, I think... as you know, I'm very committed to really im... seeing more affordable housing in more communities. However, one of the reasons that housing is not affordable is because of the operating costs which are high utility bills. In fact, older housing that doesn't use energy efficient standards with big drafty rooms or with cracks in the walls or with minimal insulation have humungous energy bills. We know this because we have a low... low income heating assistance program for very low income people. This is about energy savings for all of our constituents. This makes all new construction more affordable."

Meyer: "Well, of course, new construction certainly, if it's built to code, the… the BOCA codes or whatever they're called now, I know they're under a different name, but if they're built to codes they don't have the problem of drafty rooms because of cracks in the walls and poor insulation and things like that. My… my concern is that we're only addressing one aspect of the code… code issue and that… so, in fact, we're piecemealing it. In fact, we have a lot of communities through a normal compliance want to do this kind of initiatives. And here we're thrusting upon the rest of the state an unfunded mandate, a mandate that people that want to move into new construction, their homes are going to… are going to have to adhere to. And… and really we have a housing industry that does look for

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ways to better construct homes all the time. Certainly, I've lived in a couple… several different houses and each one of them has been constructed better than the previous one. Each one has had better insulation techniques than the previous one. And yet, we're out here… again, the big arm of government, which is mandating the cost of… of this construction. And… and whe… when the market place, I believe, will respond to it and provide that without… without the mandate. Thank you very much for your answers."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Hartke: "Representative Hamos, I appreciate your working on this piece of legislation and I know that your intentions are very well. We talked about this a long time in committee and so forth. I've got a couple of questions that I failed to ask you that... that time. And I know you've... you've worked on this very hard. Have you a reached an agreement with any of those groups that were opposition to this piece of legislation?"

Hamos: "I don't think I have, no."

Hartke: "No. Who is for this piece of legislation?"

Hamos: "All of our constituents are for this legislation. This is about lower heating costs back home."

Hartke: "Except those that are in need of housing that... that may not be able to afford housing because we're now

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

mandating an increased in cost in their housing. Is that correct?"

Hamos: "No, it's not."

Hartke: "Can you tell me some of the individual groups that are opposed to this legislation?"

Hamos: "I think the home builders are opposed, Illinois

Municipal League is opposed, and I'm continuing to work

with the Illinois Association of Realtors."

"Well, the latest information I have is that the Illinois Association of Realtors are opposed to this legislation, the Builders Association of Greater Chicago, the Illinois Manufactured Housing Association, the Illinois Municipal League, the DuPage Mayor and Managers Conference, the Northwest Municipal Conference, the Will County Governmental League, the Illinois Manufacturers Associations, as well as Commonwealth Edison. Now, looking at that group of individuals I... like I said, I think that... that your intentions are very well but this is not a perfect world that we live in. There are... these are mandates that are coming down upon those individuals and those municipalities that would be required to follow this mandate, should it pass and be signed by the Governor. I think this will increase the cost of housing... decrease the cost of housing availability for low income individuals and will cause probably more problems than it's going to solve. Great idea, but I just don't know that the State of Illinois can afford to do this. It's my understanding there are 26... 26 counties that have somewhat... have a... a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

building code in their counties. That means there are 76 counties that do not. This is a mandate, it's gonna cost tons and tons of money for individuals. I think it's a patchwork sort of method of going about. Unless we have a... a complete building code statewide in the State of Illinois in every county in every aspect of building, whether it be plumbing, electrical, insulation, roofing, foundation, construction, the whole ball of wax across the board, I'm... I'm opposed to this piece of legislation. And I would appreciate very much if my colleagues would follow through as well with a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hanniq: "State your inquiry."

Black: "As... as I called up to the podium some time ago, this Bill usurps Home Rule authority under one section of the law and I never can remember what section is what. And the inquiry of the Chair is since it clearly denies Home Rule powers to any Home Rule community adopting an ordinance less stringent, does it require a super majority or a simple majority?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the Parliamentarian's prepared to answer your question."

Black: "Okay, fine. Thank you very much."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker, in response to your inquiry, House Bill 1468

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

preempts Home Rule in a manner that requires a simple majority for passage."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Parliamentarian.

You realize on inquiries of the Chair I'm now zero for a hundred and eighty-two. It is a... at some point, before I leave here, I'd like to win one. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, how many counties in the State of Illinois have a uniform building code at the present time?"

Hamos: "I don't know."

Black: "There are 26. Twenty-six counties in the State of Illinois have a uniform building code. Representative, this Bill deals with my family business. I am not in a conflict of interest, I do not have any financial interest in the business, I own no stock, I do not draw a payroll of any kind in the family business. But I certainly have an interest, personal, in... in that heating and air conditioning business that's been around for more than 70 years. Where... where did you come up with the figures on the payback for an energy efficient appliance?"

Black: "Oh, ev... even a house. I mean, where... where did you grab these figures that are in this analysis of a hundred dollar a month payback?"

Hamos: "Okay..."

Black: "Where in the world did you come up with that?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Hamos: "Well, and actually, Representative Black, I'm really glad you asked that question because our..."

Black: "I bet you are."

"...because our opponents have put out a lot of Hamos: misinformation about this Bill, and one of them is that there would be a dol... a hundred dollar a month payback. I have never said that, I never will say that. Today I have indicated that we are going to be... our homeowners will be able to save \$250 a year, but that is a significant savings over the lifetime of a home when the original investment in the energy efficient material was \$11 hundred to \$18 hundred. Now, our opponents say that there's increased costs but they've never been able to produce any data at all. Every time I've asked, oh, it's back at the office somewhere. What we are pointing to is an actual study on the Illinois... on the International Energy Co... Conservation Code that actually did a study with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. It looked at prototype houses in Aurora and Springfield, it was an actual research study. And in that they found that they... I told you before, they assumed a two-story, single family house with 2,040 square feet. And they, for that prototypical home, they said the increased cost of construction would be 11 hundred to 18 hundred, the energy savings would be 208 to 261 dollars a year. Our opponents have no study, have no data, and have no information that suggests otherwise."

Black: "Well, Representative, I stand before you as living proof. I've grown up in this business. I have in my house

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the most expensive energy efficient furnace money can buy. It's an electronic ignition, no pilot. It recaptures the exhaust gas and recirculates it. It's a two-stage fan, it's a two-stage self... thermostat that measures the inside and outside temperature. Four thousand dollar furnace."

Hamos: "Wow."

Black: "Yeah, wow. Grew up in that business so I know a lot about that. Do you know what my energy savings is? Three dollars and ninety-two cents a month. And I can document that. I can document every penny. Now, is it worth it? Yes, it's worth it to me. And I'll spend the money because I think it's worth it. And over a period, if I have twenty more years to live, if I don't get out of here I doubt that, I will pay for the furnace, over a twenty-year period. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Twenty-six counties in this state have chosen to come up with a county building code. The vast majority of the counties have no building code. This is a classic example of, 'trust me, I'm with the government, I'm here to help you. One size fits all. An energy efficient mandate that will work in Lake Forest and Winnetka and Danville, too. And everybody's gonna benefit.' Half of the Bills still on the Calendar deal with affordable housing. Now you take a look at this Bill 'cause I'm gonna tell ya what an energy efficient house is. It's two-by-six wall studs, not two-by-four. It's R24 minimum in the ceiling, not R18. It's an insulated... if you a basement, it's an insulated

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

If it's a crawlspace, it's insulated with a vapor barrier on the bottom and insulation on the rafters. Two-by-eight rafters with blown insulation and blanket insulation no less than R24 factor. What would this house In Danville, Illinois, where we don't have the building costs that some of you in the northern area do, that... that house would cost in excess of a hundred and eighty-five thousand range. The market where I live is not in the hundred and eighty-five thousand dollar range. You can build all the spec houses you want in my district for a hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars, you're not gonna sell 'em. But if you can sell... if you can build a house for sixty-five to eighty-eight thousand dollars you're gonna sell a lot of 'em. All I'm trying to tell you... the Lady, when she introduced this Bill said, our constituents asked what can we do about high utility bills. Well, let me tell you what you can do. You can call your utility company and ask for a free energy audit. They will go through your house from top to bottom. They will tell you which windows to caulk, which windows may need to replace if you can afford it. What kind of a storm door might you be better served if you can afford it and put it on your house, what kind of attic insulation might be good. If you can afford a new furnace, here is one that you might want to buy that will save you a little money. But if you mandate this in a statewide building code, and we've never had a statewide building code in the history of Illinois, you will simply mandate an expensive construction process

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

and drive most of the people out of the new housing market. I don't think that's what most of us want to do. trying to find a comfortable modicum of affordable housing and energy efficient housing. And if you have the money today you can build a house that is so energy efficient you can practically create a vacuum in that house you have to actually pipe in outside air, the house is so airtight. And that brings up another question that they don't even want to get into. Look at all of these energy efficient buildings built in the northwest suburbs, no outside air. They call them deadly buildings. Can't get enough fresh air in, you recirculate the same old air. You know, I'm just an old dumb country boy, but one of the things that I learned a long time ago is if you... if you point the consumer in a direction where the consumer can get help, and they certainly can on an energy audit, and then let that consumer move toward that energy efficiency as they can afford to do so, they'll do so. But if you mandate this you're gonna drive people out of the new housing and renovation market in droves. If I was... if I was still in the apartment business I'd love this Bill. I'd absolutely love it, especially if my apartments were already built. 'Cause you're not gonna make this retrospective, there's no way you can do that. All of the tools exist to build an energy efficient house and to retrofit an existing structure and make it energy efficient. The way not to do it is by a statewide mandate on a building code and the consumer pays the bill. Last little bit of information

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

I'll give ya and then I'll sit down and fade guietly away. The environmental community... the environmental community labored for ten years, ten years to reduce the amount of water that a toilet could use to flush. They worked ten years on that Bill, they got it passed at the federal level. True story, honest to God. Federal Law says that your toilet cannot have more than 1.6 gallons of water in the flush tank, used to be 3.4. We were gonna save a billion gallons of water a month. But guess what happened? You have to flush the toilet twice to get rid of the solids. So what did we save? Absolutely nothing, except the cost of the toilet went up. What can we do about high utility bills? We can tell the homeowner, the person looking to upgrade a home, go to your contractor, go to your utility company and ask for an energy audit and then do these things as you can afford to do them. Please don't mandate this on the entire State of Illinois. One size doesn't fit all. And the housing market in this state, I'll guarantee ya, the housing market, one size will not, never has and never will, fit all. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are not asking Illinois to be a pioneer, to be a crusader, to... to stand out as a leader in this area. Thirty-five other states have adopted similar codes and the sky did not fall. In fact, the sky probably got a lot a clearer... a lot clearer. The Environmental Law and Policy Center contend that the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

reduction in annual air pollutants, especially nitrous oxides, is comparable to six thousand cars getting off the road. Again, other states have done this and the sky did not fall. There are municipalities that have adopted these standards, so how onerous could they be? What we're asking for, we think, is reasonable. Builders now must deal with a patchwork quilt of various ordinances throughout this state. This would simplify that process. Previous speaker talked about one size not fitting all. Well, I agree. And that... this standard that we're asking for does take into consideration the five different climates zones in the State of Illinois. And we have taken that consideration. The Home Builders have told me that they would like to see a statewide standard enforced in this state. This is a compromise. This isn't a statewide standard, this is a minimum energy efficient standard. I stress that, this is a minimum. The Amendment makes this minimum standards. What we're asking for, again, I think is reasonable. I'd like to know who of your constituents would not want you to vote for energy conservation. these times when we are really concerned about that very subject, energy conservation and our reliance on... on energy, who of your constituents would not want you to vote for energy conservation. I submit to you that conserving energy is not only good public policy but a responsibility we should take very seriously. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day when Representative Hamos put this Amendment on I had questions on the Bill, which she answered for me. And quite frankly, she won me over to the Bill. In a time when we're looking at issues such as how to save energy, there will be people in this Body that spoke against this Bill that would like us to pass a tax that will help for ethanol, that will help for natural gas, that will help for other issues that conserve energy in all areas, which is so important. Part of what we're going to war for over now has to do with energy. We should've been doing this years ago, as far as natural gas, hydrogen cells, and ethanol, which many of the people in this Body who spoke against this would certainly like to see some considerations given to that. Which more than... more of us are willing to do that because it's an important issue in our state. All you have to do is drive down a street with snow on the roof to see how fast the snow has fallen off to see which house has insulation in the ceiling. It's a heck of a lot cheaper to put insulation in your attic prior to putting the house up, and it saves you a lot of money. All the issues she's talking about are basically very, very conservative issues. And in my area, one of my home communities, has already passed this type of legislation. I think that it's very interesting when you live in an area such as we do that you have to monitor pollution from cars, that we don't want to also monitor pollution from homes. Quite frankly, I think this goes... speaks well for those of us that live around the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

airport, we're always worried about pollution. Anything that would help statewide to conserve pollution... to... to conserve energy and to make us more sufficient and self-contained in our own state, in our own country, is very important. Why are we afraid to break ground? How long can we continue to put these things off?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Biggins: "Representative, does your Bill, in the creation of this new energy policy, I guess for want of a better word, doesn't it establish five zones in the State of Illinois to have these different requirements in those buildings?"

Hamos: "As I understand the code, there are five zones in Illinois, yes."

Biggins: "And are the zones delimeated... delineated by county lines?"

Hamos: "Well, I... I don't know that. I don't know if they're
 exact counties."

Biggins: "Well, my understanding is that they are delineated by the boundaries of each county. So, if you're in Zone A, B, C, D, or E, you will have a different standard based upon your county boundaries. However, the Bill... unfortunately, the winds that blow don't know those boundaries. And so you can have different temperatures in the same county, different annual temperatures throughout the State of Illinois in all these counties and they could have one zone... part of their county correct and another part

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

incorrect because this Bill thinks that the winds blow by county boundaries. So, in addition to sticking the state's nose into the business of local government and letting them determine the policy best for them, because they know which way those winds blow better than we do at the statewide with county boundaries, I firmly oppose this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos to close."

Hamos: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a lot of good debate on this Bill and I appreciate... I appreciate your attention to this. This is a very important Bill. You know, we've said already that thirty-five other states have already done this kind of thing in Illinois. In the last two years, thirteen municipalities have adopted an energy efficiency code. We have not heard complaints in those thirteen municipalities, municipalities like Schaumburg Naperville and Chicago. We would have heard if there were problems back home from the code enforcement people. fact, they have learned how to work with this. We would have heard if there were problems with the builders. would know if, in fact, people were leaving these communities in droves. Can you really say that about Schaumburg and Naperville and Chicago? We would have heard if, in fact, there were complaints from architects, but the architects association is supporting this Bill. We would have heard if there were problems from our home buyers because they would not be able to fi... they would find that the costs were prohibitive, that is not true. This is good for homeowners, this is good for consumers because we've

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

established that this will reduce home heating bills. This is good for the rest of us in society because we know it's important for energy conservation and reduced energy consumption. This is an important Bill, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1468 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes'...,. Representative Hamos do you wish to put this on Postponed Consideration? Okay.

47 voting 'yes', 59 voting 'no'. This fail... Bill fails.
Representative O'Brien on House Bill 2318. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2318, a Bill for an Act concerning state facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2318 provides that the Department of Human Services, Corrections or the Department of Veterans Affairs cannot close a facility operated by that or reduce the use of the facility past a certain level on a permanent basis without the approval of the General Assembly. This is in response to some closures that we all dealt with last spring that didn't seem to have a... a whole lot of rhyme or reason and the General Assembly felt a little left out in a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- lot of circumstances. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and I would request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2318. Is there any discussion? There being none then, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', and 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 191?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 191, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed.

 No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Wait, are you prepared on 3117? Out of the record. And Representative Sacia on House Bill 353. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 353, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is driven by the ethanol folks. As many of you may know, when you purchase fuel you get 10 percent ethanol, right now, at... at many of your service stations. There are vehicles out there capable of running on 85 percent

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

ethanol, or in other words, 85 percent home grown corn. Many of you are driving these vehicles and you aren't even aware of it, I'm one of them. When I initially got involved in bringing this Bill forward our effort was to determine, through the Secretary of State's Office, if we could determine what vehicles out there are already flexible fuel vehicles. In other words, they can run on regular unleaded fuel, 10 percent ethanol, or 85 percent The genesis being that in certain areas there are no 85 percent ethanol service stations. And we wanted to be able to come up with a list of the amounts of vehicles in their areas that are capable of being... of operating on 85 percent ethanol. The Secretary of State's Office would be mandated to create such a list. They had some initial concerns with it. Recently they haven't expressed any opposition to me. They did early on because they thought it would be expensive and they didn't know what they would have to do to try to come up with this list. If you have a flexible fuel vehicle it can be identified in the serial number. Many of you are driving a Ford Taurus, many of them are flex fuel vehicles. Many of you are driving Chrysler Mini... Minivans, the 3.3 engine is a flex fuel The benefit of this Bill is it will give us, vehicle. meaning the citizens of Illinois, the opportunity of having service centers put in 85 percent fuel stations... 85 percent ethanol pumps so that they would be available to you and you would be running on Illinois corn, as opposed to Iraqi oil. We do think that the cost might be might be as much

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

as \$11 thousand. And I think in the overall benefit to the State of Illinois, this is an excellent Bill. I would welcome any questions from Representative Hartke or anyone else."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 353. And on that question, the Gentleman... Representative Hartke is recognized."

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Hartke: "Representative Sacia, I support your concept of your Bill completely. And I think it'd be very important to know which one of these vehicles are actually con... convertible from the 10 percent ethanol to the 85 percent ethanol. And I know that Ford Taurus is one of them. Could you tell me what it would cost the average consumer to have his or her vehicle if it is capable of being..."

Sacia: "Converted?"

Hartke: "Yes, made available to... to burn the 85 percent ethanol?"

Sacia: "Representative Hartke, I've heard several different figures. And the one that I've heard, and I've not received this from anyone that I would consider necessarily an expert but they are people that are mechanics, and their... their guesstimate is in the neighborhood of \$3 hundred. But I think the real, again, the catalyst behind this is to identify the vehicles out there that we are currently driving that we can say... you know, perhaps in Will County there's... and I... this is just a number off the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

top of my head, there are 986 that are flex fuel Tauruses or something."

Hartke: "Can you tell me how many ethanol... 85 percent ethanol stations there are in the State of Illinois at the current time?"

Sacia: "It's less than 50."

Hartke: "Less than 50?"

Sacia: "I can't tell you the… the exact number but it is less than 50."

Hartke: "What are some of the disadvantages to... other than not having a readily available fueling station in Illinois, other than that?"

Sacia: "To my knowledge, there wouldn't be any disadvantages, Representative Hartke, because you... your vehicle will perform very similarly to the way it's performing now if it is a flex fuel vehicle. You can pull into an 85 percent corn station, fill it up, and you should run relatively similar to the way you are on either regular unleaded or 10 percent ethanol fuel."

Hartke: "So your gas mileage would be the same? Or your..."

Sacia: "To my knowledge."

Hartke: "Or your fuel efficiency would be the same?"

Sacia: "Representative Hartke, I've... I've talked to several different people that are running 85 percent ethanol. I know part of my district is western Winnebago County, there is one there. And I've had some people tell me that they have lost a little bit in fuel economy but the vehicle is performing well. And... and they did not have an exact

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- figure. But, again, I think the benefit being that Illinois being a corn state and not Iraqi oil."
- Hartke: "Well, when you say fuel economy do you mean that... by the way, what would that increase the cost of the fuel? Do you have any idea what..."
- Sacia: "It... it... it..."
- Hartke: "...85 percent ethanol fuel would cost as opposed to
 maybe 93 percent octane or 87?"
- Sacia: "Yes, Representative Hartke. This very past week I checked at the Atkins Energy Plant in Lena and... and straight ethanol or straight alcohol coming right out of the plant is \$1.17 a gallon, this week."
- Hartke: "So, at that rate \$1.17 a gallon coming out of the plant, you could conceivably then, mixing 10 percent gasoline, which is probably, what, \$1.10, \$1.20 on the open market today?"
- Sacia: "I think it's more like \$1.60. When I filled up this weekend it was \$1.52."
- Hartke: "Well, that's retail. Now, you're talking wholesale
 coming out of the plant, though."
- Sacia: "Okay. You're right, okay. So, I'm thinking, Representative Hartke, that the price should be comparable or less on 85 percent ethanol as opposed to 10 percent or lead free."
- Hartke: "Well, I think it would be a tremendous opportunity if we had the expansion of these ethanol stations in Illinois... fueling stations. And I... I applaud your piece of

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

legislation. I won't be harangoing you anymore. I encourage Members to support this piece of legislation."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin for... on House Bill 353."

Dunkin: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Dunkin: "Yeah. Would... would there be a cost associated with this with the Secretary of State's Office compiling this new data?"

Sacia: "Representative Dunkin, I have been told it could cost as much 11 thousand dollars."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Sacia: "Not 11 million, 11 thousand dollars."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Sacia: "To... to get their computer software to where they can identify the digits in the serial number to be able to tell us that if it is a flex fuel vehicle or not."

Dunkin: "Sure. Have you consulted with the Secretary of State's Office?"

Sacia: "Yes, I have. They've been working with me through this from the beginning. As I said earlier, at the outset they were opposed to this because of what anticipated costs would be. I haven't had them speak outwardly to me in the recent past. In fact, as recently as yesterday they had compiled a list for me of the Ford products in this state that are flex fuel vehicles."

Dunkin: "Would the databases of the service stations already now be helpful to the consumer?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Sacia: "I... I'm sorry, I didn't understand, Sir."

Dunkin: "Would the databases of the service stations also be helpful... helpful to the consumers?"

Sacia: "I... I think it would be. I think the... the real plus here is for the oil industry to recognize the fact, as I did when I got involved with this, that there are so many vehicles out there and... and more every day coming off the assembly line that are flex fuel vehicles. And getting them identified as such would make them aware that, hey, maybe I oughta have an 85 percent ethanol pump at this service station so I can offer it to Representative Dunkin or who else might come in with his Taurus or Chrysler or Suburban."

Dunkin: "Okay. I... I'm just curious as to why we haven't... I mean, ethanol's been... been around for... for a wa... for a while now, why... why this is, you know, now coming up as relate to... relates to us complying this data."

Sacia: "If... if I were a betting man, Representative Dunkin, I would say it's because of the power of... of the large oil companies. But dealing with the current state of affairs in Iraq and recognizing that we are a corn-growing state and we can be running our vehicles on as much as 85 percent corn, I think it's a great Bill."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Mulligan: "Representative, you said that this would only cost \$11 thousand. I'm not sure how the Secretary of State would track this. Is it by model number of the car so that they could tell if it has alternative fuel resources?"

Sacia: "Representative Mulligan, as I understand it, there are three digits in the se… there… there's… all of us have a 17 digit serial number in our automobile. And there are three specific digits in there, at least for Ford and Chrysler, that will identify it as a flexible fuel vehicle. And they would have to change software and so forth to make that happen. And I believe that's where the expense comes from."

Mulligan: "Well, it seems hard for me to believe that anything costs only \$11 thousand if they're setting up a database through the Secretary of State's Office and someone to monitor it. Although, I think this is good information for the simple reason that there are alternative fuel... fueling stations in certain parts of the state and it would be nice to match up where they're ne... needed for cars. I'm very interested in alternative fuels in... in any different capacity. Although, I do find it very interesting that this Bill is called so close to Representative Hamos's Bill, also interested in which was ener... conservation. But, certainly I would support anything that would help our area. And I do know that I have two alternative fuel... fueling stations right in my area, one at a local municipality and one at a research facility. And then I think there's a third that's right next to my

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

district. And some of our local municipalities are starting to look at those kinds of cars and have one or two. So it would be very interesting to see what parts of the state have those cars and trucks and whatever. And, also, it would be interesting to know how many buses and other vehicles are running on natural gas, particularly the ones that service Midway and O'Hare."

Speaker Hannig: "Then there being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Morrow, for what reason do you rise?"

Morrow: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Morrow: "We have the former treasurer, and now the current Lieutenant Governor, Pat Quinn on the floor. Why don't we give him a good General Assembly welcome. Pat."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk... Represen... Representative Howard, are you prepared on House Resolution 37? Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd... I'd like my colleagues to please adopt this House Bill (sic-Resolution) that actually made today Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority Day in

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Springfield. As you know, my sororities were here. They came to meet their... their Legislators to learn what we do down here and to just become knowledgeable about the electoral political arena. I'd ask for a 'yes' vote from everyone."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 37. Is there any discussion? There being none, then all... all in favor of the Amendment... all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1547?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1547 is on the Order of House Bills Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Would you return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor? We have some Bills on Agreed List #2 that need to be either moved to Third Reading or have Amendments adopted. So, at this time the Chair will go to that Order of Business. And, so, Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 14 for Representative Franks?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 14, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Franks, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 was an Amendment entered... we had a lot of help on this. Let me go back. I

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

wanna thank Representative Millner who came up with some good language to help with re... to help with this Amendment. And what we're just trying to do is make sure that the intent of the Bill would prevail. This was a Bill that was originally put forward by Representative Durkin last year. And what it does is it provides that any person whose principal business is to service or repair computers would have an affirmative obligation now to report images of child pornography, much like what we do with people who work in the photo processing business. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, Representative Fritchey on the Amendment."
- Fritchey: "Thank you. Obviously, a laudable purpose here. So, if you have a computer technician that comes across this, they are then obligated to report it to the authorities. And if they don't, they're civilly liable, criminally liable?"
- Franks: "They are liable just as... I think it's a thousand dol...

 up to a thousand dollar fine. It's the exact... we... we took

 the exact same provision of those folks that work in the
 photo processing."
- Fritchey: "Okay. My... my... my concern would be this situation. You always try to take these things out to, you know, whatever levels they may reach. Would they then... if we put an affirmative duty on them, let's say that they either fail to report or they didn't see it or something and a minor or the parents of a minor who was abused who find out

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that this information was on the computer and not discovered, could they then pursue a civil claim against the computer technician? Say, hey, you know what? The abuse would've been caught months or years earlier had this person done... done with this... you see where I'm goin'."

Franks: "That's a really good question, Representative. And we have a hold harmless that was... that was part of Amendment 3. There's hold... they're being held harmless from any liability for reasonable compliance with the provision except for willful and wanton behavior."

Fritchey: "So, absent in showing that they saw the material and decided not to disclose it."

Franks: "Right, that's the only way."

Fritchey: "They're... they're not gonna be subject to a private lawsuit?"

Franks: "Absolutely."

Fritchey: "Great Bill, thanks."

Franks: "Thank you. Thank you for pointing that out."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, then all those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 85."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 85, a Bill for an Act concerning elder abuse. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Take that out of the record. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1480."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1480, a Bill for an Act concerning banking. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1529."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act in relation to housing. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2147."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act concerning healthcare workers. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Amendment #3 removes the business penalty from the Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

214

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2185?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2185, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that Bill on the order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2251."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2251, a Bill for an Act concerning parentage. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Mr. Clerk, let's return to House Bill 85."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 85 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment changes the Bill by adding reasonable belief as a qualification for the penalty of a mandated reporter. It's a fairly technical change but it requires that no mandated report on an elder abuse case suffer a penalty unless they would have a reasonable belief that the abuse is taking place. Simple change, ask you support."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? There being none, then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2526."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2526, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2536."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2536, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2545."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2545, a Bill for an Act in relation to juvenile offenders, which may be referred to as the Redeploy Illinois Program. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Barbara Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Majority Leader, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that the Department of Human Services, the Department of Corrections, the Illinois courts, the Juvenile Justice Initiative, the Department of Children and

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Family Services have been working on. The Amendment becomes the Bill and it provides a one-year planning program under the auspices of the Department of Human Services so that after the one year is up the counties could apply for funds to treat youthful offenders at home rather in the State Department of Corrections. I know of no opposition and I would be happy for your support for the adoption of the Amendment."

- Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, is there any discussion?

 There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2816."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2816, a Bill for an Act concerning recreational trails. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2956."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2956, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3022."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3022, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment

35th Legislative Day

- #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed.
 No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the House Bill 3023."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3023, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3081."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3081, a Bill for an Act concerning state personnel. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3095."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that on the Order of Second Reading and read House Bill 3215."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3215, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicular offenses. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3325."

35th Legislative Day

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3325, a Bill for an Act concerning public bodies. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that on the Order of Second Reading. And Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3406."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3406, a Bill for an Act concerning athlete agents. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3547."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3547, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3675."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3675, a Bill for an Act concerning healthcare workers. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 215."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 215, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Jones, has been approved for consideration."

35th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang, would you offer that Amendment for Representative Jones?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Amendment#... Floor Amendment #1 adds a provision that requires the Department of Public Health to conduct a public health information campaign for medical providers and the general public on Wilson's disease, an inherited disorder in which excessive amounts of copper accumulate in the body that can cause liver disease. That's all the Amendment does."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 3512. That's on... on Supplemental Calendar #1.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3512, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #1, also, is House Bill 2784. Would you read that Bill, please."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2784, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

consideration. A fiscal note and a judicial note have been requested on the Bill, as amended, and those notes have not been filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll hold that on the Order of Second Reading, pending the notes. Representative Boland, are you ready on House Bill 2456? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2456, a Bill for an Act in relation to firefighters. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill passed unanimously in committee and it is supported by the Illinois Association of Firefighters. And I believe the fire chiefs are either supportive or neutral and the Municipal League is neutral on it. It makes a technical change in the Firemen's Disciplinary Act. It changes the way that the maximum period of time for a suspension for a minor infraction is described from the current law of 72 hours, which is three calendar days, to 24 duty hours, which would still be three calendar..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Boland."

Boland: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: I've now been advised that this Bill's on the Agreed Bill List. So..."

Boland: "Oh, okay. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Why don't we just handle it that way and the Chair apologizes. Representative Collins. Representative Collins, would you like us to call House Bill 416? No?

35th Legislative Day

- Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 373."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 373, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #3 deals with a situation where we have a title in IDOT that should be included in the secondary... or the special formula because of 50 percent of this particular titles work is done on the road and... and basically that covers this in District 9 only. Be glad to enter... answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Monique Davis, are you prepared for House Bill 197? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 197, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 197 requires...
 thank you very much. It requires that there... women who are
 lactating or 13 years of age or above will receive lead

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

poisoning screening if their physician feels they live in an area of high risk. Originally, the Bill was imposing a two cent tax on video rentals and Amendment #1 removed that requirement. So, it's a really simple Bill and it just ask that physicians will test for… screen for… no, that's the wrong Bill. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 197 amends the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act. And it states that children or elementary school children who are over… I mean, there's some confusion here. I don't know. There's some confusion here. I don't know. It provides for the screening for lead poisoning."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 197, on the Order of Third Reading. Is there any discussion? Representative Lindner."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Lindner: "Representative, the rental fee on video tapes was taken off, is that correct?"

Davis, M.: "Representative Lindner, that's totally removed."

Lindner: "All right. Then how... how will this be paid for?

This is a program in the Department of Public Health, is that right?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Lindner: "This is a program in the Department of Public Health so where will the money come from?"

Davis, M.: "There are federal funds that are available that can be captured for lead abatement."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Lindner: "Will it depend totally on federal funds or will we have to have state matching funds?"

Davis, M.: "I can't hear you."

Lindner: "Will it depend totally on federal funds or will the state have to have matching funds?"

Davis, M.: "No, the state does not have to have matching funds."

Lindner: "But will federal funds fund the whole entire program?"

Davis, M.: "Yes, they will."

Lindner: "So, there's no state money involved?"

Davis, M.: "There's absolutely no state funds involved at all."

Lindner: "Okay, thank you."

Davis, M.: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jefferson."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Jefferson: "The... the fees were removed, Representative, and...

does that still mean that the Illinois retailers are still

against the Bill even though the fee has been removed?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand you."

Jefferson: "The Illinois retailers, are they still opposed to this Bill?"

Davis, M.: "No, they're not because there's absolutely no fee on any videos, so that removed the opposition."

Jefferson: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 96 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', and 15 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters, are you prepared on House Bill 2244? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act in relation to fees. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hartke in the Chair.

 Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2244 allows the county recorder to do a cost studies and set their fees according to that cost study. They cannot exceed the... the cost that they can prove with the study. It basically would allow them to do the same thing the county clerk and other county offices are already allowed to do. So, we're just bringing the county recorder's office into compliance. Be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2244? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2244?' 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? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

wish? Have all voted who wish? Fritchey. Representative Graham. Representative Younge. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 62 Members voting 'yes', 53 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 38 of the Calendar, on the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2975. Representative Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2975, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 2975 requires that school districts forward information about delinquent conduct. transferring students from one district to another. For a student who is transferring to another school, it provides that information regarding any probable cause, notices, disposition orders or court orders with regard to a student who has been detained for proceedings under the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 or for any criminal offense or violation of a municipal or county ordinance shall be forwarded along with the school... the student's school records with exceptions. It provides that the school's student record information released to juvenile authorities shall be limited to infor... information that pertains only to the use of controlled substances, assault, threatening conduct, possession or use of a weapon, per... possession of imitation

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

weapons, theft, or property damage. It also provides for parents to make an exception and file, in writing, an exception to that or have an action that would preclude that record from being forwarded."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake... McHenry, Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative Mulligan, are you... are you telling me that for all these years we have not transferred these records, previously, if one... if a student moved from one school district to another?"

Mulligan: "We have but this expands the list."

Franks: "I'm sorry, I..."

Mulligan: "We have on some things but this expands the list."

Franks: "Expands the list, okay."

Mulligan: "Right."

Franks: 'Cause I... you know, we always... as kids, we're threatened with this was gonna go in your permanent record."

Mulligan: "Right."

Franks: "And I always assumed that that was true. Because if I would've known differently I might've act differently. But... but now you're telling me there really is gonna be a permanent record that's... that's gonna follow you. Is that what you're saying here?"

Mulligan: "Right, except that at... if... if the matter has been disposed of the principal has the right to take it out of

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the record after a year. And currently, they... suspended or expelled would follow, weapon... having weapons on the school grounds, possessing, selling, or delivering controlled substance on a school ground, or battering a staff member would... would currently be forwarded. This just expands it."

- Franks: "I think it's an excellent Bill. And, if you'd allow me, I'd like to be a cosponsor. And I appreciate you bringing it forward."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig in the Chair. Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis, are you prepared on House Bill 3671, 3671? Representative Davis. Representative Davis on 3671. Out of the record. Representative Feigenholtz on House Bill 3021. Out of the record. Mr... Mr. Clerk, would you read the Committee Reports".
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' for House Joint Resolution 28."

35th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers, are you ready on House Bill 485, 485? Okay, out of the record. Representative Pankau on House Bill 1414. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1414, a Bill for an Act concerning liens. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Pankau."
- Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you move this back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, return this Bill to the order of Second Reading. Representative Holbrook, are you prepared on House Bill 1614? Out of the record. Representative Howard. Representative Howard on House Bill 2390. Are you ready for that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2390, a Bill for an Act in relation to minors. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hanniq: "Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2390 allows for homeless minors between the ages of 16 and 18 to have partial emancipation so that they might choose to participate in a transitional housing program provided by a Department of Children and Family Services licensed provider. This Bill removes authorization for a homeless youth service agency to have attempted family... to have already attempted family reunification. Under this Amendment, and that was adopted to the Bill, only after an unsuccessful attempt at family unification through a community based comprehensive youth services agency can a

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

minor petition for partial emancipation. I move for passage."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2390. And on that question, Representative Black is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, I just... I just have one question that you could explain to me. I... I'm just having trouble understanding the partial emancipation of a minor. I... I thought you were either an emancipated minor or you weren't."

Howard: "Well, this... this provides that a person who needs... still needs some protection from the... from the state but is not really old enough to be on their own can, in fact, be partially emancipated, have the ability to make some decisions in order to be able to... to get off the street. There are many young people who are somehow living on the streets. They are not able to get help from the Department of Children and Family Services because they just don't have the ability to sign the... the documents, the official documents. So we're saying that they need to be able to... to seek some kind of assistance from the department. In order for them to do that, they have to have authorization to do that. And we'd like... I'd like to... that we give them that kind of ability."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Black: "All right. Is... is there any... excuse me, I'm... I'm reading this as you go and I certainly appreciate your... your patience and your answer. Does it still provide for a reasonable attempt to notify the parents or does it just leave it to the minor to say, 'look, I've been on the street for a year. I don't know where they are and I'm not going back there anyway. So I'll sign, find me a place to live'."

Howard: "It o... it only provides for... the attempt at family reunification will already have been made at that point."

Black: "All right. So... so there is attempt to keep the family unit together but this will allow a minor to make some decisions about living in a transition home if the home situation just simply isn't gonna work?"

Howard: "That is absolutely right."

Black: "It's much better than the street. Thank you."

Howard: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers. Representative Mulligan. Who... oh, excuse me. Representative Flowers is at her seat. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield, please?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady indicates she'll yield."

Flowers: "Representative, what is the emancipation age now?"

Howard: "Eighteen years of age."

Flowers: "Eighteen years of age?"

Howard: "Yes."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Flowers: "And so if a child no longer wanted to be a part of DCFS, this Bill would allow them to become emancipated at 16?"

Howard: "Only for the purposes of seeking the services that are provided in this one instance. That's why it says 'partial emancipation'."

Flowers: "Are these wards of the state already or are these runaways or what?

Howard: "Because... Mostly they're runaways, Representative.

Were they already wards of the state, then they would not have to seek... we would not have to deal with this... this legislation because the state could then make some kind of decisions. These young people are on the street and don't have any roof over their head, for the most part."

Flowers: "Okay."

Howard: "And rather than them be in the streets, subject to all kinds of evils, we would rather that they make some decisions and... and, in fact, avail themselves of the children and family services licensed program."

Flowers: "Representative, what if..."

Howard: "Yes?"

Flowers: "...a parent is looking for his or her child? Will this... I mean, will DCFS notify the parents that we have your child who's not of age yet before they start delivering these types of services? Will there be some type of... will there try to be some type of contact with... with the family?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Howard: "Representative, by the time that we get to this point there has already been the attempt to unify with the family and it is not working. That's why we say that this is a last resort. That we want that child off of the street and we'd rather that they be off the street and out of harm's way than to continue to be in the street and not have a... a home."

Flowers: "So, who would take care of these children?"

Howard: "Well, they can go and avail themselves of the services of a licensed provider under DCFS."

Flowers: "But they will not be wards of the state."

Howard: "They are not wards of the state."

Flowers: "Okay."

Howard: "They will just go into a program that currently exists."

Flowers: "Okay. So, you have Amendment #1 to this Bill. And Amendment #1 removes the authorization for a homeless youth service agency. You're... you're telling the agency not to try to attempt family reunification? Am I correct? Because... the... Representative..."

Howard: "By the time this child gets to the agency that he or she finally winds up being a part of, some other agency will already have attempted to unify that child with the parent."

Flowers: "Representative, with all due respect, I remember this Bill from a couple years ago. And what frightened me about this Bill then and what frightens me about this legislation now is that we will be creating a mechanism where is it

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that if... if my daughter decides to get angry with me about something she may run away a couple doors down to my sister's house. But if this Bill were to become law she would be a runaway and someone would make it convenient for her not to try to come back home. And so, as a result, I'm looking for my child, some state agency has my child, and there has been notification placed in this legislation to purposely not notify me that she's okay?"

Howard: "Let me... let me suggest that perhaps you would feel better that your child is in off of the street and perhaps not..."

Flowers: "But how would I know that, Representative?"

Howard: "But if..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, have you..."

Howard: "By the time that the child has... has become a part of a provider's program the parent will already have had an opportunity to be a part of an emancipate... or, a part of a unification hearing."

Flowers: "So, will I have to be there in regards... when the hearing come for the emancipation part, am I there? Would you show me, specifically, where that's at, please? Because here it removes the authorization for a homeless youth. And I need to know how is one defined as being 'homeless'?"

Howard: "Well..."

Flowers: "Because if I'm the parent and you've contacted me for emancipation purposes..."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Howard: "On page 6, Representative… there is a provision that the parent or guardian is requesting or can request a hearing."

Flowers: "Ok... okay. At what point can the parent..."

Howard: "And must be notified."

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

Howard: "And must be notified of such a hearing."

Flowers: "Okay, I'm sorry, Representative. Would you please repeat that again?"

Speaker Hannig: "Could we give the Lady a little order, please."

Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative."

Howard: "Would you repeat the question?"

Flowers: "You were answering at what point will I, the parent, be notified that the child has... is asking for emancipation."

Howard: "You will be notified early on that that is the case because there will have been efforts to reunify the child with the parent. Only when that is not possible and the child is still in harm's way will the provision, in this particular legislation or the Bill that I am trying to get passed, become effective."

Flowers: "Okay, according to Amendment #1, it says 'remove authorization for a homeless youth service agency to have attempted family reunification."

Howard: "And... and that is the agency that accepts the child.

As I said, there will already have been... by the time that it is appropriate for the child to become emancipated there

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

will already have been the process of trying to reunify with the parent and it has not worked. Therefore, rather than that child wandering around in the street, in harm's way, then... then the... this legislation would... would allow the child to make a decision to come into DCFS and to accept the services of the provider. This is merely about trying to help some children who can... who have made a decision, for whatever reason, that their family situation is not going to work. And they oftentimes wander in the street, many of them get involved in prostitution many of them get involved in all kinds of things as they are on the street, as you well know. This is merely something that will help them to know that there is... there is protection there for them and that they need but make a decision to become a part of this program and they can be off of the street."

Flowers: "Representative, I thank you for your time."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've previously worked on this legislation so I think I understand some parts of it. Although, in the actual legislation it says that no child under DCFS custody can petition to be emancipated out of DCFS custody. So I'm... what I'm going to do is ask for the Sponsor to yield so I can ask her a couple questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady indicates she will yield."

Mulligan: "Representative Howard, I think this is a good Bill,
 I've worked on it before in years gone by. But it does say
 in here that no minor can petition DCFS and get out of

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

guardianship of DCFS to change this to get the partial emancipation. Is that not correct?"

Howard: "All right, the persons that we're talking about are not wards of the state."

Mulligan: "No, I understand that."

Howard: "These are individuals who are... are not at all connected to DCFS. They are..."

Mulligan: "But... but the Bill does say that. It says no petition may be filed for the partial emancipation of a homeless minor unless appropriate attempts have been made to reunify. And it's my understanding, from some of the organizations that put this legislation forth, that in some instances parents actually will come to court and allow for the partial emancipation. Is that not correct?"

Howard: "Representative Mulligan, perhaps I didn't make it clear before. But this is not about young people who already have a relationship with DCFS."

Mulligan: "I understand that. I'm just saying it does state in your Bill, specifically, that they cannot leave DCFS to participate in this program."

Howard: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay."

Howard: "So that those persons who already have a relationship with DCFS cannot leave it to participate in the program."

Mulligan: "Also, the partial emancipation only pertains to the living arrangement, it pertains to nothing else. And if that living arrangement was terminated, the court could

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

change the order for the partial emancipation, is that not also correct?"

Howard: "That is... that is correct."

Mulligan: "All right. And in some instances isn't it correct that they do find the parents and the parents do come forth and say they are agreeable to this because the child will not stay home or they're very disturbing in the home or something's going on and they... they will agree to the partial emancipation?"

Howard: "Oh, I'm certain that that's the case."

Mulligan: "I've worked on this Bill before and I think it's a good Bill. And I certainly support your efforts."

Howard: "I appreciate, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Howard, were you at the hearing that we had at the James R. Thompson Cen... Center in 2001? I would imagine that... this was a Human Services Committee that had a hearing on homeless youths."

Howard: "I think that I... I'm relatively certain that I was there, yes."

Feigenholtz: "Right. And... and I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, that this may have been a... one of the... Patty's shaking her head... this may have been right after 9-11, as I recall. Probably. Maybe."

Howard: "I do not remember that."

Feigenholtz: "I do, because..."

Howard: "Okay."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Feigenholtz: "I do."
Howard: "All right."

Feigenholtz: "And... and there were many, many youths that fall into these categories that were testifying. And I know that there was a speaker earlier who was concerned about children and reunification with their families. I don't believe that I ha... I am a very strong supporter of people being reunified with their families, as you know."

Howard: "As am I."

Feigenholtz: "And their families of origin if... if it's possible. And I think one of the things that we heard when... at this hearing, and I'm sure Representative Bellock will... I see her shaking her head, are some circumstances that were very, very compelling. Some circumstances of children who had come home and no one was there."

Howard: "Absolutely. And... and..."

Feigenholtz: "Children who have come home and there has been no family for them to come home to, has been no family for them to reuni... reunify with, is that correct?"

Howard: "Absolutely."

Feigenholtz: "Some of the people also, as I recall, some of the young women were talking about coming home to drug addicted parents and domestic violence and living in very, very dangerous situations, as I recall. And I believe that some of the problems that we were having are being remedied in this Bill. So, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "I really would like to applaud the Sponsor of this Bill for the efforts that she's made. I don't recall ever being at a hearing where everyone on the committee was in tears after listening to these youths who really want a new lease on life, who really still, after abandonment and abuse, have hope. And fortunately, we have shelters for homeless you... homeless youth in the State of Illinois that are sorely underfunded. And although this Bill doesn't remedy that problem it does fill a couple of holes. So, I rise in strong, strong support of this Bill and I encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 114 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Aguilar, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Aguilar: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be on our record recorded on House Bill 187 as voting 'yes'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Journal will so reflect. Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Stephens: "Do you know what time we're gonna get out of here tonight?"
- Speaker Hannig: "We're shooting for 7 o'clock if we can move things along."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Stephens: "One other... one other item."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes?"

Stephens: "On the last Bill..."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative?"

Stephens: "...Representative Howard did a great job of working the Bill. And I voted 'no'. But that was my protest because we're spending too much time debating each Bill. I'd appreciate it if we could just kinda crank it up and make this place hop for a while."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative."

Stephens: "What do you think?"

Speaker Hannig: "I'm for that."

Stephens: "All right."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Millner, are you prepared on House Bill 1574? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1574, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Millner."

Millner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fifteen seventy-four is designed to get that person in that left lane to move over to the right when someone's trying to pass. And this Bill is introduced for safety reasons, for being courteous, and just plain common sense. The idea behind the Bill is to prevent tailgating, to prevent road rage, and to help maintain a smooth flow of traffic. Today we have too many accidents caused by people trying to whip around that slowpoke in the left lane. Now the idea behind this, also, is that the person can drive in the left lane all they

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

want. However, if someone's trying to pass, this law would say get over to the right and let the person pass. If you're not passing in that left lane and people are trying to pass, just move over. And I urge support for this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1574. And on that question, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. This is not the most important Bill we'll have this year but it's my favorite Bill that we'll have this year. We all drive to and from Springfield, we all drive around our districts, so do our constituents. And I think the basis of this Bill is it's not up to the guy in the left lane to decide how fast I'm gonna drive. Not a matter of speeding, it's a matter of person doesn't belong in the left lane. We should not have to go around a person in the left lane. It's the kind of thing that makes you want to pull the person over and take their drivers license away from them if you could. These people are dangerous on the road. These people are incredibly dangerous because they cause other drivers to do things they shouldn't have to do. The Gentleman's got a very good Bill here. Now, some people who drive the speed limit in the left lane say, 'well, I'm going the speed limit, tough on the guy behind me. I'm just gonna keep going the speed limit.' I would submit to you that person is not a traffic cop and that person has no right to decide how fast any of us want to go on the road. That's up to

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

the State Police, not up to some guy wearing a hat with flaps over his ears that wants to go any speed he wants to go. And so, I strongly recommend 'aye' votes on this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "I'll say one thing, Representative. Anything that you can do to keep the previous speaker from moving any further to the left would be appreciated by me. I was hoping maybe we could keep him in the right line. But I'll... I'll settle for the moderate middle, whatever. Now, Representative, I'm surprised that a conservative Gentleman, like yourself, would sponsor this Bill because... you know, you're too young to remember Barry Goldwater. But in the good old days when I was in the College of Young Republicans, we'd take down the name of anybody that would go left. Why don't we make this a right lane Bill? So that we could encourage more people to drive in the right lane? By the way, under your Bill, which is the right lane? Is there a wrong lane? Under this Bill, what is now the right lane?"

Millner: "We want... we want to encourage people... if they're in that left lane you can stay there as long as you want. But if someone's trying to pass, be courteous and move over to the right and let somebody pass."

Black: "How long have you been in the General Assembly?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Millner: "Since January 8, 2003."

Black: "No wonder you're still talking about courteous driving.

Representative, do you have legislative plates on your car?"

Millner: "Yes, Sir, I do."

Black: "I see. Would you like... The squawk box goes to the State Police across the street. What's your license plate number? I... I can just see the parade. Mr. Speaker, I... I... to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "You know, this... this is one of those Bills I... I hate to say I agree with the Gentleman from the Skokie area, but he may have a point. My only fear is... I would hate to get into a left lane procession trying to follow the Gentleman from Skokie going anywhere. Believe me, I don't think that's gonna happen. My only fear is, having been here and seeing many of you, the Chicago television stations are gonna have a lot of fun with this Bill. The Gentleman is young, he... he doesn't know that for the last nine or ten years, every other year, the Chicago TV stations put up a hidden camera in the back of a van along Interstate 55 or Interstate 57. And then they... they clock... they only look for the legislative plates and then they clock you. And if you're going in excess of the speed, some of you have been there, then they track you down and ask you on camera why you felt it was necessary to drive 80 miles an hour or 85 miles an hour. I think the all time record is held by a Gentleman from Rockford who got the nickname the 'Rocket'.

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

The think the state trooper got him in... around Bloomington at around 110. And I think his excuse was he was just trying to stay ahead of the traffic in the left lane. I... I don't know how I'm going to vote on this Bill. I've... I've waited. I wish it had come up weeks ago. The anticipation has just driven me crazy. I... as I look up on the board I'm... I'm getting hives, but in a place where I can't scratch. So, anyway, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has simmered in this chamber like fine wine for many, many years. I'm just glad Representative Brunsvold finally found somebody who would actually present the Bill. He's carried it for a decade but would never present it. So, let's just see what happens."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Schmitz: "Representative, what... what's the fiscal impact on this piece of legislation?"

Millner: "There's no fiscal impact to my knowledge. However, if people are speeding they'll probably get tickets by the state troopers."

Schmitz: "I was just curious if it... if you had a plan or maybe proposed one to IDOT how we're gonna let our friends from, say, Iowa and Wisconsin and Missouri know that the left lane is going to be for... for passing. Is there any plan or anything in the Bill that's gonna to allow for that?"

35th Legislative Day

- Millner: "If they're blocking traffic and the police see 'em, they'll get a ticket."
- Schmitz: "So I... we're not gonna put this up on billboards or anything that's... explains to our friends from out-of-state what the left lane will be used for?"
- Millner: "There's... there's current signage. I'm not sure what the fiscal impact is in the sign 'keep to the right' or 'slower traffic keep right'. But IDOT didn't provide that to me."
- Schmitz: "And I was looking in here, too, on another matter.

 The… the effective date of this Bill."
- Millner: "No, there's none stated. It's when it passes it goes through the regular..."
- Schmitz: "So as soon as the Governor signs it will become effectively immediately?"
- Millner: "No, when... whenever the statute says. Was it June 1st or whenever? Whenever it may be. Whenever..."
- Schmitz: "The last day of adjournment, what?"
- Millner: "I'm not certain. Whatever the Legisla... when the Governor signs it or passes... this question was asked of me on another Bill. So, it's the same time. Whatever that time frame is."
- Schmitz: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanted to say that at certain network outlets have established. I have a conflict on this issue and I'll be voting 'present'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kurtz."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Kurtz: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

Kurtz: "I rise..."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman..."

Kurtz: "I rise in support of this Bill. I have family in Texas and this is a law in Texas that really works. I think especially today because of the lack of civility people are very thoughtless and they hog the left lane. So we really need a Bill like this. Please support it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Giles."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Seriously and one of the reasons why I put my name on this piece of legislation for... for a serious point. I know some of you may think that, you know, once you get in that lane that lane is for speeding. However, experience have been I have been in circumstances which individuals purposely get in that lane and simply stay in that lane and hold up traffic for about a half a mile. Also, there's individuals that get in that lane that don't know that they should get into the left lane and simply pass that individual and get back into the right side of the lane. It's... it's simple courtesy. And also, from a safety standpoint of view, I have seen individuals stay in that lane and do about 50, 55 mile... about 50 miles an hour. And a speeding eight-wheeler (sic-eighteen wheeler) comes and by and want to get by and that creates some serious problems. And so, for... for those reasons I think an individual should simply just pass that vehicle and simply

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

move to the right lane. And that way individuals will not jeopardize lives. I think this Bill could... could truly prevent an accident in the future. Thank you. And I urge everyone to support."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scully."

Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. You're the last speaker,
Representative. So there's no need to do that. So, there
being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this
Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 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 99 voting 'yes', 13
voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Lou Jones, are you prepared on House Bill
3062? Out of the record. Representative Mendoza on House
Bill 2567. Representative Mendoza. 2567. You wanna...
Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2567, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2567 amends that... well, it deals with the Property Tax Board of Appeals. And it says that they should provide annually, and no later than February 1, to the Governor and the Members of this Assembly a report that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

contains, for each county, the total number of cases for commercial and industrial property requesting a reduction in assessed value of a hundred thousand dollars or more for each of the last five years. It also requests the total number of cases for commercial and industrial property decided by the board for each of the last five years. Ok it requests the total change in assessed value based on the Property Tax Appeal Board's decisions for commercial property and industrial property for each of the last five years. In counties with 3 million or more inhabitants, the board would be required to electronically provide that information to... to the counties, free of charge as well. So, I would ask for your support and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 2567. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, the... the only question I have is... is, I guess, not even really procedural. But as you well know, the Governor has filed legislation. It cleared committee yesterday. And as I understand, having read the legislation, the PTAB Board would cease to exist as it is currently constituted. Now, the Governor could reappoint members of the Property Tax Appeal Board. If I remember correctly, if I read the Bill correctly they would not

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

receive any salary which they currently do. So, I'm... I'm not sure that the Property Tax Appeal Board, if the Bill is passed... and certainly your party's in the Majority in both Houses, and since it's the Governor's initiative I assume he will sign it into law. I guess the question I have is is there any rush to get to this? Or should you just... should we wait and see what the Governor wants to do with all of these boards? Or do we just continue the process to add potential laws to the statute books, which the Governor may very well wipe out by the... by the end of this Session?"

Mendoza: "That's a good question. But I would... I would just suggest that we move forward with the Bill. And at the time and once it passes this chamber and goes over... excuse me, I was a little... caught off-guard there by Representative Feigenholtz. But if we move it through this chamber and then over to the Senate it'll eventually get to the Governor's desk and at that time, based on what happens with his legislation, we can come to that decision. But, again, I think this is a really good piece of legislation.

I know of no opposition to it..."

Black: "I don't have any..."

Mendoza: "...and would hope that..."

Black: "...any problem with the Bill whatsoever. I... I just... at some point I think we're gonna have to wait for some direction..."

Mendoza: "Sure."

Black: "...from the newly elected Governor who has given indication that he wants a rather total change in boards

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

and commissions and how they're paid and how they're appointed and so forth and so on. So I... I intend to vote for the Bill. But I think it may send a very mixed message to the people who want the Bill because it may very well be that the PTAB as constituted in the current statute will cease to exist on July 1, 2003. And I don't know what's gonna take its place. But, whatever. I don't have any problem with the Bill. I'm just trying to figure out whether we should be following the Governor's lead or just pretending like the Governor hasn't made this effort, legislatively, or what. So, I guess you're saying we just do our thing and the Governor will let us know later."

Mendoza: "Well, I... I guess my response to you would be that we just keep moving forward. Each of us has our issues and this is an issue that, I think, should move forward. And hopefully we can convince the Governor that this is the one that should be signed."

Black: "Representative, as... as amended..."

Mendoza: "Yes, Sir?"

Black: "...what does... what does the Bill do as amended?"

Mendoza: "The Amendment... the Amendment specifically details that the petitions have to be related to the grounds that are listed within the... their guideline. So it's a very technical Amendment. It really doesn't change much other than that any appeal that's filed before the PTAB must be limited to the grounds that are listed in the petition filed within the PTAB. It's a simple matter. We took that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

from Representative Hamos's Bill, which had passed out of committee. And we put that on."

"Well, it passed out of committee on a partisan Roll Black: The Amendment, seems to me, to make a very serious change in how... how someone... if I want to file a complaint, I... I currently have that right. As I listen to staff and as I've read the Amendment, it appears that the Amendment would make me fill out a rather detailed statement as to what I'm appealing. Now, I'm not a lawyer but then I've... then I've given you my case which... which then gives the Board of Review or the ... someone in the Cook County Board of Review's office an opportunity to research my complaint and to show up at the hearing in much better shape to destroy, if you will, any other word, my argument for an appeal than if I didn't have to tip my hand. Why... why are we making someone who thinks they have legitimately been overassessed fill out a form that the person you're protesting against then has access to this form and when you finally have your hearing comes in and is able to have weeks of investigation and just rip your appeal to shreds? that doesn't seem fair to me."

Mendoza: "Well, I think... Representative, the... the intent of that was just to stay consistent with... well, what we were looking for was to have the... the grounds, I thought, were an important part in... in filing for that appeal before the Board of Appeals on the property tax review. I mean, I think it's an important thing to include. We voted on that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

yesterday. I... I kind of wish you would've brought that up yesterday when we were doing the Amendment."

Black: "I... if I had been on the committee I would have."

Mendoza: "Excuse me?"

Black: "If I would... if I had been on the committee I would have."

Mendoza: "No, we did the Amendment yesterday here on the floor."

Black: "Oh."

Mendoza: "So..."

Black: "All right."

Mendoza: "I apologize."

Black: "Representative, as always, I appreciate your answers.

Mr. Speaker, to the... to the Bill, as amended."

Speaker Hannig: "To... to the Bill."

Black: "Ladies and Gentlemen, my apologies. I... I did not do my job. I did not look far enough into the file, I did not look far enough into the Amendment and the staff analysis. The... the Amendment was attached to the Bill on a partisan Roll Call. And I think the reason that that was done, if everybody will look at this very carefully... and I have great respect for the Sponsor. If I file an appeal because I think my assessment is too high, under this Bill as amended, I have to give all of the reasons and all of the evidence prior to my hearing. I have to fill out a form why I think it's too high, what am I basing it on, any information that I may have. That information is then made available to the very body, in this case the Cook County

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Board of Review, who will come to the appeal board hearing and argue against my appeal. In other words, I have given constructive notice of what I'm doing to the person who will show up to defeat my appeal. I...I think that's a very strange way to treat people who are seeking a fair and equitable hearing on what they consider to be an unfair tax assessment. I don't think I should have to tip my hand. I don't think that's what the American way is all about. And with all due respect to the Sponsor, I have to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The chairman of the Revenue Committee, Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know... you know, one of the best things about being down here is when we look at something and... and we just see it two entirely different ways. You know, every time this happens I get amazed by it. And I'm certainly amazed this time. I mean, I thought the American way would be openness and fairness. We're... we're not here where it's a criminal proceeding and let's hide the ball. We're over here where someone's assessed by the assessor, he's goes to the... in Cook County you go to the Board of... of Tax Review, they do their assessment. Now you go to PTAB. So what you do, when you go to PTAB and what this Bill wants you to do is you go to PTAB and you say, 'I think I wasn't properly assessed and here's why.' You don't go there and say, 'I'm not gonna tell you why I think I'm not properly assessed. I'm gonna hide it. I'm gonna keep it from ya.' If you over there think you

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

weren't properly re…assessed, tell us. What are the grounds? So now the assessor, or whoever's defending it, could look at it and say on behalf of all the other taxpayers because remember, if you get... if you get a reduction in PTAB, all everybody... all the other taxpayers have to make it up. So they have to be fair. representing the people who are gonna make up this... this lowering. So, it only makes sense to me that this isn't an adversary proceeding. This is fact finding. Were you assessed properly or were you not? Why do you think you weren't? Here's why we think you were. Everything should be out in the open. It shouldn't be where we're gonna keep it from ya and it's fair that I should keep it from ya. It's just the opposite. So, all this Bill says, when you go to PTAB and you want your taxes reduced and you say these are the seven reasons, then when you go to PTAB to arque it you stick with those seven reasons. You shouldn't be able to surprise the assessor and surprise the other taxpayers. This isn't that type of a thing. We're not looking for surprises. It should all be laid out. should see what it is. And if you lay it out and you weren't fairly assessed you should get the reduction. That's the American way. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Krause."

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

Speaker Hanniq: "She indicates she'll yield."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Krause: "Representative, I am a supporter of this legislation.

But if you would go over, briefly, not only that there is a report but again as to what is required in the Amendment."

Mendoza: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you repeat your question? Thank you."

Krause: "Yeah. I am a supporter of this legislation. My district is really being wracked by many of the procedures that have come from PTAB. And... in just the public school system in the northwest suburban area our schools have lost \$121 million as a result of what is occurring. However, this Bill talks about a report. Now, could you go over in addition what the Amendment would provide and would require?"

Mendoza: "Sure. Representative, the report itself asks for the total number of cases for commercial and industrial property requesting a reduction in assessed value or more for the last... for a hundred thousand dollars or more in the last five years. Right now the county really doesn't have any idea..."

Krause: "I would agree. Okay."

Mendoza: "... about thi... this information or these statistics. It also asks for the total number of cases for commercial and in... and industrial property decided by PTAB in the last five years and the total change in assessed value based on PTAB's decisions for commercial and industrial property for the last five years. Now, a second part of the Bill requires that in counties with 3 million people or more that information be va... made available in an easier fashion

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

through the Internet and would be distributed electronically to the county assessor, free of charge, with appeal information that contains the appeal year and docket number, the PTAB class and requested level of reduction, the appellant's name, the preeminent index number or numbers, scheduled hearing dates relevant to that, fi... the final assessed value that's determined by PTAB..."

Krause: "Okay."

Mendoza: "...the dates of closings, et cetera, et cetera."

Krause: "I think that..."

Mendoza: "So it's a pretty complete list of info."

Krause: "Okay, thank you. To the Bill. I think that those requests are reasonable. At the current time, the public schools in our area, as it is, no notice is given to them that this is occurring. People who appear at the schools must re... retain an attorney. I think there has to start being some type of an balance that could be given in Cook County to these type of appeals. They have been devastating to the public school system up to now. And I think there is a reasonable basis for what this legislation does provide. And I will vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza to close."

Mendoza: "I would just simply ask for everyone's support on this Bill. I think it's an important piece of legislation.

And look forward to it passing out of here and moving onto the Senate. Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "The questions is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Excuse me, Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you rise?"

Moffitt: "Just to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Chamber, I'd like to introduce a former Member here of the house. With me is Judge David Hultgren who served in this Body, the 94th District, that... that I had the privilege of representing for the last ten years from '87 to '92. Would you welcome Judge Hultgren back?"

Speaker Hannig: "Welcome back. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much. I just want to welcome my old seatmate back. But as I recall, he's a North Carolina fan and therefore, during the NCAA tournament is not allowed on the House floor."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I rise on a... for purpose of an announcement. Tomorrow there will be an informal meeting of the House Health and Human Services Appropriations

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Committee at 8:30 at the Bloom Building, which is at Second and South Grand, in the first floor conference room. We'll be meeting with Director Barry Marim and Micheal Woomen from CMS is also invited."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Jones, did you indicate you're ready on House Bill 3062?

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3062, a Bill for an Act in relation to children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Lou Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Bill 3062 amends the Child Care Act of 1969. It provides that DCFS must take certain steps to keep track of its wards who have been in placed in foster care by private child welfare agencies. It provides that if a child who is in a... who is a ward of ... of the department is placed or transferred by a private child welfare agency, the department must verify that the child was either at that sight of the initial or transferred placement. This is a Bill that I was worked on with DCFS because of... there are children in the system that neither DCFS nor the... the private agency knew where they were at. This is just a sort of a tracking measure so we can know just where children's at. Right now they said there's 200 ... we have 214 missing children. All of those are not missing children. Some of those are runaways. And the foster parents failed to contact DCFS for fear that the check will stop. There's also a measure in this Bill that says that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

if you do not report a child that has runaway... report it to the department that the child has runaway, then there are certain measures taken as far as that concern. And one of those is that the revocation of your license for foster care and also the stoppage of whatever payment is due for you for that child. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 3062. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. In fact, I worked with Representative Jones and DCFS to help make this Bill a real solid piece of legislation. And I'm proud to have been helpful. As you all know, for some time we've had missing kids. DCFS can't find these kids. DCFS worked with Representative Jones to make sure we crafted a Bill where there's some real teeth where the foster parents have a responsibility to report if a child's missing. And where DCFS has a responsibility to find these kids wherever they can find them. This is a very, very important piece of legislation, worked on very hard by the Sponsor. And I strongly urge your support."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', and 0 voting

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lyons, are you ready on House Bill 44? Okay. Out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Miller on House Bill 3543. Want us to call that Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Molaro on House Bill 1171. Out of the record. Representative Reitz on House Bill 3078. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3078, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3078 simply adds the... the emergency workers, the people that do our EMS work, to the... it's a assembly Bill, yes. It adds that to, along with firemen and policemen, it's anyone that obstructs them with their... in their duties as they go through their job. It allows the same penalties that we have for firemen and policemen. I think we've seen the work that emergency management people do in the State of Illinois. The other thing it does, it... it adds a new section that... it says, obstructing an emergency management worker will be a class... in its official capacity will be a Class A misdemeanor. And be... I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3078. Is there any discussion? There being none, then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Smith on House Bill 2216. Twenty-two sixteen. Representative Mike Smith. Excuse me, I... I'm sorry. That's already passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 2376?"

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2376 is on the order of House Bills Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Please move that to the order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1648 please."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1648, a Bill for an Act concerning a comprehensive health insurance plan. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendment... No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson on the Amendment."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1648. The Amendment replaces everything and permits the comprehensive health insurance program to offer a prescription drug only product to higher income seniors. The offering is subject to approval of the CHIP Board and availability of the funding. Can answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? And the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye';

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Burke, would you like us to call House Bill 468 on Third Reading? Okay.

Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1166?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act concerning boater registration. Second Reading of this House Bill.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Colvin, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment to the Bill simply would make the language permissible in terms of who can be determined as the voter registration. In the original, the way the Bill was drafted, it was... it could've been inferred that the principal has to become a voter... the deputy registrar. The Amendment simply clarifies that language that the school principals... the high school principals either have the choice of becoming a deputy registrar or they may designate individuals in the school, whether they be a teacher, a coach, or a group where individuals that come into the school from in the community to do deputy registration... to be deputy registrars and register students to vote."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. And on the Amendment, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicated he'll yield."

Parke: "Representative, are you saying that a principal does not have to sign up as a registrar?"

Colvin: "That's correct. In terms of how this program would actually work... in the original Bill... and it was never intended that the school principal had to become a deputy registrar. But the Amendment simply clarified that language and makes it far permissible that the principal can ask teachers, whether it be students from the student council who are registered voters and become deputy registrars, work with the county clerk, or bring in a group from the community, whether it be the 4-H Club or a parent group to come in to be deputy registrars. The Amendment simply clarifies that and states it in plain English."

Parke: "Is the Illinois School Board Association still opposed to this, even with your Amendment?"

Colvin: "You know what? To be honest with you, I am not sure. They haven't spoken to me since the Amendment. They spoke out against the… the committee because they thought that it may be a cost involved with this. But as we all know, being a deputy registrar costs no money to become a deputy registrar nor does it cost anything to actually register when someone to vote."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

"Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, to Parke: Amendment #1. I am going to oppose the Amendment #1. This Amendment requires a principal to sign up students to vote, as if principals don't have enough to do. The Illinois School Board Association says that this is a... a mandate. And I agree. I mean, I think it's a great idea but, you know, we ask an awful lot of our educators, whether they're in the classroom or giving administration... administrators. And I just don't think that this is what should be doing. I... I think there's plenty of opportunities through motor voter and registrars that if they want to... to register to vote they have plenty of opportunities. So I rise in opposition to this legislation. It's just another burden that we're putting on the administrators of our school districts."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke, were you asking for a Roll Call vote or a voice vote?"

Parke: "Not... not now. We'll do it when the..."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative."

Parke: "...Bill comes up."

Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2553?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2553, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 244."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 244, a Bill for an Act in relation to public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Franks, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Repr... Representative Turner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just... for a point of personal privilege. On the previous Bill, House Bill 3078, I inadvertently punched the 'green' button and I meant to vote 'no'. I'd like for the Ro... Roll Call to reflect my 'no' vote instead of the 'present'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record... the Journal will so reflect. And Representative Franks on the Amendment."
- Franks: "Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. We passed this Amendment unanimously in state government this morning and I want to thank my Members of that committee. This Amendment is a genesis of the Speaker's idea to go around the state and come up with the best practices for prescription drugs. We heard, at one of our many meetings that we had, what other states are doing in being able to use prescription drugs that have previously been prescribed been not had been used. Connecticut had a law dealing with nursing homes and

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Ohio had a law, as well, dealing with the Drug Repository Program. What we did is we copied those two statutes from those two states to be able to utilize prescription drugs at little or no cost to the... to the end users that otherwise would not have been utilized. We understand this is gonna be a work in progress. We'd like to move this over to the Senate. There's a question with... we met with FARMA this morning and they needed an Amendment dealing with liability. But we believe we'll be able to get this done. So I'd be glad to answer any questions. But our intention is to move this to the Senate, hold it over there, and then make any necessary changes."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, is there any discussion?

The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, does the Amendment become the Bill?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Okay. I'm not gonna belabor it on Second Reading. But does this ...does this create what you were trying to do for ... three ... I can't remember, four or five years ago, similar to the Maine ... the State of Maine program?"

Franks: "No, Sir. This has nothing to do with the prescription buying club. What this has to do with... let's say you're in a nursing home and someone gets a 30-day supply of medication and it's in a single-use package. And that person would die and then they have all this medication not

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

been open in its original package. We'd like to be able to get that back to the... to the nursing home and have them give it to somebody else, as long as we follow certain procedures, make sure it'd never been open. If the integrity is there, it's safe, and it's usable we'd like to be able to use it instead of just throwing it out."

Black: "All right. Wasn't this... this was discussed at one of the Medicaid meetings in the last year or something?"

Franks: "It... it has. It's sort of been a hot topic around the country 'cause there's many states doing it. And we, under the Speaker's guise when he told us to go find the best practices throughout the country, we came up with these two from Connecticut and Ohio."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I always like to see who I'm talking to on the House Floor. There's a Gentleman in the middle aisle who's completely blocked my view. I can't even see Representative Franks."

Speaker Hannig: "You can look up on the board."

Black: "What?"

Speaker Hannig: "Look up on the board you can... you can see everyone."

Franks: "Yeah, we could ask him to move out of the left lane into the right line."

Black: "I... Representative, are you still over there?"

Franks: "Barely."

Black: "All right. I can... I can just barely see you. This looks like a huddle of the Notre Dame fan club here. What is going on?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "They're gloating over their victory last week."

Black: "Excuse me, Representative Lindner. Representative Lindner."

Franks: "Over there."

Black: "Could you step you back just a moment? My goodness. Oh, my heavens. Mr. Speaker, I just want the record to reflect if Representative Lindner has five Bills called first thing tomorrow morning I am going to object. Because I'd do the same thing to the Speaker if I could get some Bills moved. But I think he'd probably charge me with harassment. Representative, I appreciate the... I... I can't see you again. Representative Lindner's up, waving a piece of paper. Oh, my goodness. So, this is not, as you were saying... now we have a military officer standing up. We're all gonna be in a nursing home if you don't adjourn pretty soon, Representative. This has nothing to do with the buying club?"

Franks: "No, Sir."

Black: "What it does is try to recapture prescriptions that could be used rather than... are they currently destroyed?"

Franks: "Yes."

Black: "All right. I... I filed a note on this Bill as amended.

But I think if you and I can talk for about two minutes we can have... take care of that."

Franks: "Thank you."

Black: "I appreciate your... your response."

Franks: "Thank you."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "I... I think, if the analysis is correct, Representative the... according to your Amendment a vendor pharmacy with our provider... I assume a pharmacist... well, it would, by law, have to be a pharmacist, would administer the return of these used pills... products and then they would... how would they... they would come from the nursing home, let's say, and go back to a pharmacy location?"

Franks: "Not necessarily. It could be within the nursing home could do it themself if they've got someone... 'cause I think right now when...if they're at their nursing homes they get 'em in bulk and then they package them anywhere... anyway there."

Stephens: "That's... that's an interesting point that you bring up. I heard you say earlier we get this to the Senate, we want... we need to make sure that we clean up any errors."

Franks: "Right."

Stephens: "I haven't read the exact language but one of the things that... that I would be... would have to make sure that we cover is the lot numbers."

Franks: "Yes."

Stephens: "As you... as you are quite aware, drugs not only come from certain manufacturers but they come in lot numbers."

Franks: "Right."

Stephens: "And lot numbers... it's absolutely essential that we... once we know the lot numbers, if there's a problem, that entire lot number has to come out. You're getting some advice, I'd like to know what that is."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Franks: "I... I agree with what you're saying because... we... this has to be done by agreement. And I think we have Department of Public Aid and we put the most stringent rules forward, obviously. And we'd welcome your expertise on that, Representative, if you've got ideas. But what we'd like to do is see what the other states are doing and try to put those same type of rules. If you think they need to be strengthened, that's what we want to hear. I'm just worried about time because we... we get done next Friday here with our Bills. And I'd like to move it over there for that reason."

Stephens: "I have no problem with that, Representative. With the… with your declaration that… was that the Bill would not move at all in the Senate until everyone agreed. That's what I thought I heard you say."

Franks: "No. No, I wanted to move it to the Senate and let them fix it over there because I know we're... frankly, this morning FARMA had an issue as did the pharmacists as well. I said we're glad to... to work it out. And if we can't then it won't be time in the Senate, we'd ask for it not to be called there. But I'd just like to keep this moving while we can."

Stephens: "I want to work with you but your idea of fixed and my idea of fixed might be different. So, if you just keep that staffer with you we'll... we'll be okay."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons."

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

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lyons, E.: "Representative Franks, you and I have discussed my reservations about this Bill. But I would like to alert the Body that there is a real grave concern about liability."

Franks: "Right."

- Lyons, E.: "And who would be liable if these drugs are then transferred to... to someone... some other patient? And I know at this point you have not addressed that concern but you are saying that you will?"
- Franks: "Yes. I... because when I met with FARMA this morning I... obviously, this is a donative program. The only way anyone's gonna have any liability if it's willfull and wanton. That's... that's what we're saying. We're not... we don't want to punish people that are doing good here. And we want to make sure that it's protected. And they told me that they've worked out language in other states already on this very issue. So, I'm confident we'll be able to do that."
- Lyons, E.: "Well, that's why I was initially supportive of this concept 'cause I was interested in the same Bill. But... and I know Ohio has a program. And... but, apparently, this is not reflect... truly reflective of Ohio's legislation because it does not contain anything about liability."
- Franks: "I wanted it... that's news to me. I wanted it to... to be reflective of Ohio. It's missing that component, believe me, I want the component back in with the... with the liability clause."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Lyons, E.: "The other issue I'm concerned about, too, is the… who would monitor the life expectancy or the potency of these drugs, whether they… the potency has expired? That's another…"
- Franks: "That's already in the Bill and it's... it's Department of Public Aid, I think, would be doing that. I think that they have strict requirements of when they can bring it back. It has to be, I think, before 90 days, if I'm... if I'm correct, before the expiration date. And in the nursing homes the expiration dates are actually shorter than the manufacturer's date."
- Lyons, E.: "Okay, but they couldn't automatically be transferred to another patient. Perhaps that patient..."

Franks: "No."

Lyons, E.: "...might be allergic."

Franks: "Right. Oh, absolutely. That's only done by prescription by your doctor through a.m. through a pharmacy, that's it."

Lyons, E.: "Okay, so..."

Franks: "Or... or a nursing home, as they already do it. Or a clinic where a doctor's prescribing."

Lyons, E.: "Now, are the pharmaceutical companies responsible for repackaging?"

Franks: "No. No."

Lyons, E.: "How would that work?"

Franks: "For instance, in the nursing home, the nursing home would be the one who would repackage. But the pharmacy would be the one to insure the viability. Right, and... and

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

there may... that's a good point. There may not be any repackaging because we're saying it has to be in the original package, it can't be adulterated at all, if it's opened it can't be used. We're talking original packaging."

Lyons, E.: "Okay. So that's in the legislation as well?"

Franks: "Yes. Yes."

Lyons, E.: "Okay. Well, my biggest concern is the liability issue. And you said you're going to address that so I... as I said, this is a great concept. Rather than wasting that kind of medicine and prescriptions we should be able to find use for it in the appropriate manner. So, I would hope that we can come up with an agreed Bill in the end. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Amendment. In committee this morning we heard testimony from several of the opponents that addressed many of the issues and the questions that have been raised so far on the floor this evening. The issue of restocking charge and the cost associated with that. The issue of liability. The issue of the bio... or the degradation of the drug and how we can prevent that. All of those issues were raised. And Representative Franks, I think, addressed those very well from the standards and the knowledge that he had. But he also agreed that he would certainly work with the opponents in trying to iron out any of the disagreements

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

that they might have. I think, from all indications in committee this morning, Representative Franks showed good faith effort in making sure that this Bill get... that the opposition gets addressed in the Senate and works closely with whoever the Senate Sponsor is going to be in making sure that this is a clean Bill when it finally comes back over to us. Again, I support the Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "And on the Amendment, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Mulligan: "In going through our analysis, Representative Franks, it states that DHS stated that similar provisions regarding return of unused medications in nursing homes introduced in the 92nd General Assembly could've placed Illinois in conflict with federal provi... provisions regulating how drugs are to be dispensed."

Franks: "I'm... I'm sorry, I... I couldn't hear you."

Mulligan: "It says that DHS, last year, stated that we would be in conflict with Federal Law on how regula... regulating how drugs may be dispensed. Is that true or not?"

Franks: "I am not aware of any legislation in 92nd General Assembly."

Mulligan: "This... on the face it seems like a good idea to me because that's the biggest raise in cost in Medicaid is prescription drugs. So that to try and save money is a worthy idea. I just would not want us to be in conflict with any Federal Law that would hurt us in collecting that

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

money. And could someone check on that before and let the Senate know if that's the case?"

Franks: "Sure. And... and the departments are gonna be the ones who are setting these standards. I presume they're not going to be in violation of Federal Law. And... and to following up briefly on what Representative Myers said as well, what I met with the... with FARMA this morning I told them to choose the Sponsor who they'd like to work with and they chose Carol Ronen over there to work with her. And I've already spoke with her this..."

Lyons, E.: "All right."

Franks: "...this morning about that."

Lyons, E.: "That would be good. And the department did not state that in committee today, that they thought there would be a problem?"

Franks: "They... nobody testified on behalf of the departments."

Lyons, E.: "Okay, except that there's a lot of new people there. So it would be just good to check on it."

Franks: "Sure. Sure."

Lyons, E.: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the que... then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. A fiscal note has been requested on the Bill, as amended. And the note has not been filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Re... so Representative Franks."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Franks: "Yup?"

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks, there's been a request for fiscal notes. So, the… yeah. So the Bill can now move to Third at this time. Representative Hamos, do you want us to move House Bill 2202 to Third? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Currie on House Bill 2545. Would you like to adopt the Amendment? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Okay, I've been advised we've… we've adopted this Amendment. Mr... Mr.. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2545?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2545 is on the Order of House Bills.

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Then, we'll leave it there. Representative Jakobsson on House Bill 344. Do you want us to move that to Third? Okay, that'll stay on Second then. Out of the record. Representative Joyce on House Bill 3527. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Mathias on House Bill 2088. Do you want to adopt the Amendment? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2088, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mathias, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 amends the Code of Civil Procedure by in... by increasing the Homestead Exemption and all of the personal property

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

exemptions currently in statute by doubling them. In other words, for example, the Real Estate Homestead Exemption would go from \$75 hundred to 15 thousand, and all the other exemptions under that statute also are doubled. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative McGuire, would you like us to move House Bill 3398? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Morrow. Charles Morrow on House Bill 2461. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2461, a Bill for an Act concerning property transactions. Second Reading of this House Bill.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Novak, on House Bill 360. Do you want to move it to Third? Out of the record. Representative Osterman, on House Bill 2526. Out of the record. Excuse me. Oh, there's Representative Osterman. He'd like us to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 2526? Okay. Representative, that has been moved already. I'm... the Chair was in error. House Bill 20... 2818. Representative Phelps, would you like us to move that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2818, a Bill for an Act in relation to townships. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Rita on House Bill 2490. Would you like us to move it? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2490, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Slone on House Bill 220. Representative Slone. Is the Lady in the chamber? There she is. Would you like us to move that to Third? Okay. Out of the record. And... and Mr. Clerk, let's see... Representative Soto. Representative Soto, I believe, would like us to call House Joint Resolution 28. Representative Soto on House Joint Resolution 28.
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Joint Resolution 28 seeks to commemorate the labor union organizer Cesar Chavez. And this Bill will make Cesar Chavez's birthday commemorable on March 31. Cesar Chavez's leadership in inveighing against racial and economic discrimination set a precedent. Many of our men and women in labor use that today. The nonviolent nature of this protest for labor rights makes his life something we should celebrate in Illinois. His dedication and leadership extend beyond racial bounds and into the hearts of the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- community leaders across the nation. I ask this General Assembly to recognize the 31 years of Cesar Chavez... I... I'm sorry. I ask this General Assembly to recognize 31 years Cesar Chavez spent forging a legacy of service, conviction and principle, leadership, and adopt House Joint Resolution 28. I urge your support and I thank you for your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for passage of this adoption of House Joint Resolution 28. And on that question, Representative Kurtz."
- Kurtz: "I rise in support of this and I strongly recommend it.
 I hope that Representative Soto will bring us ensalada de
 lechuga y tambien uvas, por favor, en honor del Senor Cesar
 Chavez (Translation: salad of lettuce and also grapes,
 please, in honor of Mr. Cesar Chavez)."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Black: "Representative, I wanna make sure this is drafted in such a manner that it is a commemorative holiday, not an observed holiday. We... we got into this some years ago, I don't even remember the holiday. But there was a mix-up and it turned out to be an observed holiday, and once those things are on the books you... you play heck ever gettin' rid of it. So this means children will go to school, people will go to work, the parking meters on Michigan Avenue must be fed, correct?"

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Soto: "Correct."

Black: "All right."

Soto: "It's only commemorative, Representative."

Black: "All right, so it's just a commemorative holiday?"

Soto: "Correct."

Black: "And nothing in the Resolution changes the School Code or..."

Soto: "Nothing at all."

Black: "Okay, fine. Thank you very much. Appreciate your help."

Soto: "No, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then there being none, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 28 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted."

Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would... what is the status of... of House Bill 2298? 2298. Represen..."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill..."

Speaker Hannig: "Go ahead."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2298 is on the Order of House Bills. Second Reading."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson, would you like to adopt the Amendment and move that to Third? Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2298, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for con... approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson."

- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment to clarify what we will be including in the curriculum. It adds the words to the Safe... Safe Abandoned Baby Act. We will also provide information about responsible parenting and the availability of adoption ser... confidential adoption services. Can answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Colvin, would you like us to move House Bill 3530 from Second to Third?

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3530, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Hamos, would you like us to move 3695 to Third Reading? Okay, we'll hold the Bill for the Amendment then. We'll hold that Bill. Representative Joyce on House Bill 2971. Do you want us to move that from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative McGuire on House Bill 3675. From

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Okay, I've been advised we did move that Bill earlier. Representative Slone on House Bill 3313. Would you like us to move from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3313, a Bill for an Act concerning the state budget. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Nekritz on House Bill 2187. Should we move from Second to Third? Okay, out of the record. Representative Osterman on House Bill 2630. Okay, out of the record. Representative Turner, do you want us to move House Bill 1119 from Second to Third? Second to Third. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act relating to higher education student assistance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Currie, do you want us to move 3553 from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3553, a Bill for an Act concerning air pollution. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Feigenholtz, would you like to move House Bill 2185? The Rules Committee has approved your Amendment. Mr. Clerk,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

would you read the Bill? Okay. Mr. Clerk, would you read the would you read the Rules Report?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, ac... action taken on March 26, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct for consideration' for Amendment #2 to House Bill 223, Amendment #1 to House Bill 486, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2185, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2412, Amendment #2 to House Bill 2607, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2608, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3095, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3316, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3325, and Amendment #1 to House Bill 3452."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, we have three Bills that are on the Agreed Bill List that have received 'do adopt' recommendations from the Rules Committee for pending Amendments. And the first is House Bill 2185. And Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2185, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sara Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 amends the Blindness Prevention Fund which is the underlying Bill. Essentially what it does is restructure the way that the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

program would be implemented. And I'd be glad to answer any questions. It is now an agreed Resolution..."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion?"

Feigenholtz: "...agreed Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: " Indicates she'll yield."

Parke: "Representative, is there gonna be increased costs?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I designed this Bill so that it would be cost neutral. I have not gotten any indication from the Secretary of State's Office that it would be otherwise."

Parke: "Cost neutral."

Feigenholtz: "This is a... the same... this Bill has actually been drafted to emulate the Bill that Representative Tom Cross passed about juvenile diabetes about three weeks ago. I believe that the Amendment creates a mechanism that a... improves or offsets whatever potential costs my underlying Bill may have had."

Parke: "I didn't hear that. Could you just say that one more time, Representative? What was..."

Feigenholtz: "I said... I said I think that this Amendment straightens out any cost that this might have had."

Parke: "And how does it do that?"

Feigenholtz: "I... Representative Parke, I don't have a fiscal note on this Bill. Perhaps you know something I don't, but

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- this Amendment really just changes the mechanics of how this program would be run."
- Parke: "Okay. Well, we'll wait 'til it's on... we'll have staff look at it closer and we'll let it go onto..."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And Representative Meyer, we're gonna call House Bill 3095. And the Amendment is now out of the Rules Committee. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3095, a Bill for an Act in relation to public safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Meyer, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment 1 simply changes a word from 'building owner' to 'plan'. It was an Amendment that I agreed to do at... when I presented this in committee. It passed out of committee with no dissenting votes."
- Speaker Hannig: "All in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3325 for Representative Biggins."

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3325, a Bill for an Act concerning public bodies. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Biggins, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. The Amendment is a result of an agreement between the Illinois Press Association and the West Central Municipal Conference, a group of suburbs I represent in western Cook County. Be glad to answer any questions anyone may have."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 120?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 120 is on the Order of House Bills.

 Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Move that back to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, would you read the House Committee schedule for tomorrow?"
- Clerk Rossi: "The following committees will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m.: the Judiciary II-Criminal Law Committee in Room 118, the Judiciary I-Civil Law Committee in Room c-1, the Human Services Committee in Room D1, the

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Transportation & Motor Vehicles Committee in Room 114. The following committees will meet at 9:30: the Consumer Protection Committee in Room c-1, the Executive Committee in Room 118, and the Local Government Committee in Room 114. The Revenue Committee will not meet tomorrow morning."

Speaker Hannig: "Are there any announcements? There being nothing further, Representative Currie moves that, allowing perfunctory time for the House, that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, the 27th of March, at the hour of 10 a.m. All in favor of the Motion say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

"House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Clerk Rossi: Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 40, offered by Representative Hassert, a Bill for an Act concerning emergency services. Senate Bill 70, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act relating to Senate Bill 157, offered by Representative education. Hassert, a Bill for an Act concerning plats. Senate Bill 192, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act relating to education. Senate Bill 278, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 384, offered by Representative mediation. Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Senate Bill 385, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Senate Bill 386, offered by Representative

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning professional Senate Bill 387, offered by Representative regulation. Delgado, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 402, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning health care facilities. Senate Bill 679, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 880, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act in relation to hypodermic syringes and needles. Senate Bill 1124, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act in relation to sanitation districts. Senate Bill 1154, offered by Representative O'Brien, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1199, offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1211, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning farm development. Senate Bill 1366, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning dogs. Senate Bill 1368, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Senate Bill 1369, offered by Representative Giles, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Senate Bill 1401, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 1458, offered by Representative taxes. Lindner, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 1498, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 4, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 58, offered by Representative Hultgren,

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. 133, offered by Representative Washington, a Bill for an Act concerning enterprise zones. Senate Bill 185, offered by Rep... Representative McGuire, a Bill for concerning state designations. Senate Bill 212, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning civil Senate Bill 229, offered by Representative procedure. Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning libraries. Bill 466, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act regarding disabled persons. Senate Bill 1101, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Senate Bill 1757, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning budget stabilization. Bill 46, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. Senate Bill 61, offered Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning language assistance services. Senate Bill 75, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 90, offered by Representative Delgado, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 118, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act relation to family law. Senate Bill 125, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 211, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 252, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Human Services. Senate Bill 265, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill

35th Legislative Day

3/26/2003

for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 390, offered by Representative Miller, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Senate Bill 901, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Senate Bill 1342, offered by Representative Eileen Lyons, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Senate Bill 1415, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning judicial elections. Senate Bill 1601, offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned.