55th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask all Members to turn off cell phones, pagers and computers. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. The guests in the gallery are asked to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray, as we lift our hearts and our minds before His throne. Most gracious and wonderful and sovereign King, who art the author and the finisher of our faith, who has created us and created all things and without You was not anything created. For we realize that even ourselves were created, created for Your will and created for Your purpose and created for Your glory. So, Father, today I pray that You'll be glorified, glorified by what we say and how we say it. Pray that You'll be glorified by what we do and how we do it, so that when this day is done You will have received all honor, You will have received all praise, and You will have received all glory. This we kindly pray and ask in Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hassert."
- Hassert et al: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative May is excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect all Republicans are here today."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall... the Clerk shall take the record. There being 117 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson for the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law , to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 07, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 922, Senate Bill 1414, Senate Bill 1506, Senate Bill 1785; 'do pass Standard Debate' Senate Bill 1872. Representative O'Brien, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II - Criminal Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 07, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 992; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 280. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 07, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 222; 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' Senate Bill

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

1379. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on Wednesday, May 07, 2003, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 1021."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Osmond: "I would like to ask the Members of the House the welcome in the gallery eighth grade class and their parents from St. Peters School in Antioch."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair would like to introduce a new Member of the House. As you know, Illinois now has its best Director of Agriculture in the history of the state.

And we're very pleased that his district has selected Bill Grunloh as the replacement for Chuck Hartke. And so, I give you new State Representative Bill Grunloh."

Grunloh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A short introduction, I've been in the construction business for the last 28 years. I'm also... I have some interest in farming. My wife's family was in farming, so I have some interest in agriculture also. I don't have much more than that to say. I... I'm honored to be a part of this Body. And I look for any advice and help I can get. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A point of personal privilege, if so, Sir. Once a year my daughter, Laurie Daniels, comes to visit us. Laurie is a resident of the Bethshan Association Adult Care Facility. And many of her friends and colleagues are up in the gallery, joined by people from Bethshan. wondered if we could just greet them and say hello to 'em all. And Mr. Speaker, through your kindness, Sir, and with the indulgence of the House, you always allow Laurie to say a few words to greet you all. So, with your permission. This is my daughter, my eldest daughter, she's 38 years Shortly after birth Laurie suffered brain damage. She had what they called a highline membrane, which doesn't allow the lungs to expand. And consequently she suffered brain damage before she recovered. It may be interesting for all of you to note that women are much stronger at birth than boys. So, you might want to take that into account as well. Laurie has achieved great things in her lifetime. She has had five major surgical procedures. has the blessings of having resided in the Elim Christian School as a... as a young girl. And now resides in a CILA, community integrated living arrangement, in Orland Park. You all will remember because you've created that program, you fund that program year in and year out. And I want to thank every Member of the House for what you have done to help Laurie achieve her maximum potential. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, this is my daughter, Laurie Daniels."

55th Legislative Day

- Laurie Daniels: "I can say only a couple words for you. We have a lot of good things going on with us. And I live in Orland Park and I love my job. And I wanna thank you all for... for helping me. And every... everybody does a good job in Springfield. And I want to thank you for giving my nice home in Orland Park. And I always will be happy because God made me like this. And we want to thank you all for letting me come and my friends up there have a good time today. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2331? 2331. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 880?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 880, a Bill for an Act in relation to hypodermic syringes and needles. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 902? 90... I'm sorry, Senate Bill 902?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 902, a Bill for an Act relating to schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1751?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1751, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil procedure. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

55th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Holbrook, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1054. Do you wish to move the Bill? 10... 1054. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1054, a Bill for an Act concerning highways. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative O'Brien, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1053. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Lang, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1044. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1044, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you're the Sponsor... Mr. Brosnahan, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1035. Do you wish to move the Bill? Representative Berrios, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1081. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Reitz, you're the Sponsor of

55th Legislative Day

- Senate Bill 1098. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of 1098?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1098, a Bill for an Act concerning telecommunications. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No further Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1039. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1039, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, Senate Bill 1038. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1118, a Bill for an Act concerning children's advocacy. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

55th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Mathias, do you wish to move Senate Bill 1127? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act concerning fees. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Kosel. Kosel, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1147. Do you wish to move the Bill? Representative Bellock, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1167. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Franks, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1190. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1190, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Boland, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1199. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1199, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

55th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Nekritz, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1207. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1207, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Nekritz. Representative Nekritz, Senate Bill 1333. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1333, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Eileen Lyons, Senate Bill 1342. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Munson, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1353. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

55th Legislative Day

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Bradley, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1366. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning dogs. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Giles, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1368. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Giles, 1369. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Washington, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1417. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment

55th Legislative Day

- #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed.
 No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Feigenholtz, 1418. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, Senate Bill 1431. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1431, a Bill for an Act in relation to property. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1351. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of professions. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, Senate Bill 1210. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1210, a Bill for an Act in relation to municipalities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have

55th Legislative Day

- been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Acevedo, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 642. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 642, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Acevedo, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 110. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 110, a Bill for an Act concerning child care facilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, Senate Bill 83.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 125. Do you wish to move the Bill? 125. Shall we move the Bill or hold the Bill? Hold the Bill. The Lady wishes to hold the Bill. Representative Pihos. Pihos, on 130, Senate Bill 130. The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill.

55th Legislative Day

- Representative Feigenholtz, 131. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 131, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 149. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 149, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Hassert, on Senate Bill 157. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Representative Feigenholtz, on 180. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 180, a Bill for an Act concerning records. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Soto, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 76. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 76, a Bill for an Act in relation to health and nutrition. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Giles. Mr. Giles, Senate Bill 70. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

55th Legislative Day

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 70, a Bill for an Act relating to education..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Oh, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Flowers, on Senate Bill 59. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 59, a Bill for an Act concerning hospitals. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed.

 No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. For what purpose does Representative Slone seek recognition?"
- Slone: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "State your point."
- Slone: "Thank you. I would like to welcome in the gallery State Senator Jane Krentz, from Minnesota, who is a guest in our chamber today. And with her is Adam Schafer, the staffer from the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators. They'll be in the Speaker's Conference Room for the next couple of hours if any of you would like to meet with them and become part of the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators. We'd be pleased to have you. Thanks for being here."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is Mr. Hultgren in the chamber? Mr. Hultgren, did you wish to move Senate Bill 58. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 58, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

55th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Bellock.

 Bellock. Bellock, you're the Sponsor of Senate Bill 44.

 The Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. Mr.

 Joyce, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 10. Do you wish to move the Bill? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to move the Bill. Mr. Franks, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 3. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 3, a Bill for an Act concerning discount prescrip... prescription drugs for senior citizens. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Bellock, 359.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 359, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Mathias, on Senate Bill 363. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 363, a Bill for an Act concerning family law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Millner, 374. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

55th Legislative Day

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning commerce. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Miller, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 376. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 376, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Smith, you are the Sponsor of Senate Bill 381. Do you wish to move the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 381, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put Senate Bill 381 on Third Reading. Representative Kelly, do you wish to move Senate Bill 382? Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 382, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Verschoore, on Senate Bill 383. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

55th Legislative Day

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 383, a Bill for an Act concerning libraries. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, 385. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 385, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Mathias, Senate Bill 402.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 402, a Bill for an Act concerning health care facilities. Second Reading of the... of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Feigenholtz, on 407. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. McKeon, on 423. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 423, a Bill for an Act in relation to the expungement and sealing of arrest and court records.

55th Legislative Day

- Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Giles, on Senate Bill 424. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 424, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Saviano, on 459. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Cross, on Senate Bill 472. Leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller, on Senate Bill 490. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 490, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Mendoza, 492.

 Senate 492. Lady indicates she does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1751?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1751 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Will Davis. Mr. Will Davis, Senate 201.

 Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 201, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 387, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 387, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Representative Monique Davis, did you wish to call Senate Bill 15? Yeah, Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 15. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 15, a Bill for an Act in relation to interrogations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Senate Bill 15 req... requires electronic recording of custodial interrogations of minors and adults for homicide cases when the interrogation takes place in a police station or other place of detention. And I stand ready to answer questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Millner."

Millner: "Will the speaker yield... or Sponsor... Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "The Lady... Sponsor... the Lady yields."

Millner: "Representative Davis, should we be concerned that this Bill will not allow guilty offenders to go free if some or all of an offender's interrogation is not recorded for some reason? As you are aware, statements made by offenders are extremely valuable in fact-finding process to obtain evidence."

55th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "Representative, I'm not at all concerned about that possibility due to several provisions in the Bill that cover the situations that may arise in the police station that may result in partial or unsuccessful taping of an interrogation and the subsequent statement made by the accused."
- Millner: "Representative, could you please explain those provisions to this Body?"
- Davis, M.: "Certainly, Representative. First, a statement is presumed inadmissible if an accused shows by a preponderance of evidence that the interrogation or a portion of the interrogation at the police station was not recorded electronically as required by the Bill. If that showing is made the prosecuti... the prosecutors must show by the same standard of preponderance of the evidence that the interrogation falls into one of the exceptions in Section (e) or Section (f) of the Bill for the statement to be admissible."
- Millner: "Representative Davis, what are the exceptions of Section (e)?"
- Davis, M.: "Representative, there are several exceptions found in Section (e) of this Bill. These exceptions apply to the interrogations of juveniles, as well as adults. They are as follows; the statement was made in open court or before a grand jury or at a preliminary hearing; number two, the statement was made during a custodial interrogation and was not recorded because it was not feasible to do so at that time; the statement was voluntary and has a bearing on the

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

credibility of the accused as a witness; the statement was spontaneous and not made in response to a question; the statement was made during routine booking questions; the statement was made and not recorded because the accused has requested that his statement not be recorded provided that his or her request is recorded; the statement was made in a custodial interrogation out-of-state; the statement was made at a time when investigators were unaware that a death had occurred in fact; the statement is otherwise admissible under current existing law. I hope that answers your question."

Millner: "Representative, I'm concerned about situations where the police are unable to record a statement due to equipment problems, lack of equipment, and situations where the time of questioning the person being interviewed by the police is not believed to be a suspect, but incriminating statements that are not recorded as required I'm also concerned about situations where by the Bill. there are too many suspects and/or investigations occurring at the same station. As you are aware, it's not uncommon for there be multiple suspects homicide to or investigations going on at the same time at the same police station. It is also possible that the police are detaining multiple offenders at the same police station where there is a homicide investigation. How does this Bill address all of these situations?"

Davis, M.: "Representative, in all of the situations that you have described the prosecutor can argue that the taping of

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

the interrogation was not feasible. They can also argue that the statement was voluntarily given and reliable, based upon the totality of the circumstances based on Section (f) of the Bill. Representative, I wanna make you aware that the feasibility requirement is not limited to the situations you described in your question. If the prosecution can show by a preponderance of the evidence that the taping was not feasible due to the circumstances, a judge can rule that the statement is admissible."

- Millner: "Thank you, Representative. What happens if the interrogation and statement is not recorded by electronic means and does not fall into one of the exceptions of Section (e) that you have described?"
- Davis, M.: "Representative, the statement can still be admitted by the court if the prosecution can show that preponderance of the evidence, that the statement was voluntarily given and is reliable based on the totality of the circumstances. That catchall provision is found in Section (f) of the Bill and is applicable to the interrogations of both juveniles and adults."
- Millner: "Thank you, Representative Davis. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to thank Representative Davis and the other people who worked so hard on this Bill. This... We were very far apart initially, now we came together. Meaningful legislation is crafted that I think will make a difference for everyone, and for that reason, I support this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Acevedo."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

- Acevedo: "Representative, as I look at the opponents, you have the City of Chicago and Illinois Municipal League and it says 'funding only'. What's the estimated cost for the local governments?"
- Davis, M.: "The City of Chicago is neutral except for the...
 they're concerned with cost and they already do some videotaping."
- Acevedo: "Well, on the computer, they're listed as an opponent and I'm asking what... what's the estimated cost that it's gonna cost the City of Chicago or other municipalities?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, you know, we worked with all of these organizations and associations and to my knowledge, even the state's attorney is, of course, in support of this at this time."
- Acevedo: "No, you're not answering my question. My question is, what's the estimated cost to the local governments?"

Davis, M.: "You said the cost?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

- Davis, M.: "Well, if you have a very small police station with one interrogation room, you would have only one or two cameras or you could just do an audio, like with a tape recorder. If you have a huge police department, like Chicago, you may have eight interrogation rooms, so you may have to buy eight video cameras."
- Acevedo: "Okay. You telling me what's needed, but you're not telling me the cost."

55th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "And if they can't afford it, Representative, they can buy audio equipment."
- Acevedo: "You're still not answering my question. What's the cost? I'm asking what's the estimated cost of..."
- Davis, M.: "There's no estimated cost because it would differ based upon the size of the police station. There is no cost because each police station has a different amount of interrogation rooms."
- Acevedo: "Okay. Now, let me ask you this. Is... is there a requirement that the police department set up a certain amount of interrogation rooms..."
- Davis, M.: "Certainly not."
- Acevedo: "...according to... according to the size of the police department?"
- Davis, M: "No, there is not. If they wanna use one room, that is certainly their prerogative, Representative."
- Acevedo: "And there's no funding coming from the state itself?"
- Davis, M: "They would make this decision based upon their own size and their own requirements. That would be their decision to make."
- Acevedo: "No further questions."
- Speaker Novak: "Further questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 15 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 15 is hereby declared passed. Representative Novak in the Chair. We are greeted here this morning by former State Representative, Charles Hartke, our new Illinois Department of Agriculture Director. Welcome, Mr. Hartke. We want Chuck. We want Chuck. We want Chuck. We got Chuck. On pa... on page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 21. Representative Meyer, the Gentleman from Will. Do you wish to call your Bill? Is Mr. Meyer in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the... read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 21, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 21 prohibits the transportation of a device in a passenger compartment of a motor vehicle. Provides that any violation of these prohibitions is a Class A misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of a thousand dollars. In addition to any other penalty, it provides that the manufacturer/retailer may not sell that device to a person or entity for any intended use other than operation as permitted under the provision. devices we're speaking of are those types of devices that will change a red light to green. It's normally used in they pass emergency vehicles as through crowded intersections in busy towns and our communities on a way to emergency calls. And now that those devices are being marketed by outside firms for people to use in a nonemergency manner, thereby cutting the traffic flow

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

through the communities as it's provided by the traffic lights. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 21 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting having reached 'present'. And the required Constitutionality... Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 21 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 265. The Gentleman from Cook, Repres... Representative Acevedo. Is Mr. Acevedo in the chamber? Out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 266. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce. Kevin Joyce. Is Mr. Joyce in the chambers? Out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 278. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brosnahan. Jim Brosnahan. Out of the record. On Senate... on page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 291. Mr. Mathias, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 291, a Bill for an Act in relation to sheriffs. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois Ass... Sheriffs' Association. It basically amends the Counties Codes... the County Codes to provide that a sheriff shall not be civilly liable for serving any

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

warrant, order, process, or judgment that's been issued or affirmed by a court of the State of Illinois, if the sheriff was directed by the court to serve that process, unless there is willful or wanton misconduct on their part. This measure's supported by the Illinois Sheriffs' Association and the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. And I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative Mathias, why do we need this?"

Mathias: "The Sheriffs' Association felt that they needed a clearer language in the statute. Because, apparently, every time... ya know, there have been incidents of lawsuits and they have to defend it, and even though there are some case laws that... case law that already says the same thing, they feel that this way if it's by statute and then people still file it that they have, I suppose, more of a basis to ask for fees for unlawfully filing an action, unless they allege willful and wanton misconduct."

Franks: "It's my understanding that they... people can't sue process service, a sheriff anyway, if they're carrying out their job, except for willful and wanton. And so, what you're trying to do here is just to codify the existing case law?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Franks: "Okay. Then, I... I think it's a good Bill. Thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 291 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bost. Mr. Daniels. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 291 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar there is Senate Bill 311. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Mitchell. Jerry Mitchell, do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 311, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I bring you a very simple issue. We have covered this issue before, however it... it came back because of a technical problem with the Bill. Basically, what we've... we've done was we've expanded the area of students getting on or off a bus. We have a problem with... with vehicles that want to go around the bus even though the stop light is... the stop arm is out, the lights are flashing, because it's not on a roadway, it happens to be in a rural high school with a large parking lot. And because it said 'roadway' the bus was still passed. We want to say 'anywhere'. And this only... only happens in that area that talks about roadways that are single or

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

areas, it does not affect a divided highway in any way at all. But simply changes it to 'anywhere' so that it does cover large parking lots and rural high schools, rural grade schools. I'd certainly answer any questions and request a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 311 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 311 is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reitz, for what reason do you arise, please?"

Reitz: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Novak: "State your point."

Reitz: "I have Director Hartke here, wanted me to remind everyone that at... starting at 4:00 this afternoon they have, out at the fairgrounds, live harness racing sponsored by the Illinois Harness Association. And if... if you're there, Director Hartke says come on out and watch him race. He has a shovel for everyone to help clean up afterwards."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you very much. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 330. The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Reitz. Do you wish to call your Bill, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 330, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 330 authorizes towing... a vehicle that towed disabled vehicles for an initial point of wreck or the location where... where it was wrecked to where it's going to be repaired or... and abides by the posted weight limits and allows the state routes to be approved. This is an initiative of the Illinois Tow Truck Association just trying to make sure that we're able to get cars to the points where they need to be to get repaired. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 330 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Smith. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 330 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 332. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 332, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of professions. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Saviano."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 332 is simply the rewrite of the Illinois Certified Shorthand Reporters Act, extends the sunset date to January 1, 2014. And we put in just one change in that... in that rewrite and that was that any fees that are collected under the Act will be deposited into the General Professions Dedicated Fund, so we could keep track of what the fund balances on each of these practice Acts. And I would ask for your favorable vote to Senate Bill 332."

Speaker Novak: "The... and on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I fully intend to support the Bill. I guess it's a question of my own frustration or the way things have gone in the last couple of weeks. As you'll recall, most of the monies from these dedicated funds used to be transferred out to the General Revenue Fund. And... and then we have started setting up special funds to take care of the costs of each licensed or regulated activity. But it seems to me that now the Governor is getting into these funds and transferring them back to the General Revenue Fund. So, I wonder if sometime, ya know, do we continue down this path and when they get a balance they just get rolled into the Revenue Fund? Or should we just go back to the old way, and say put it there in the first place?"

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Saviano: "Well, I don't know if that's a question, but I'll add to that. Well, there's... there's a, ya know, there's a couple reasons for a dedicated fund. And... and that ... one reason is, is to keep track of how much money is being generated by that specific licensure Act. The other reason for it is to keep track of what it costs to monitor that specific licensure Act 'cause the same amount, ya know, whatever goes in has to come out, and it's... it's a way we could keep a closer accounting of what each Act costs. But I agree, the last... last administration raided the fund... all the funds last year and they put a lot of those funds in... in a real... a real predicament because for exist ... example, the Nurse's Licensure Act, we've got about one year's balance left, one year's monitoring amount left, to monitor that fund. And after this year, even with the ... even with the licensure fees coming in there's not gonna be enough there to con... to continue on. And that's why all these fees are gonna be raised by the current administration because we're in that sort sort of spot. The... the assumption that they're raising the fees to raid the funds again, I don't think is... is viable because we simply don't have the money now in those funds to monitor a lot of these licensure Acts. So, it... it would behoove them to leave the money in there at this point in time so we could take care of those licensure Acts in the future."

Black: "I... I appreciate that answer. And I would assume if we get into one of those cautionary problems where we draw that fund balance down to where it may not be able to...

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

particularly in the nurses where you have a number of licenses that come due on a very regular basis, that you would work and alert the Members of this Body and raise the caution flag that sometimes what appears to be a temporary transfer can cause serious problems a year down the road and create a fiscal crisis that we might have to address in that fund. And I... I know you're going to keep an eye on that and I appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 332 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Millner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 332 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 414. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunkin. Do you wish to call your Bill, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 414, a Bill for an Act in relation to housing. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Novak: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill allows for two residents... two tenants who are residents of CHA housing to become members... permanent members on the... five-year members, excuse me, on the CHA Board of Commissioners. Currently, that is not the case. There is no opposition to this Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 414 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 414 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar there is Senate Bill 562. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Mathias. Do you wish to call your Bill, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 562, a Bill for an Act concerning electronic fund transfer terminals. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As... as we know, there have been many incidents of people who have been robbed at ATMs or forced in some manner to withdraw money under threat from... from various ATMs. What House... I'm sorry, Senate Bill 562, what is does, it provides that ATM terminals may be design... designed and programmed so that the entry of the PIN number in reverse order would cause an alarm to be sent to local law enforcement. Sometimes we've he... heard incidents... in fact, there was some testimony in the Senate of, actually a victim of this. And I believe, if the banks are willing to go along with this program, this would certainly discourage people from doing this, because they

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

don't know if an alarm is being sent to the police department. So, I urge your 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 562."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Representative..."

Speaker Novak: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Thank you. A couple questions for you. Can a financial institution now do this without this legislation?"

Mathias: "My understanding from the Senate Sponsor, Senator Link, told me that when he talked to the Office of Banks and... and Real Estate, they told him because the state regulates ATMs and what they can do and can't do, that it takes this language to even... even though it's permissive, it takes language of legislation in order for them to... to do this since they're preempted by State Law when dealing with these issues, when dealing with ATMs."

Kosel: "So, that has changed since it was testified in our committee, that a bank could do this now. Because that was the testimony that came up in our committee, correct?"

Mathias: "I believe the testimony was we weren't sure what the answer was and that I would try and get the answer from the Senate Sponsor, which I did do after the committee meeting."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Kosel: "Okay. The technology to do this reverse PIN has been copyrighted. Is that correct?"

Mathias: "Yes."

Kosel: "And it is owned by one person? So, if we pass this legislation in the House of Representatives, we will be actually promoting the business of one individual. Is that correct?"

Mathias: "If the banks choose to do this."

Kosel: "That's all I have to say. Thank you."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Bill, primarily for the reasons that the previous speaker pointed This Bill is... I quess it's like Linus' security blanket. You may feel better if you wrap it around ya, but it doesn't really do anything. It doesn't require the banks to do one thing. If it required the banks to do this, the opposition would be overwhelming, because there is a tremendous dispute in what it costs to retrofit or order a ATM machine to recognize a reverse PIN. And I don't know about you, but even... even when I go up to the machine and I'm under no stress, half the time I can't remember my PIN number. Now, I've got a gun stuck in my back and I'm supposed to remember that if I reverse the PIN number it'll set off an alarm. Well, it won't set off an alarm unless the machine is hooked into a police station or

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

some kind of monitoring decision. This Bill requires nothing. But it does give credence to a firm, I use the word loosely, who has copyrighted this technology. Now, I'm not gonna stand here on this floor very often and say going to endorse a technology that someone has copyrighted and will make money off of if we mandate or There's all kinds of technology out suggest or allow. there in the ATM industry that banks can choose to use if No state that I'm aware of, and I asked they want to. legislative research, has in any way, shape, or mandated or suggested or perhaps gently try to persuade banks to use the reverse PIN technology. This Bill has no punishment or... or fines or business offense if a bank doesn't do this. And no bank will do it. They're not gonna pay a copyright. They aren't gonna go to the expense. They may use other technology, such as a panic button, an entrance, a... an enclosed door with an entry code, a phone at the ATM. There's all kinds of possibilities for ATM security. This Bill, in all the years I've been here, is the closest thing I've ever seen to a security blanket full of holes. And it isn't gonna keep me warm on a cold night. And it sure as hell isn't gonna keep me safe at an ATM machine if somebody has a gun in my back. It's hard enough for me to remember a PIN number, let alone a reverse PIN number. The Bill has absolutely no enforcement mechanism whatsoever. And a vote for this Bill, as far as I'm concerned, is a vote to endorse technology that is copyrighted and owned by an

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

individual who will stand to make money if this comes about. And I'm not about to be part of that."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Novak: "Speaker... I mean, he yields."

Currie: "Representative Black made the point that it might be difficult to remember the reverse of one's PIN... one's PIN number. Now, if... if my PIN number were, for example, 0880. I wouldn't have any trouble remembering the reverse."

Mathias: "Obviously..."

Currie: "But what, under your Bill, would happen if I put in the reverse of 0880? Would alarms go off at the police station?"

Mathias: "It's..."

Currie: "Would I be required to change my PIN number?"

Mathias: "It is my..."

Currie: "The only one that I can remember, and have remembered all these years."

Mathias: "It is my understanding that if you have that type of number, like 1111, obviously, it would not work and... and if this bank chose... and again, it is voluntary on the... on the part of the bank, although I think it certainly would be a good marketing mechanism for the bank if they decided to do it, they would require that you change your PIN number."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? Mr. Sacia."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Never did I think I would stand and take issue with Representative Black. His esteem in this Body is well renowned, and I deeply respect that. However, I'm a couple years younger and I'm still able to recall my PIN number. And, accordingly, I think the majority of us can. And... and this is more a recommendation than a requirement. And anytime there is anything to enhance the ability of law enforcement to do their job, to hopefully prevent crime or deter crime, I think it's a good thing. And I applaud the Sponsor. I think this is good legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further... any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 562 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And 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 71 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 562 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 563. The Gentleman from Randolph. Do you wish to call your Bill, Mr. Reitz? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 563, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 563 has three functions. It authorizes the operation of a tow truck by

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

special permit for a third axel of not more than 64 thousand pounds, which is... which is a new classification. And it reduces the permit fee from 2 thousand to 2 hundred dollars. And it removes the restriction on how far you can transport a disabled vehicle. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 563 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 563 is hereby declared passed. Is Mr. Hoffman in the chamber? Mr. Jay Hoffman. Mr. Granberg in the chamber? Thank you. On page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1085. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson. Do you wish to call your Bill, Ma'am? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1085, a Bill for an Act in relation to groundwater. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would amend the Department of Natural Resources Act and require the department to conduct a study of our aquifers, to develop an understanding of the geology of each aquifer in the state and determine the groundwater flow through these geological units. And it would determine the chemistry of

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

these units and the groundwater to make sure that we have good quality and quantity water for our future."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1085 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And 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 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1085 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1093. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1093, a Bill for an Act in relation to vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1093 permits school buses to be equipped with alternating flashing head lamps consistent with the 8-lamp flashing signal system currently required under the Illinois Vehicle Code. This is the same Bill that was passed in the 92nd General Assembly as House Bill 4276 by our former Member, Representative Winkel. And it passed the House 111 to 0, but never made it out of Senate Rules, at that time. So, this year since, now, Senator Winkel was able to introduce it in the Senate, it passed 56 to 0. And I ask for your 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 1093."

55th Legislative Day

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mautino."

5/8/2003

- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1093 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1093 is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1104, Mr. Mautino. Do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Mautino: "Thank you. 1104 amends the Insurance Code and... in the area of a... an Insurance Guarantee Association. And if they elect to continue their rights of an insolvent insurance carrier under reinsu... insurance, this simply says that they must pay the past unpaid premiums and future premiums owed before the order of liquidation, in addition to any future premiums that may come due. It's an agreed Bill, know of no opposition. And appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Mautino. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1104 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1104 is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar there is Senate Bill 265. Mr. Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 265, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 265 serves three purposes. First and for most, it puts teeth into the Illinois' current money laundering statute by making it a nonprobational offense, requiring the offender to serve at least some prison time. Second, it allows the law enforcement to pursue the reverse… cash-based businesses that enable money laundering. Third, the legislation increases the penalty for theft where large sums of money are involved. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Hoffman's in the chambers. Is there any questions? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2... Oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. Pardon me. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "I know you're new, Mr. Speaker. But don't let your arm cover up our side of the aisle's lights. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "He yields."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Black: "Representative, I haven't had a chance to read the Bill, I'm just going on the title. I took some clothes into the laundry down here the other day and forgot to empty my pockets, I had a \$5 Bill in my pocket. And they laundered it. Now, I'm not even sure I can use it. Can I go back and punish them? Look at this... look at this, the thing is wet, smells of dry cleaning fluid, doesn't... I probably won't be able to spend it. Can I go back to that laundry and say, 'look, you laundered my money. I want the \$5 back.' Does this cover that?"

Acevedo: "If I went to the laundry and found \$5 in my pocket,

Representative, I'd keep it and put it back in my pocket."

Black: "Yeah, that's what I'm afraid of. In other words, we're not talking about that kind of money laundering."

Acevedo: "No, we're not."

Black: "That's a good thing, because over the years I think my wife has washed hundreds of dollars of mine in the pockets.

And you know, it's always my fault for leaving the money in the pocket. And all I've ever asked her is, 'well, just check the pockets before you put it in the washing machine.' So, she's not covered under this law either?"

Acevedo: "Well, Representative, whenever you decide to pass some legislation like that I'd be happy to work with you on that."

Black: "I... I'd appreciate it."

Acevedo: "Let's keep it clean."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Black: "I'll tell you what, I'm not about to stand in opposition for clean money. I think clean money is the way to go and I intend to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 265 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And 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 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 265 is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hoffman, the Gentleman from Madison. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk... We're gonna stay on Third Readings, okay. Mr. Moffitt, Senate Bill 1117. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act in relation to physician assistants and advance practice nurses. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1117 would allow physicians' assistants and advanced practice nurses to make disability determinations for handicap license plates and disabled identification card purposes. This provides that the physician assistant has been delegated that authority to make the determination or certification by his or her supervising physician. This legislation would simply make it able to issue these... this determination in a more timely

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

manner. There are no opponents. And the proponents include ARC of Illinois, Illinois Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, the Illinois Hospital Association, Illinois Academy of Physicians' Assistants, and Illinois Society of Advanced Practice Nursing. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Moffitt. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1117 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1117 is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mathias, on Senate Bill 1133. Do you wish to call the Bill, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1133, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1133 would create the Small Business Advisory Act which would require state agencies to create and make available on the Internet a small business advisory page reporting proposed and adopted rules and legislations that affect small businesses. Basically, it would be done and written in plain language so that small businesses could understand exactly what the nature of any of these rules are. I know

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- of no opponents to the Bill. I do have some language... this... well, actually, this Bill originally passed, actually, both Houses in the last Session and was, unfortunately, vetoed by our previous Governor. I do have some leg... legislative intent that I would like to have called. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Novak: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I have a question of the Chair. I'd like to ask it after the debate on this Bill is done, if it's approval of yourself."
- Speaker Novak: "Certainly. Mr. Moffitt, do you wish to speak on the Bill?"
- Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker, I had a question I wanted to ask in terms for legislative intent."
- Speaker Novak: "Certainly. Proceed."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, it is my understanding that this legislation does not mandate the creation and implementation of brand new websites if a state agency has an existing website or websites that currently list all the requested information affecting small businesses, as defined in House Bill 3209 and Senate Bill 1133. Is that correct?"
- Mathias: "That is correct. And that is agreed upon language from the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation and the NFIB, who also support… the NFIB supports this Bill, as well as IDOT and the State Chamber of Commerce."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Moffitt: "Thank you, Representative. And that answers my question for legislative intent."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1133 pass?' All those in favor v... vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, take the record, please. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1133 is hereby declared passed. Mr. Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've noticed yesterday and today the... I have a question of the Chair. But..."

Speaker Novak: "State your point, Sir."

Biggins: "Yesterday and today we have been very agreeable to many Senate Bills. And so, I'm kinda wondering how we're... our House Bills are doing over in that other chamber. Is there perhaps a way, since the Chair calls up the Bills for the Senators' Bills for us to vote on and pass agreeably, is it possible we could find out how the House Bills are faring in the Senate? And could the Chair help us with that tabulation?"

Speaker Novak: "Well, as I understand it, the Senate's going back in Session tonight at 5:30. And I think they're gonna be doing a lot of work. So, let's just hope our Bills get consideration like we've been giving theirs."

Biggins: "So, better late than never is what you're saying?"

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Absolutely."

Biggins: "Well, how... and I think that one of the questions we might ask is how many freshmen Bills is the other chamber advancing, be... be it either party?"

Speaker Novak: "Well, I think the freshmen themselves have to find out for themselves to see how their Bills are doing.

But..."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Novak: "You're welcome. Thank you, Mr. Biggins. The Gentleman from Cook on Hou... Senate Bill 1175. Do you wish to call your Bill, Sir? Mr... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1175, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides that the removal of a secret compartment from a car subject to impoundment and the forfeiture is not a defense to the forfeiture and does not create a bas... basis for release of the car. The Bill provides that a person who knowingly operates and owns a motor vehicle with a false or secret compartment or knowingly builds or installs a secret compartment commits a Class IV felony. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor will yield."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Davis, M.: "Representative, suppose you purchase this car from out of state and you're not aware that it has a secret compartment?"
- Acevedo: "Can... can you repeat that, Representative, please?"
- Davis, M.: "Suppose you buy the car from out of state and you don't know that a secret compartment exists because it's even a secret from you."
- Acevedo: "Well, you have to be aware that the compartment is in the vehicle. And it has to be with intent, meaning that if you do have a secret compartment and you... you're storing CD discs in there, I don't think that's commit... you're committing a crime. But if... but if you have a secret compartment and you have drugs and weapons in there, that car will be impounded."
- Davis, M.: "So, you're saying if you have a car with a secret compartment and you don't have anything in it, it's okay."

Acevedo: "Right."

- Davis, M.: "But if they find drugs or alcohol or victims, then you're in trouble. Is that right?"
- Acevedo: "Depends how big the compartment is. If it's a midget and they put him in there, I guess so. Well, you said victims."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, do you think it's important that when you buy a car from a used car lot that they have written in the sales receipt that there is or is not a secret compartment that exists?"

Acevedo: "In a sales receipt, Representative?"

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Davis, M.: "You know, like if you buy a used car and somebody has already created a secret compartment, maybe, don't you think they should have it on the sales receipt? That in order for you to be liable that this is a secret compartment that exists in this car."
- Acevedo: "I don't... I don't think if you're gonna build a secret compartment in a vehicle, I don't think when you sell that vehicle that you're gonna make that person aware that it's in there. Because, most likely, that person, knowing that this legislation... is in place, they're not gonna wanna buy that vehicle."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you."
- Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."
- Black: "Representative, the way I read this I have a serious concern on my rights to private property. A secret compartment, it may be in the car, and I think as Representative Davis mentioned, it may have been in there when I purchased the car and I am... I am not aware that it's in there. I get stopped, a lawful and legitimate search says, 'ah-ha, a secret compartment in the car.' There's nothing in it, but as I read your Bill, they can take my car even though I haven't been convicted of anything."
- Acevedo: "No, Representative, not necessarily. You have... the secret compartment, you have to knowingly and willingly use

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

it to hide contraband inside the compartment. If... like I stated to Representative Monique Davis, if you know there's a compare... secret compartment in there and you have CDs in there, that's not necessarily a cause for them to impound your vehicle. It has to be with intent to commit a... to commit a felony."

Black: "If you'll look at the Bill on first page, line 9. 'It is unlawful for any person to own or operate any motor vehicle he or she knows to contain a false or secret compartment.' Goes on to say it's unlawful to knowingly install. I don't have a problem with the install or create or build or fabricate language. But what's the burden of proof as to whether I know there's a secret compartment in a car that I bought off a used car lot?"

Acevedo: "Re... repeat that, Representative, please. I'm sorry."

Black: "There's language in the Bill, 'it is unlawful for any person to own or operate any motor vehicle he or she knows to contain a false or secret compartment.' What is the burden or standard of proof that I have reason to know there was a secret compartment in my car, even though I tell the investigating officer I did not know it was in there? They find that there is nothing in there. I said, 'I bought it from a used car lot, I had no idea it was there.' And as you go on a read the Bill, there is a procedure to confiscate my vehicle to do a further search. And as I read it, even if I agree to say, 'look, I'll take it out, I didn't know it was in there. I'll have a body shop guy fill it in with putty or whatever.' And then it...

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

the Bill goes on to say the removal from such compartment shall not be a basis for defense to forfeit my automobile. My fear is that a zealous prosecutor and... and a judge... ya know, I... it just looks to me like I'm at... I'm at risk of losing my car on something that I honestly didn't know was in the car. I make an agreement, I'll get it fixed, I'll get it filled in. And the... the language of the Bill specifically says that the removal of the compartment or my promise to do so shall not be a basis for a defense to forfeiture of a motor vehicle under Section 36-2, that's line 89 on page 2. Again, this Bill's been before us before and I don't have a major problem with it. What I do have a problem with it is that I don't know what the burden of proof is on a traffic stop that I know... that I had knowledge that there was an illegal compartment in my car."

Acevedo: "Representative, if you... if you continue reading the Bill where you left off at where it says... line 14, definitions, 'for the purpose of... for the purpose of this Section, a 'false or secret compartment' means any enclosure that is intended and designed to use... to conceal, hide, and prevent delivery... discovery by law enforcement officers of the false or secret compartment, or its contents.' So, you have to knowingly and willingly do it with intent. And..."

Black: "But what... what if there's nothing in the compartment and my defense is I didn't even know it was there?"

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Acevedo: "That's not cause for them to take away your vehicle,

Representative."

Black: "Well, I... ya know, I have a great deal of faith in the judicial system. I... I just... I just want to make sure that we... ya know, I used to teach history and the Bill of Rights is extremely important to me. And the criminal justice system, when allowed to operate unfettered, can usually work fairly well. I just don't want to put someone in harms way with the huge market in used cars that I... I... I could lose my car because there's a compartment in it that I didn't even know was there. I... I have... probably, if I go down and look through my three-year-old Buick, there's probably a compartment in that car that I don't even know what it's for or where it is. I... ya know, but an officer may find it."

Acevedo: "Representative, let me explain it a little simpler.

Your vehicle cannot be taken away from you for the fact is...

the simple fact that the compartment's in there. That's

not the intent of the Bill. The intent of the Bill is that

you have a secret compartment in there and you're using it

to hide contraband. That's cause for them to take away

your vehicle."

Black: "Well, and I... and I tend to agree with you and I'm not going to belabor the point. But you can understand that if a... if a person who has done time, an ex-felon gets stopped, he just bought this car two weeks ago from 'Honest Fred's Used Car Lot', police pull him over, they've run the license, they know he's a... a convicted felon, he's out... out

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

of prison. They search the car and they say, 'ah-ha, there's a secret compartment in this car. You and the car are going downtown.' I mean, would the preponderance of evidence be against this individual? And he's trying to explain, 'I didn't know it was in there. There's nothing in there. I had no intent to put drugs or weapons... ya know, I just got out of jail for armed robbery. I don't want to go back for driving a car that I bought in good faith that has a secret compartment.' But... but he... but he's an ex-con. My fear is the police will say, 'oh sure, yeah, and I'm sure you're Santa Claus, too. We're going to charge you under this law. We may take away your car and we may charge you with trying to transport or...' even though there's nothing there and he had no... no intent to violate this particular Sec... Section of new law."

Acevedo: "Well, Representative, you know as well as I do it's the responsibility of the prosecutor to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that that person in that vehicle knew very well that that compartment was in that vehicle."

Black: "Well, could we... couldn't we amend the Bill on its face to say that any search of a car with a secret compartment would have to be videotaped?"

Acevedo: "If you talked to Representative Monique Davis, she'd probably be..."

Black: "Well, maybe we can amend that."

Acevedo: "...more than willing to do that.

Black: "Well, I also read in the Chicago newspapers today and, ya know, if you really want to know what's going on this

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

state you have to read to two Chicago newspapers. And I... I do it religiously every morning. I see the Governor is going to make a tremendous tax incentive to the movie industry so that movies will be filmed in Chicago. 'Cause he, ya know, he's upset that the Oscar winning film Chicago was really filmed in Toronto. So, it'd only be fair if the next big musical number called Toronto would be filmed in Chicago. So, we're going to give incentives to these movie producers. Now, what if I'm filming a movie Batman and I'm using the Batmobile on the streets of Chicago and the Chicago police officer pulls over the Batmobile after the movie shoot and he finds a hundred secret compartments? Because you know Batman and Robin, they've got secret compartments all over the Batmobile. Now, what's going to happen to the Batmobile?"

Acevedo: "I'd probably ask them to park it in my driveway,

Representative."

Black: "That's what I'm afraid of. See, we may be runnin' the movie business out here. And James Bond, don't forget his car. I mean, holy cow, rocket launchers, you name it. So, I just want to make sure if a movie company comes to Chicago and they use a... a Batmobile or the James Bond car... Because the Bill says 'operates', doesn't nec... it says 'owns or operates'. I don't want to put that movie producer in jail. Now, we're not going to do that are we?"

Acevedo: "No, Representative."

Black: "Well..."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Acevedo: "But if you want to add an Amendment to that, we can do that, too."

Black: "Now... now that we've gotten to the really important part of the Bill I guess we can vote."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor will yield."

Dunkin: "The Sponsor yield, excuse me. I just got here, Novak.

I'm just curious... I don't have the law in front of me.

What's a Class IV felony versus a Class C misdemeanor felony?"

Acevedo: "A Class C would be considered a misdemeanor, Representative. And a Class IV felony would be from one to three years."

Dunkin: "From one to three years. And the Class C would be, what, a fine or probation?"

Acevedo: "I... I believe that's at the discretion up to the judge."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, if... if someone is caught with contraband in a secret compartment wouldn't they be convicted on the contraband as well?"

Acevedo: "Yes, they would."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Acevedo: "Representative, the intent of this legislation is there... there's been so many secret compartments where weapon have been hidden, which puts, also, law enforcement into jeopardy."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Dunkin: "Sure, I don't think anyone here would... would want any law enforcement officer to be jeopardy. My question is...

 I'm trying to understand because... ya know, if we were... if I were to get stopped, let's say, if I was driving someone else's car, what would preempt or prompt them to start searching the vehicle? I mean, will they base it on me wearing a, ya know, a certain colors, looking a certain way or... I'm trying to find out what would avoid them from sear... wanting to search the entire car and looking for this secret compartment because they have probable cause."
- Acevedo: "Well, Representative, as you know, there could be various situations why a law enforcement officer would search your vehicle. But in the process of searching your vehicle a secret compartment is found, then at this point the legislation would take effect as far as if contraband is hidden in that secret compartment."
- Dunkin: "Okay. Because, I don't know, this legislation seems to have some sort of... some... an urban intention or possibly another reason for a car search of young, ya know, minority teenagers."
- Acevedo: "Well, Representative, being a police officer I... I can stand there and name you quite a few reasons why I would pull over a vehicle. I mean, if... if I'm driving down a street and they're chasing an offender and the vehicle that I pulled over looks like the vehicle... fits the description of the vehicle that they're looking or, of course I'm going to pull that over... I'm going to pull that vehicle over.

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

I'm going to get everybody out of car and I'm going to search the vehicle myself."

Dunkin: "Sure. I guess my only question, and I'm sorta... I'm agreeing with Representative Black, is... and I think he made a whole lot of sense, ya know, it's, again, the probable cause to search the vehicle. Because it seems as if you would already have a lot of preemptive information, as you pointed out, if you're chasing someone and you see an identifiable car you'll want to stop that car, pull that car over anyway if you sus... have a... chasing someone, or you're looking for a suspected drug user or dealer, if you will, or whatever the case may be. I'm just trying to figure out why you need this piece of legislation and you already pretty much have a lot of... seems as if you have enough laws already if you want to convict someone of the level of suspicion or probable cause that you have already. Ya know, this seems to be just sort of adding more laws to the books. Just out of curiosity. And the other question I would ask is does this include individuals with motorcycles?"

Acevedo: "It would, Representative, for the fact is a motorcycle is a motor vehicle. As far as what it does change... as the preponderance of evidence that you're talking about, this... this legislation does not change any of the preponder... preponderance of evidence. What it's changing is that the time... actually, it changes the level of the offense from a Class IV felony... I mean, from a Class C misdemeanor to a Class IV felony."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Dunkin: "Right. Yeah, I read that in my analysis. Well, let me ask this other question. What if I go to... In my district, it's on 63rd and State Street... or Wabash, there is a... an auction... an Illinois auction that auctions off cars that have been forfeiture... the police auction actually has forfeiture... excuse me, they have auctions as well of confiscated products or merchandise. I mean, how would it affect that? And let's say if it... let's say it cost... it'll cost me about \$600 to move... remove this compartment. I mean, I'm just trying to look at the overall circumstances right here, if it's even necessary, since it's already, really, on the books. Am I right?"
- Acevedo: "Yeah, yeah. Absolutely. And let me explain something. What you're talking about as far as not having any knowledge that the compartment... secret compartment was in the vehicle. It's up... it's the responsibility of the prosecutor to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that that person knowingly and willingly with intent knew that compartment was in there and used that compartment to hide contraband."
- Dunkin: "But it seems if it... it would be very subjective if the officer is there and it would be his word against the person who was in the car's word."
- Acevedo: "You... you have to understand, just because the compartment is in the vehicle does not necessarily mean that they're gonna... they're gonna forfeiture their vehicle."

Dunkin: "I'm con... I'm sorry, can you repeat that?"

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Acevedo: "Just because the compartment is in the vehicle doesn't mean they... they're allowed to take away your vehicle."

Dunkin: "But it says..."

Acevedo: "It has to be used for... to hide contraband. If you have a secret compartment in your vehicle and you... and it's empty or you have CDs in there or you have candy in there, they cannot take away your vehicle. Just because you have a secret compartment in your vehicle, this legislation does not say they can take away your vehicle."

Dunkin: "Sure. But what if I acquire this car from an auction and I have some... some old heroin from the '70s that's in there, or ten years ago, and it's in a compartment. And next thing you know I get pulled over, you have your... your dog sniffers and the car gets confiscated. The marijuana or the heroin or whatever it is, contraband, is old."

Acevedo: "Well, I'm kind of worried... I'm kind of worried that you said if you had heroin in there from ten years ago and you forgot to take it out, it's your responsibility to make sure you get rid of that contraband."

Dunkin: "But it's... it's a secret compartment and I didn't about it and it wasn't disclosed to me..."

Acevedo: "Oh, I thought... I thought you said yours."

Dunkin: "...when they sold me the car."

Acevedo: "I thought you said you had put it in there ten years ago and forgot to take it out."

Dunkin: "No, I didn't say that. I said if I have purchased the car... or I meant if I have purchased the car from an auction

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

or a friend or a used car dealership and they have heroin in there, the liquid kind, from the '70s, along with the needles that they used back then. I mean, am I liable for that particular offense?"

Acevedo: "Rep... Representative, like I said before, it's the responsibility of the prosecutor to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the heroin is your heroin."

Dunkin: "So, again, if that weed is about five years old and we can prove that, I won't be convicted, nor will they take my car?"

Acevedo: "That's up to the courts."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. I just want to remind everyone this Bill is on Short Debate. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Molaro."

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

Speaker Novak: "Sponsor yields."

Molaro: "All right. Well, I... I would assume, Representative Acevedo, you get the same analysis on your computer that we do?"

Acevedo: "Yeah."

Molaro: "Or I do. We're in the same party so we better be getting the same analysis, right? So, it says here the... the second sentence under the executive summary, 'the Bill provides that a person who knowingly', and they have 'knowingly' written... I don't know if you've seen the... the analysis... it says, 'the person... the Bill provides that a

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

person who knowingly owns or operates a motor vehicle with a false or secret compartment or who knowingly builds or installs a secret compartment commits a Class IV felony.' So, if you read that is says, 'the Bill provides that a person who... who knowingly owns or operates a motor vehicle with a false or secret compartment.' So, the 'knowingly', according to our analysis, goes to owning or operating. It doesn't go to knowing that there's a false compartment, at least that's what the analysis says."

Acevedo: "Right."

Molaro: "Now, I don't know, maybe that's a mistake. But if you could look at that. Now, to the legislation. legislation itself. What... the law is the law, we already have this. Okay, so all you did was made it a misdemeanor... Class IV felony. Okay, and maybe we can live with that because police officers want to feel safe. But to the forfeiture section, that's Section C of the Bill. And when you read the definition for... to ... to good reverend doctor Black over there, you referred to Section B. So, remember in the forfeiture section it says, 'any motor vehicle containing a false or secret compartment, as well as those items, shall be subject to seizure by the department.' When it comes to forfeiture you don't have to know anything. In other words, when they pull you over, to be charged with the crime you may have to know it was there or you could... or you could make that case. But forfeiture is just if the drugs are there, if ... if the gun's there, if you have a secret compartment the... the car gets forfeited, you

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

don't have to know about it. And that's what the law is today. Now, I guess what I have to ask you is this. What your Bill does... and this is all your Bill does, 'cause everything I just said is current law."

Acevedo: "Absolutely."

Molaro: "Absolutely. But here's what your Bill says, 'the... the removal of the false or secret compartment or the promise to do so is no defense to the forfeiture.' Forget the crime, because the crime's always the crime, but to the forfeiture. So, I have to ask you this, what was... was happening out there in the real world? Are you trying to say that someone would go before a judge, his car's being forfeited, and he would come up there and say, 'hey, listen, here's what's going on. I didn't know about it, I'll take it out.' And judges were saying, 'okay, as long as you take it out, we'll give your car back.' Is that what was happening? Because that's all you're changing. So, apparently that's what must have been going on."

Acevedo: "Absolutely, Representative. That's exactly what's happening."

Molaro: "So, getting back to doc... I gotta quit calling him doctor Black... getting back to Representative Black's question. So, if we're stopping that, if... if a person does go up and they go to the forfeiture... now remember, forfeiture is just that it was there, and a person comes up and says, 'I didn't know it was there. I was not aware of it.' And the state can't prove otherwise. The state says, 'you know what? We can't prove he did or didn't know.

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Let's assume he did not know.' Is that still a defense and do I get my car back if I say I didn't know it was there? Or does the prosecutor have to prove I knew it was there to bring a forfeiture act? For legislative intent, what do you think the intent of the law is today?"

Acevedo: "They... they still have to prove that you knew the compartment was in the vehicle at the time."

Molaro: "That's fine enough. So, as long as we know that they have to prove... they have to prove that he, the driver, knew that the... the... the legal compartment was there. So, if the driver didn't know, then he will not get his cor... car forfeited. Is that your understanding"

Acevedo: "Right. Yes."

Molaro: "Thank you. That's all I needed. Thanks a lot."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, I... I've got a completely different situation that I need to ask about... about on this Bill. Sports utilities vehicles, pickup trucks, quite often there is a false compartment that is installed in the back of those because it still looks very decorative if, say, when you go hunting you slide your shotguns into those false compartments, keep them covered and those... those are hid that way. The guns are being transported legally, they're unloaded, according to what the laws are in the state. Is this vehicle, then, able to be seized..."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Acevedo: "No, Repr..."

Bost: "...and forfeited?"

Acevedo: "No, Representative, for the fact being that if them vehicles, like you say, you named quite a few, obviously it's manufactured like that, that's not cause for them to take away your vehicle cause..."

Bost: "No."

Acevedo: "...it's not considered a secret compartment."

Bost: "No, it's... no it's not manufactured like that. What this... how this is done is you go to an after-marketer and you place in... in the back of the pickup or in the back of the sports utility vehicle, it looks like a false floor, then carpeting is matched over that and you might have a latch that then twists and then picks up. You can't ... unless you know it's there, a person looking at it thinks, okay, the vehicle just has a rise. Now... now, we're running into a little bit of a problem because that is an aftermarket installed false floor and it is a compartment, and that compartment holds guns. Under this new... what I'm reading here, those sports uve... utility vehicles are a vehicle that's been prepared in that way, even though you're... you're not doing anything illegal. What you're doing is you're going hunting and... and you want to have ... have a place to protect your guns, and quite often, they're a locked safe. Will you lose your vehicle under this? I think you will."

Acevedo: "No, Representative. For the fact is that just because the vehicle has a secret compartment doesn't give

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

'em cause to take away your vehicle. Secondly, if you're caring the weapons legally, you're not trying to conceal contraband because the weapon is legal."

Bost: "Okay. Okay, I just... I was... I was wanting for legislative intent... I... I want people to know if we're gonna support this that I don't want to hear later on... and lot's of times we say, 'for legislative intent', and it doesn't leave this chamber. Nobody looks at it and it goes to a court and next thing you know we're out there trying to defend ourselves, no, no, no, we were trying to go after those criminals that hide... the gang members that hide the guns, the... the person that hang... that hides the dope in... in a compartment that's been put in after-market. I don't want to see it come back to us later and haunt us and say okay, now all of the sudden we have this problem. So, pur..."

Acevedo: "Representative..."

Bost: "...for purposes of intent..."

Acevedo: "The Bill is to deal with illegal contraband."

Bost: "Okay. That's what I needed to know. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Rose."

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

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, I just want it to be very clear for the legislative record, the addition in no way impacts the innocent owner defense, both statutory or otherwise according to case law."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Acevedo: "Can you repeat the question, Representative? I didn't hear what you said."

Rose: "Sure. I just want to make sure that... that your Bill here today does not impact the innocent owner defense, whether it's the statutory innocent owner defense or any current existing case law."

Acevedo: "I can't hear him."

Speaker Novak: "Can we ha… excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen, could we be a little bit more quiet here. Shh. Would you repeat your question, Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Sure, thank... thank you. Representative, I'm just... wanna make sure for the... the legislative record, here, that your Bill does not impact the so-called innocent owner defense that's currently in the statute or otherwise provided for case law."

Acevedo: "No, no it does not."

Rose: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Novak: "To the Bill."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to vote for this Bill.

I think many of the concerns that are being raised here today are inherent within the entire civil asset forfeiture statute that we have in place already. Much of what's been talked about here is the fact that Illinois... the burden shifts to the defendant to prove that in fact his asset wasn't used to commit a crime. I... I support you, Representative Acevedo, in this Bill today, here, currently. But I think many of the concerns as I've been listening is, really are better placed to the existing

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

statute, the civil forfeiture statute as a whole, both here in the state and also around the federal statute as well. So, I just wanted to make sure on this one point that we're not going to override the innocent owner defense. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Fayette, Mr. Stephen... No, okay. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is... Excuse me, Mr. Acevedo to close."

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

Speaker Novak: "And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1175 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Saviano. Mr. Mr. Wait. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and 1 not voting. And having reached the requ. required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1175 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1176. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Delgado. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1176, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 116... I'm sorry, 1176 does the following. As we all know, in our communities this a Bill that is dealing with criminal justice. In Illinois on a sentencing that's

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

for certain crimes, the crime victim may make a statement... an impact statement, regarding the impact, if you will, of the crime had on him or her. This includes victims of violent crimes, drunk driving victims, victims of certain drug offenses. This Bill is identical to my Bill that I passed unanimously out of here last Session, 115 to 0. And basically, the Bill allows victims of prostitution, solicitations of a prostitute, keeping a place of prostitution, patronizing a prostitute, patronizing a juvenile prostitute, and pimping, to make a victim statement at a sentencing to offer evidence in either aggravation or mitigation. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Delgado. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, then the question shall be, 'Shall Senate Bill 1176 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McKeon, you might... do you want to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record, please. On this question there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1176 is heredy... hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1205. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1205, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1205 would allow municipalities to enter into long-term energy contracts. It's identical to House Bill 2574, by Representative Giles of this 93rd Assembly, which passed the House on a vote of 116, with 1 voting 'present'. And I ask for your 'aye' vote again on this legislation."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Mathias. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1205 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And 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', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1205 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1347. Mr. Mathias. Mr... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act concerning estate administration. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1347 would provide that a decedent's estate qualifies for a summary administration if the gross value of the estate does not exceed a hundred thousand dollars, under present law it's fifty thousand dollars. And this is supported by the Illinois State Bar Association. And I ask for you 'aye' vote."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Novak: "State your in..."

Black: "Are you doing a... are you doing a special order of call?"

Speaker Novak: "I'm going right down the list."

Black: "You're going..."

Speaker Novak: "We're on Third Readings."

Black: "You're going right down the list. Yesterday it was the order of Washington and today is the order of Mathias?"

Speaker Novak: "I haven't seen the order of Novak yet, but..."

Black: "Is this... is this his first, second, third, or fourth priority Bill? It's the twentieth Bill he's called today.

I... I don't even have a Senate Bill. Yeah, a good one. All right. So, we're just going down the list?"

Speaker Novak: "We are going down the list, Mr. Black."

Black: "Well, I wish he would be more like former Representative Preston and you'd be more like former Majority Leader McPike. Call on him early in the morning and on the order of Mathias, if he isn't here we don't get back to it."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Is there any discussion? Hearing none... and the question shall be, 'Shall Senate Bill 1347 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Biggins. Mr. Colvin. Marlow Colvin, do you

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

wish to vote? Mr. Biggins. Does Mr. Biggins wish to vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record, please. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1347 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1375. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCarthy. Do you wish to call your Bill, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, first of all, would like to thank Representative Mathias for allowing me to interrupt his presentations. But, Senate Bill 1375 is a initiative of the Illinois Community College Board. It basically sets up a federal trust fund so that the money that they get for their operational expenses from the Federal Government could be held in a trust fund in our treasury so that the interest would accrue to our state instead of sitting in the… the Federal Government's treasury. I think it's a good initiative. We would be able to access federal funds a little quicker. And I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Novak: "The Sponsor will yield."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Mulligan: "If we're creating this fund and the Governor is raiding funds, how does this help if we put the money in a fund and then the Governor takes it out? Will it still be able... the community colleges be able to access it or would they be better off just getting it from the Federal Government, the way they do it now?"
- McCarthy: "Well, they feel very firmly that they would be better off bringing it down into this trust fund. I think that because these are designated federal funds that the Governor's Office should not be able to deplete them for any intent other than the purpose which they are taken down from the Federal Government for. I'm sure we'll have that question answered, because I understand that some of the trust funds that he is looking into now, that that may come up as a question. So, I think the question will be long answered before any funds accumulate in this trust fund. I did ask the Community College Board people, they still feel it's a very worthwhile initiative."
- Mulligan: "And what will... what will be the charge of administering this fund from the Governor's new proposal?"
- McCarthy: "The... I'm sure it would be whatever the... the percent that they said in the... the new budget regulation as any other fund."
- Mulligan: "I'm sorry, say again."
- McCarthy: "I don't know the exact... I... I know the proposal that you're referring to. I don't know what that percent was, but I'm sure it would be the same percent if... if it is across the board for all of these trust funds."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Mulligan: "Where does the money go now?"

McCarthy: "The money sits at the federal level until the Community College Board appropriates it."

Mulligan: "Does it accrue any interest?"

McCarthy: "It... not for us. Not for anything in the state or for the Community College Board or for the State Treasury.

The Community College Board feels that if they can set up this trust fund the interest would then accrue to the benefit of the state."

Mulligan: "And do... do the community college... does the board understand what's going on now with funds in the State of Illinois?"

McCarthy: "They do... they do. They feel as I do that the...

because these are designated federal funds that the

Governor would be limited in his ability to access them.

And I certainly hope that's true."

Mulligan: "So do I, Representative, but you know, in this climate, who knows. I just thought it was very interesting, every new fee that we passed, every new fund, every new group that we give professional status to now has the potential to have their money raided. So, I'm just curious as to know how this was going to re..."

McCarthy: "I... I think your concerns are genuine and I think that that question will be answered by the... the money being taken out of other funds before this fund ever accumulates enough money to be... to looked into."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Further discussion? Mr. McCarthy to close."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- McCarthy: "Thank you. I think the Community College Board is genuine in thinking that this is a good idea. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Novak: "Thank you. And the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1375 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. And 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 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1375 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1407. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act in relation to courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Yes, you'll be... you'll be all glad to hear this is my last Bill, for today. This is Senate Bill 1407 which would permit the Clerk of the Circuit Court to accept credit card payments over the Internet for fines, penalties, or costs from offenders on voluntary electronic pleas of guilty in minor traffic and conservation cases. It's an initiative of the Lake County and Metro Counties Association. I know of no opponents and I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Mathias. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In honor of this being his last Senate Bill of the 123 he has sponsored, I just have one question. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Novak: "I'm sure he will, Sir."

Black: "You promise this is your last Senate Bill?"

Mathias: "I said for today."

Black: "For today?"

Mathias: "Yes."

Black: "All right. I just have one question."

Mathias: "Yes."

Black: "When we have passed these Bills in the past to allow the payment by credit card, as you know, there is a fee to the credit card company. So, if I charge a \$100 fine on a credit card the county, if they don't cover that fee, will not get the hundred dollars. Now, this... this Bill recognizes that, I assume. So, you have to pay the service fee so the county gets the net fine, not the fine minus the credit card service fee."

Mathias: "That is my understanding."

Black: "That is your understanding or is that what the Bill does?"

Mathias: "Well, it... it's... it's in the same section as other payments by credit card, which are done in person."

Black: "All right. Yeah, 'cause... well, whenever we've done this we've always made sure that the government body adds on that service fee that... so the net payment is... is what it's supposed to be, either by court or by statute. We're not in the business of... of making money for credit cards.

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

If it's a hundred dollar fine, it's a hundred bucks. It's not a hundred bucks minus whatever Visa, MasterCard, or American Express would charge the county for that fee. So, I'm... I'm just assuming that that continues current practice."

Mathias: "That is... in the Bill... in the existing language of the statute it... it provides for that service charge, this is contained within that same provision."

Black: "Okay. I... I think that's important to make sure that it is. And I... would it... would there be any chance we could just get you to put all of the rest of your credit... or all of the rest of the Senate Bills you're sponsoring on a credit card and we'll deal with it when the statement comes in?"

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1407 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1407 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1409. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lang. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill, please."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1409, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1409 adds blood blanks to the institutions in a local community that have to be added to an emergency energy plan when demand is at significant risk of... of exceeding supply. So, local communities today have to notify police, fire, hospitals, and nursing homes, and others if there's a significant risk of not enough energy to go around. This would simply add blood banks so blood banks can prepare for these types of emergencies. This Bill passed the Senate unanimously and the House committee unanimously. I would ask your support."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Lang. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's very hard to hear in here. Will the will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Novak: "Yes, Sir, he will."

Black: "Representative, does this Bill allow for, I'm sorry, slot machines at blood banks?"

Lang: "Well, despite the fact that that might be good idea, that's not in this Bill, Representative."

Black: "So, this is not an expansion of the banking business or the gambling business. This just really deals with blood, right?"

Lang: "It deals with blood, Sir."

Black: "I've got a great line there but I won't use it."

Lang: "Use it later, I'll have a drink with you."

Black: "Thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1409 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there's 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And having reached the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1409 is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1478... excuse me, 1458. The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner. Is Representative Lindner in the Body? Out of the record. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1468. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1468, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1468 amends the Illinois Controlled Substances Act, provides that a factory-sealed, imprinted container of a chemical used in the manufacturing of methamphetamine, self authenticates the contents of that container which is admissible in the evidence as the vio... as a violation under the Act. In layman's terms, what this means is the label says what it is and what it is is what the label says it is. Quite often, what we find is there'll be a traffic stop, there'll be quite a bit of Sudafed in a vehicle. Under current existing evidentiary statutes, rather than relying on what

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

the package says, which is that it's Sudafed and such and such in amount per a capsule, we have to send it to the Illinois State Police Crime Lab, they then have to open each individual capsule, weigh it, test each individual capsule, and in fact say, yes, in fact, this is Sudafed, which after all is what it said on the bottle in the first place. There is quite a bit of evidentiary exceptions, both from the State of Illinois and also the Federal Law that are like this, most notably, self-authenticating documents, a dictionary, for example. So, I would ask for passage of this Bill. And would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1468 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having reached a required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1468 is hereby declared passed. On page 25 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, is House Joint Resolution 19. Mr. Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution. Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 19 is a bipartisan effort with myself and Representative Novak, he was on there... I believe you're supposed to be on there. It names two things. It would

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

add Galesburg and Monmouth to the Reagan Trail. The Reagan Trail really is not complete in Illinois unless you add those two towns as former President Reagan spent childhood there. This also names a highway for former Democrat Mayor Kenneth Hayes of Bradley, and this is at the request of Representative Novak. The Reagan Trail's been very successful in terms of development of tourism. The... all parties on the Reagan Trail would like for Galesburg and Monmouth to be added. The leadership of that trail even came to Galesburg, met with Galesburg officials and asked if they'd be added. Be happy to entertain any questions. Thanks."

Speaker Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Moffitt. Is there any questions? Hearing no... hearing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 19 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ms. Lou... Lou Jone... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. having reached the required Constitutional Majority, House Joint Resolution 19 is hereby declared pass... is adopted, excuse me. On page 28 of the Calendar is House Resolution 167. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Jefferson. Charles Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson, House Resolution 167. Jefferson, do you wanna present your Resolution? Proceed. Mr. Jefferson."

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

- Jefferson: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. House Resolution 60... 167 basically says that we're asking you to recognize June 19 as a day of remembrance for all the slaves that were freed June 19. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 167 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, House Resolution 167 is hereby adopted. On page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1458. The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1458, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Novak: "Ms. Lindner."

- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Juvenile Court Act and the Probation Officers Act. It's an initiative of the Probation and Court Services Association just to clarify that probation officers are peace officers for the purposes of picking up somebody who has violated their probation."
- Speaker Novak: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1458 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. All... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

55th Legislative Day

5/8/2003

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And having received the required Constitutional Majority, Senate Bill 1458 is hereby declared passed. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. Allowing perfunctory time for the… Excuse me, Representative Bellock, did you have… what reason do you rise, Ma'am?"

Bellock: "I just wanted to announce the practice for Capitol Capers tonight at 6:00 in the Howlett Center, again. Thank you very much."

Speaker Novak: "You're welcome."

Bellock: "6:00, Howlett Center."

Speaker Novak: "You're welcome. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Davis moves the House stand adjourn 'til the hour of 10 a.m. on Friday, May 9. All those in favor vo... say 'aye'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. The House stands adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1335, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning prevailing wages. First Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session is now adjourned."