12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off their laptop computers, their cell phones and their pagers. Today we will have two invocations. And so for those of you who are in need of spirituality and grace, you came... you came on the right day. First, we shall be led in prayer by Bishop Larry Trotter with the Sweet Holy Spirit Church in Chicago. Bishop Trotter is the guest of Representative Monique Davis."

Bishop Trotter: "Let us pray. Our Father and our God, how we thank You for this day that we've never seen before nor that we'll never see it again. We thank You for the blessing of the day, health, strength, wisdom. pause today to ask Your blessing upon this... this House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, this 94th General Session... General Assembly. We pray God that You would order our steps, these Your people who make decisions for the lives of people everywhere in Illinois. And our decisions would be those for the betterment of Your people. We ask Your blessing upon the Speaker of the House and all of the other lawmakers throughout the land, throughout this country, that we have stood on the fact that we trust in And so we stop and we ask Your blessing upon the workings of the day. We pray now that everything that is done would be done decent and in order. And we pray now Your blessings upon the family members of these that have to toil and work here that are back home that their homes

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

would be safe, that their children would be well, that their spouses will be kept. We pray that Your name would be lifted in all of the earth. The time when people are hurting across the world, we thank You that we are blessed and that we are not victims of a tsunami or earthquake or any of those tragedies but we remember those people. And that we ask Your blessing not just upon ose... those of us that are here in Springfield but we ask Your blessing upon those that are watching via the internet. That in every household, every senior citizen, every single mother, every child, every person under the sound of my voice would receive the blessing. Guide us today is our prayer. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall also be led in prayer by Father Bruce Wellems of the Holy Cross Parish in the Back of the Yards Neighborhood of Chicago. Father Wellems is the guest of Representative Acevedo."
- Father Willems: "We pray, Lord God, this is a time of change, of conversion, of reconciliation. And You remind us in this season that we are salt of the earth. We draw one another together to be family. Help us live this spirit in this sacred Assembly. We are light of the world, You tell us, help us to give to one another, to recognize You in all people. And we ask Your blessing this day. In the… name of our Lord Jesus. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative D'Amico."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

- D'Amico et al: "I pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Jone... Jones and Molaro are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Tenhouse is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Mautino, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 08, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 500. Representative Granberg, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on February 08, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 445 and House Bill 601. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation and Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on Tuesday, February 08, 2005,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 187. Referred to the House Committee on Rules: House Resolution 100, offered by Representative Hamos; House Resolution 102, offered by Representative Holbrook; House Joint Resolution 16, offered by Representative Barbara Flynn Currie."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yeah... Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, if I might."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Black: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I can have your attention. I want you to all join with me in congratulating the Speaker. And I know you all want to join me in congratulating the Speaker because many of your Bills haven't yet been assigned. So, Mr. Speaker, we'd just like to thank you and Notre Dame, your university, for knocking off the only other undefeated team in basketball last night, Boston College. Congratulations. Now, I... I will leave the poetry for the Illinois victory to the poet laureate of the University of Illinois, Chapin Rose."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Acevedo: "Just for a quick announcement. Anybody who wasn't able to join us in the chapel, Father Bruce for the next 15 minutes will be distributing ashes on the side of the chambers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy. Mr. Eddy."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Eddy: "Point of pri... personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Eddy: "I would like... if the House could join me in welcoming a very special group of people here today from Crawford County, Illinois. We have a group of 25 individuals who are part of a leadership program there. They are here today for Law Day in... in their leadership program. They're sitting right up here... on this side. And if they'd stand please, the leadership group from Crawford County. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. I believe my name was used on the floor here. I would simply like to respond with two words, go Irish."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, on a more serious note. I have an inquiry of the Chair. Would you be kind enough to appoint a committee on safety and investigate why there seem to be so many Legislators with their arms in a sling, on crutches, their foot in a cast. This looks like a MASH unit out here. Something obviously is... is wrong. I... I think that knowing how you care about this chamber, you need to appoint a committee on health and safety because something obviously is going wrong. Flider is on crutches. I don't who else is on crutches. My seatmate, Eileen Lyons has her foot wrapped up. She looks like Admiral Byrd on her way to the North Pole. It's... the walking wounded out here.

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Something's going on and I know you'll get back to us on what's going wrong."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Jakobsson: "In case the Members of the House didn't notice, last night the University of Illinois had a basketball game. And still undefeated."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy on House Resolution 41. Mr. Clerk, do you have the Resolution?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 41, offered by Representative Eddy.

- WHEREAS, Mrs. Pauline Parker and her late husband, George Parker, long held a special place in their hearts for the children of Crawford County, especially the students in the Oblong Schools; because they had spent their working lives watching technology advance at an incredibly fast pace and had no children of their own, they chose to share their own good fortune with the children of Crawford County; and
- WHEREAS, The Parkers have given \$250,300 to the Oblong Schools since 1986; the only stipulation placed on their gifts has been for the school to use the money to help finance the acquisition of technology to help students; and
- WHEREAS, The generosity of the Parker family does not end with Oblong Schools; they have given generously to Lincoln Trail College and the public schools of Hutsonville, Palestine,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

and Robinson; the Parker legacy has touched thousands of young people in Oblong and the rest of Crawford County; and

- WHEREAS, The Parkers' foresight anticipated a time when society would demand that students receive technological training; their generosity has given the schools of Crawford County the ability to provide that training; and
- WHEREAS, Citizens like George and Pauline Parker are rare; their commitment to children is exemplary, their motivation genuine, and their hearts pure; Mrs. Parker's vision of the future is focused on our most precious and valuable asset, children; she does everything she can to give them the tools they need to be successful, and she has taken steps to ensure that her gifts will continue to be a benefit for many, many children in the years to come; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we honor Pauline Parker and the memory of George Parker for their deep commitment to education, and we thank her for her extreme generosity to the students of Oblong and Crawford County; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Pauline Parker as an expression of our gratefulness and admiration for her benevolence."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the attention of the Body for just one minute, please. If I could have your attention. We just read a Resolution for a very, very special lady who is in attendance today.

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Pauline Parker is sitting in the back of the chamber on this side. She's standing now. Pauline Parker has been a true... a true angel to education in our area, giving over \$250 thousand in donations to school districts for use in technology and other programs. I thought it only fitting, at a time when we're struggling for school funding in this state, to have someone who has been so good to education come and receive a little bit of recognition for that work. So, if you'll join with me in honoring Pauline Parker for her dedication to education in this state."

Speaker Madigan: "On the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, on page 3 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 35. Mr. Schmitz. Wish to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 35, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 35 is, I believe, making a cor... a well needed correction in the Truth in Sentencing Law. Right now, as it stands, is if you use a firearm and you shoot an individual and you actually hit them, you serve out 85 percent of your term. If the victim is fortunate enough not to be shot at or be hit, they only have to serve half their term or a portion of it. So, what this is trying to do is add aggravated discharge of a firearm into the Truth in Sentencing Law. And I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Moffitt, did you wish to call 156? The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call the Bill. Mr. Leitch, did you wish to call 180? Mr. Clerk, House Bill 180, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 180, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the same Bill that we passed unanimously out of the House last Session but was held in Senate Rules. The situation is that in Tazewell County whe... where they have a federal prison, often after prisoners finish their federal time, other states or jurisdictions want those prisoners extradited to their state for additional time or other purposes. Unlike many other states, Illinois does not have a direct extradition law under those circumstances and as a result, when the prisoners are released pending extradition, they're lodged in the Tazewell County Jail. The good folks at... in Tazewell County, the county board and the state's attorney

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

are very concerned about not only the expense of holding these prisoners in the Tazewell County Jail until the extradition is perfected, but also for the liability that it represents to the county, as well. So, I would simply ask the Members to support this Bill again this year and ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Watson. Did you wish to call 181? Mr. Watson. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 181, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 181, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 181 is... is a permissive Bill. It simply allows the State Police to collect fingerprints of those under 18 and maintain them with the expressed written consent of a guardian or an adult. They do these at state fairs, etcetera. It will only be used in case of an abduction or an Amber Alert. And I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Has Representative Younge voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 337. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 337, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill deals in the issue of judicial subcircuits. It at the current time is a shell Bill. I'd appreciate your help in sending it to the Senate. We may or may not see it come back, but obviously at this point it doesn't do anything. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, this is a vehicle, a shell Bill, correct?"

Currie: "That is right."

Black: "And you have no specific plans, for the Bill?"

Currie: "I do not have specific plans today."

Black: "If there are no specific plans, then why do we need to move it out of the House?"

Currie: "Well, as you remember from earlier discussions in this area, we have found that there are people in some parts of

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

the state who feel that subcircuits would increase opportunities for real democracy among the citizenry. And we think it's important to be... to have legislation available should we find other areas of the state where those same kinds of concerns come to the fore. So, we're just trying to be available for the citizenry should this issue turn out to be one of major import."

Black: "All right. A very noble purpose, no doubt."

Currie: "Thank you."

Black: "All right. Do you have a list of the concerned citizens or the areas in which they live that have expressed this concern to you?"

Currie: "Not at this point, Representative."

Black: "All right. Do you have any idea or could you release any idea or any list of counties that have approached you about these subcircuits?"

Currie: "Not today, Representative."

Black: "But... but at some point in the future, no doubt."

Currie: "If those concerns come to our attention, I will be happy to share them with you."

Black: "Yes... well, thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what you're being asked to vote on is a shell Bill. There's no substantive material in this Bill, whatsoever. And as the Sponsor said, there are concerned people in areas of the state who might want to create judicial subcircuits. But we can't be told who those people are or where they live. Now, if it... if it involves my district, I think I would've

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

heard about it. I am not about to vote for 'a pig in a poke', if you will, a shell Bill that can come back from the Senate putting my counties in a judicial subcircuit Bill when I know for a fact that nobody in my... either of the counties that I represent have approached anyone about a judicial subcircuit. If anything, most of the counties that I represent would simply like the state the to pay bills for the court system that we're suppose to pick up but we only pick up a small percentage of that cost. Rather than fiddle faddle around with judicial subcircuits in counties that may not even want them, I wish we would turn our attention to the full funding of the criminal justice system. If... if you know what's going to be in this Bill, you vote 'yes'. More power to ya. I don't have a clue, most of you on this floor don't have a clue what's gonna be in this Bill. For that reason I think you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by
voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question,
there are 63 people voting 'yes', 52 people voting 'no'.
This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. Mr. Mathias, House Bill 349. Mr.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 349, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 349 makes it a criminal trespass to restricted areas and restricted landing areas of an airport a Class IV felony. Today it's a Class A misdemeanor. It also if you to happen to have a... if you're in possession of a weapon at the time that you're in these restricted areas, it would be a Class III felony. This Bill came also from the 93rd General Assembly where I believe it passed unanimously. And I ask again that we pass this on to the Senate. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative Lindner. Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

- Lindner: "There was a question asked in Criminal Law, the Judiciary II Committee, about if this would have any effect on hunters who were flying in and had a weapon in their plane. Could you just explain what you said in the committee?"
- Mathias: "Yes. It would have no effect because you... you have to be in a restricted area where you in effect have no permission to be in. So... so long as... so it wouldn't effect somebody who is legally present. It... this only applies to someone who in other words, is first has to be in a situation where there's a criminal trespass, meaning an illegal entry. So, it would not apply to legal entries."
- Lindner: "And any... any sportsman flying in a private jet then would obviously not be in that situation."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Mathias: "That's correct. It has to be... this Bill applies to illegal entries into an airport... a restricted area."

Lindner: "All right. Thank you..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, let me follow up on what Representative Lindner was saying. Every part of an airport, including the runway, is a restricted area. Now, if I have a party fly into the Vermilion County International Airport to go pheasant hunting in my district, when they land their private plane on that runway they are in restricted space. What assurance can you give me that when they're unloading the plane and unloading their shotguns, which of course will be properly cased, that an over-zealous officer won't come out and say, 'oh, my god, you have firearms on airport property. You can't do that.' And immediately summon the police and arrest them or attempt to arrest them and confiscate the weapons?"

Mathias: "Actually, if... the Bill also states and I should've stat... stated this earlier that the person has to receive notification from the airport authority, I assume that that's done through signage that the entry is forbidden."

Black: "Entry... what? Entry of..."

Mathias: "So, this is... is the current law already..."

Black: "Entry of the airplane?"

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Mathias: "I'm sorry. This is the current already. I'm just changing the penalty. So, in other words, if the... the... for example, as you know, when you go into an airport there'll be a sign there saying, ya know, access forbidden or you can't enter, this is restricted areas. If you enter those restricted areas without permission, that's a criminal trespass whether you have a weapon or you don't have a weapon. So, you have to have the criminal trespass first before... the weapon is only an additional penalty. So if you, ya know, you have to be illegally in that spot to begin with, after receiving notice that the area you're in is a restricted area."

Black: "Well, if... if you'll look at the Bill, what confuses me on line... le... let's just start on line 8, 'Whoever enters upon, or remains in, any restricted area or restricted landing area used in connection with an airport facility, or part thereof, in this state after such person has received notice from the airport authority that such entry is forbidden, commits a Class IV felony.' Now, what... what constitutes that notice?"

Mathias: "Well, that's the existing law."

Black: "I... I understand that."

Mathias: "The felony part is the... is the change my Bill proposes. This already has been the law. The notice, I assume, has to be either... gen... generally in airports the notice I see is written notices that are posted like when you're going... for example, if you're... Well, several places if the... the doors have notices on 'em. When you're flying

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

in and you're landing on a runway, obviously, what you're saying is then everyone on that plane would be committing a crime. So, obviously, they have permission to be on that runway as long as they don't stray off in some other part of the airport."

Black: "Well, they... they have implicint... implicit authority...

Mathias: "Right."

Black: "...to land their airplane. My concern is that if there is a rule on the... and I'm not talking about O'Hare or large airports. In small rural areas, obviously, you have the implicit authority to land a private airplane on that runway since most of them don't even have a control tower. My fear is that when you land and you're unloading your private aircraft, then somebody from the airport comes out and says, 'I'm very sorry but our airport does not allow the possession or... of a firearm on airport property. And you're now a... charged with a Class IV felony.'"

Mathias: "But that's not..."

Black: "But I had no... I had no constructive notice that I couldn't fly into that airport and then rent a car and go hunting."

Mathias: "But the cla... the... the part dealing with weapons only deals with situations where the airport authority states that the entry is forbidden. So, you would not... ya know, you may violate some other law if you're carrying a weapon, but this Bill only applies when you're in a restricted, forbidden area after receiving notice that you're not supposed to be there."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Black: "Is it not a given that any land owned by an airport is restricted property?"

Mathias: "Well, but you don't commit a criminal trespass unless you knowingly are on an airport without permission. That's the definition of cri..."

Black: "Right."

Mathias: "...criminal trespass to any property is being on that property without permission."

"Knowingly... All right. And that... that begs the Black: question again in rural areas, Representative, and I'm not trying to nit pick the Bill. Airports often buy hundreds of acres for future expansion. And the airport in my home county did that some time ago. Now, I don't know whether all of that land has been fenced and not... and notice posted because they... they do some cash-rent farming. Now, if I inadvertently am hunting on land that is owned by the airport, even though at the time I did so it was not fenced, and I saw no sign, I'm technically on air... well, not technically, I'm on airport property. What... do I have an affirmative defense that there was no fence and no posting requirement so I cannot be arrested then for trespassing on an airport? Because I'm on airport property."

Mathias: "Well, I... again, it says, 'with notice'. So, then the issue would be if you... if there was not proper notice posted, then you didn't receive that notice."

Black: "All right. What I would like from you is... is your word and I know your word is... is your bond. If we run into

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

problems with a technical understanding of this Bill, would you do… you'll do a trailer Bill if we find out that the law of unintended consequence kicks in?"

Mathias: "There's... no question..."

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

Mathias: "...Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Has Mr. Holbrook voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 350, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 350 is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

Mr. Hannig in the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "On page 3 of the Calendar is House Bill 351.

Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 351, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 351 basically gives discretion to a court to impose an extended term upon an offender who's been convicted of first-degree murder when the person who is the victim was someone that

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

previously had brought charges against the offender for either a domestic battery or aggravated domestic battery or if the offender is in violation of an Order of Protection against the victim. The court then may have the discretion to impose an extended term. This also came from last year where it was, I believe, unanimously passed by this chamber. And I again ask for passage of House Bill 351."

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House Bill 351 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives Lyons? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 371."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 371, a Bill for an Act concerning juvenile delinquents. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 371 attempts to correct an oversight... or a loophole, if you will, in current statute. It was first noticed in the 2nd District Court case of <u>In re Dexter</u>, a minor. Essentially what happens is that when you have a... a minor who is arrested or sentenced prior to the age of 17 and then subsequently turns the age of 17, the local county jail is not an option for the court. The... the problem ya get in is if you have a

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

minor who's sentenced, say, at the age of 15... juvenile delinquency to... at the age of 15, say, a 5-year sentence, at 20 they end up getting revoked. Now, they're 20 years old and the only place they can go is back to say the... the Juvenile Department of Corrections or the local juvenile detention center. This has caused a huge problem for our... our juvenile centers because they're not set up to deal with older people who really should be in the county jail or... or elsewhere. This attempts to correct that and I'd ask for your favorable consideration."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 371. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Excuse me, the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that we already have laws on the books that kinda address what you're attempting to address?"
- Rose: "No, Representative, they don't. And in fact, in the 2nd District case of <u>In re Dexter</u>, the court specifically notes that we don't have this option on the books and that's why we're here today. In fact, the only option that... that a judge is left with is either a sentence to the Illinois Department of Corrections Juvenile Center or to the juvenile center of the local county. The problem being that if you've got a 20-year... a person who's now say 18 or 19 or 20 years old, you don't want them in the same detention center as a 13- or 14- year old."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Davis, M.: "Well, then, do you want a 17-year-old in the same place with a 40- or 50-year-old?"

Rose: "Representative, keep in mind this is after the sentencing... this is at the sentencing stage when they've turned 17. That is... we have plenty of other 17-year-olds already in the Department of Corrections, but this doesn't deal with the Department of Corrections. This actually helps avoid people from having to go to the juvenile division of the Department of Corrections by making a local county an option."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I know that the Representative has all the best intentions. But I have a great concern with putting a 17-year-old... a 17-year-old in with other adults. What did the 17-year-old... what did he violate his probation for? And will he be in a cell or in a prison with murderers, with deviant sexual predators? You know, a 17-year-old is still a child. Sometimes they grow very tall. I have a 17-year-old in my family and he's 6 feet 2 but he has the mind of a 17-year-old. So, when we talk about the violation of probation, we should also consider what crime had been convicted(sic-committed). For example, in large urban areas you have a number of young people who erroneously are selling drugs on corners and they definitely should not be doing that. But because they violate probation or parole or whatever that's been given to them, should they be put

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

into a system with hardened criminals? I don't think so, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Have you concluded your remarks?"

Davis, M.: "I would just... I would urge a 'no' vote unless we really want to permanently criminalize young people. We should be about the business of rehabilitating rather than putting these children in circumstances which will make them perhaps hardened criminals. You know and I'm sorry that I have to speak against this. This is an important issue. Nobody in this room supports or condones crime, but neither can I support condemning a 17-year-old to the same kind of facility that an adult, hardened criminal is sentenced to. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just... To the Bill. I wanted to say that the Juvenile Justice Commission this summer... we met... we held hearings and we met with a lot of people from around the state... around this country, actually, dealing with juveniles and juvenile detention. So, what I wanted to say was that... was that a juvenile that's... this is a juvenile you're talking about puttin' it in a.. in a correctional facil... facility with adults, has violated their parole or probation but this child has never been to jail. So, why... when they violate their probation that now you wanna put 'em... and they only having six months and because... they're upset because the kid has to be 20 or 21. Well, if you were 17 and you were sentenced as a juvenile, you should complete your sentence as a juvenile

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

and not be transferred to an adult facility even if it's only for six months because we're trying to separate juveniles from an adult. If they go to the juvenile facility, then they'll receive services as a juvenile. they go to an adult facility, then there's no services for an adult. And we're talking about rehabilitating our children, not throwing them in with the wolves. If they're in an adult facility, then they're there and they become hardened criminals. If they stay with the juveniles, then they can get all kinds of services for juveniles. people... if you look at your analysis, the people that are opposed to the Bill is the City of Chicago, ...the Cook County Board president, the Juvenile Justice Commission and whole... a lot of other people who've been working with juveniles in trying to get them... trying to get our society to look at juveniles and re... rehabilitate them and make them part of our society if they want to. If we look at them and say, we wanna correct their behavior and not punish them for the rest of their lives. So, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

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

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

Gordon: "Thank you. Representative Rose, how are you today?"

Rose: "Outstanding. How are you, Representative?"

Gordon: "Great, great. I just have a couple of questions about this Bill. I supported it in committee and I intend to support it again today. This is a 17-year-old at this

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

point, with the laws in Illinois, can be... is an adult. Is that correct?"

Rose: "Yes."

Gordon: "Is that... that's correct. And there are some... some crimes that when they commit as a juvenile, they're automatically transferred to adult court, as well. Is that correct?"

Rose: "Correct."

Gordon: "Now, if someone's probation is revoked their juvenile probation, are they automatically going to be sent to jail or could they get an extension of the probation?"

Rose: "No, Representative. In fact, this would be one of many options that the court would have at its discretion. And unlike what other Members have said, this would actually be an additional option other than prison that a court could decide to impose something short of prison if that was the appropriate thing. And that's why we're asking the courts to have the ability to do that."

Gordon: "Thank you, Representative. Additionally, does every county in this state have a juvenile detention facility?"

Rose: "No."

Gordon: "And... and in fact, counties have to share those juvenile facilities. Is that right?"

Rose: "Yes."

Gordon: "To... to put a juvenile... and I hate to bring up cost, but to put a juvenile in a detention facility is at a much higher cost to some of these smaller counties than it would be for them to be in the county jail for... for crimes that

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

they may have committed as an adult that would put them there anyway. Is that right?"

Rose: "This most likely will be a cost savings to most counties."

Gordon: "Okay. And... and do you feel that in actuality by putting an older person in with younger people that could possibly, ya know, cause problems for the younger children and we wouldn't be able to get them the same services that they usually get in a juvenile facility?"

Rose: "Absolutely, Representative. In fact, in our testimony, that's one of the concerns that's come up is if you have the circumstances, say in In re Dexter, where someone at 15 years old is sentenced to a 5-year juvenile delinquency probation and say at age 19 or 20, violates that probation, the awkward position the court is in is to send that 20... 18- or 20-year-old to juvenile detention with 13- and 14year-olds. We have an obligation as a society to protect those individuals from that older adult while they're in our custody. It's totally inappropriate for 13- and 14year-old to be placed in the same level of incarceration as a 19- or 20-year-old and the educational programs in this Bill the idea of rehabilitation was brought up. educational programs for juvenile detention centers are aimed at people 13 to 16. Once you've breached that 17 gap, the ... either the local county jail or the Department of Corrections takes over and they have educational programs aimed at rehabilitation for that age group."

Gordon: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, nobody wants to see a juvenile Gordon: put in detention by any means, but this Bill just makes common sense. Our juvenile facilities are set up for a certain age group. There are services there for them but if you put an older offender in there, you're going to disrupt those services and you're going to disrupt the purpose of that juvenile facility. And in an adult facility, that offender, while they are now an adult, can get the services that they need. We don't like to hear about this. We don't like to deal with this situation because it's very unfortunate when a juvenile is put in a detention facility or in jail. But this is commonsense legislation and I absolutely commend the... the Sponsor of the Bill for bringing it forward. It'll help a lot of the smaller counties and the state's attorneys are for it. Thank you very much. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The noise level in the chamber is... is so high and that's very unfortunate because there's a lot of misunderstanding about this Bill.

I... I don't know if you can get any order. It's very difficult to do in the chamber. Representative Rose, there's been a lot of misunderstanding about your Bill. Your Bill gives a judge leeway on what to do with a young parole violator. Correct?"

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Rose: "That is correct, Representative. This will be one option among many."

Black: "Without the option that you're presenting, the judge is faced with a decision to send him to the Department of Corrections, right?"

Rose: "Potentially, yes."

Black: "So, your Bill would give the judge an option where he may use the county detention center rather than a Department of Correction's facility. Correct?"

Rose: "Correct."

Black: "Is it not the policy in a county detention center to separate juveniles from the general population?"

Rose: "Yes."

Black: "That's what I thought. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you'll pay particular attention to Representative Rose's Bill, contrary to what you've heard it does not automatically take a parole violator at 17 and put him or her in the Department of Corrections. It's trying to close a loophole that allows that to happen now. His Bill would allow a court to have a... a leeway to sentence that individual to incarceration in the county jail where that juvenile will be separated from the general adult population. I think that makes much more sense than putting him or her into a Department of Corrections setting. This is not the Bill that some have portrayed it to be. I think it deserves a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Giles: "You know, I know we've heard a lot of talk about we're gonna leave things at the discretion of a judge. And of course, judge... in some instances do the right thing, but in oftentime, judges are human being and they do the wrong I see this particular legislation... the type of legislation that will have an individual convicted and going to a facility in which does not warrant an individual in a... adult facility. I think what we're doing is creating a crime here. We're creating a situation in which a minor or individual need a little quidance, lead... need a little compassion and of course, need a second opportunity, a second chance. And so if we allow some language to... to have them to go directly to an adult facility because of a misdemeanor or something that is minor, or because this individual may have... have a problem that the system have not looked at that's not criminal, then we put these individuals in... in another situation in which they will become hardened criminals. I... I have a problem with that. I have a problem with legislation that do not have compassion. And I think that we need to take a closer look at this. I don't think we want to do exactly what we intend for this legislation to do. I don't think we want to do it because it will not have the effect of the intended legislation, because you're dealing with human beings. You're dealing with a human element and that human element as we know is flawed some of the time. And so I

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this legislation. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's go back to the drawing table and really try to do something that will close loopholes and... and to make sure that that young individual have the opp... the best opportunity to... to get straight and to abide by the law and to go on to be viable and productive citizens of this state. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Howard: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Morning."

Howard: "I noticed that the County Board of Cook, the City of Chicago, the Juvenile Justice Initiative are all against this Bill. Have you talked to them... representatives from those entities?"

Rose: "They were present or they filed witness slips at our committee hearing. No. I'm a little surprised as to why a county would be against it 'cause this would actually be a cost saving measure for most counties."

Howard: "So you did... so you've not talked to them..."

Rose: "No."

Howard: "...to ask them why..."

Rose: "No."

Howard: "...such a good Bill that you have sponsored that they're opposing it?"

Rose: "No."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Howard: "Someone mentioned to me that this is gonna cost some money to each of those entities. Do ya... do you have any knowledge about that?"

Rose: "No, Representative. In fact, if I could address a couple of comments here. This is another option for the courts that would actually would give the courts the opportunity to not send someone from... to the Illinois Juvenile Department of Corrections and actually keep them locally. Again, that type of thing would be an extreme cost savings or at least for the counties that I represent, the counties that share juvenile detention centers. But to answer your question directly, no, I've not talked to them."

Howard: "So, in your opinion, this would not be an unfunded mandate?"

Rose: "No."

Howard: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos."

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

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

Hamos: "Representative Rose, it's very... it's... very difficult to understand this Bill because it only covers one section of the Juvenile Court Act which has to do with sentencing. So, can you explain wha... under what circumstances is a minor... or actually is someone who has reached the age of 17 or older, still subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court? Who does this cover?"

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

- Rose: "Representative, it actually... the Bill deals with two sections. It deals with sentencing and resentencing. The... inference in the initial is 5-710..."
- Hamos: "I mean, Amendment 1 seems to only cover that one section."
- Rose: "Well, but it... it also deals with... with offenders who are being resentenced after they have violated the terms of their probation."
- Hamos: "And where is that, please?"
- Rose: "I'm looking for it, Representative. Representative, I don't have the exact site but there is a paragraph in the resentencing guidelines that refers to Section 7-... or excuse me, Section 710 which says that resentencing options are anything that's available during sentencing. And we're looking for that site right now."
- Hamos: "But where... what... what part of the statute is... where do you see that... can you refer me to the exact..."
- Rose: "Well, we're looking for that right now. But if I can...
 while we're looking for that, if I can answer original
 question about what types of circumstances this would
 happen under?"

Hamos: "Yes."

Rose: "It's exactly the type of circumstance out of the In recase out of the 2nd Circuit where we had a situation in which a juvenile was sentenced at 15 years old, subsequently violated their baro... their parole after they turned 17. The judge then in that sentence, that is essentially a loophole, the county jail is not... not an

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

option. The recourse is to take somebody who is then 18, 19, 20 years old and lump 'em into juvenile detention with 13- or 14-year olds which is not appropriate or send them to the juvenile detention center... the Illinois Department of Corrections which may not be warranted by the facts of the parole violation. And to answer your other question, it's on page 8... line 6, the specific wording is that, 'If the court finds the minor's violated a condition at any time prior to the expiration or termination of the period of probation or conditional discharge, it may continue him or her on the existing sentence with or without modifying or enlarging additions or may revoke probation or conditional discharge and impose any other sentence that was available under Section 5-17.'"

Hamos: "But wait, Representative Rose, I don't see a page 8 in
 my... in the Amendment. Doesn't House Amendment 1 become the
 Bill?"

Rose: "It's already... the... the parenthetical reference I'm referring to is already in statute. At resentencing, you're able to be sentenced to anything that was originally... originally a possibility at the time you were originally sentenced. So, the answer to your question is, by changing 5-710, we're also, by reference, allowing the same sentence to be given out at... after a revocation hearing for a violation of probation."

Hamos: "Okay. So, Representative Rose, I think what is confusing about this Bill is that there's a section... subsection 8 which is two paragraphs above where you're

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

trying to amend, that does refer to putting on probation or condi... conditional discharge. There's a subsection (b), immediately following after where you're amending which says, 'a minor found to be guilty may be committed to the Department of Corrections', etcetera. And then you just have this one phrase in the middle of that, that makes no reference to what type of situations this applies to. And even though you're explaining one judge and one case, this seems to open the door to many other situations where this could be applicable."

Rose: "Represent... Rep..."

Hamos: "And that is the concern that we have with this Bill."

Rose: "Representative, I am amending a list of sentences that are available to the court. If you go to the very beginning of 705 ILCS 405/5-710, the current statute, part 1, 'the following kinds of sentence... sentencing orders may be made in respect of wards of the court.' Therefore, all I'm doing is adding in the thing that's missing and In re Dexter pointed out that our 2nd District court case pointed out was missing from the list of available sentences. Keep in mind, Representative, a court now is faced with the... a decision of taking someone who might be 18, 19, 20 years old and see him in juvenile detention. That is not a good outcome for the 13 or 14 year olds. Or say, it was a minor violation of probation, the court could send him to Illinois Department of Corrections Juvenile Detention and the circumstances may not warrant it. Or that person just walks scot-free with no punishment."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Hamos: "But are you saying that this Bill only applies in situations where a minor was sentenced initially as a minor and was put on probation for a term that exceeded his 17th birthday and then violated that probation? Is that the circumstance..."

Rose: "No."

Hamos: "...that you're trying to deal with?"

Rose: "There are two circumstances. A minor who's arrested at say 16 and the day before their birthday and is sentenced at 17. Okay. Or someone who is placed on probation which would... the similar facts of the Dexter case, although that person was then in their 17th birthday when they were violated and then resentenced."

Hamos: "Okay. So, do you acknowledge that by including 16-year-old... 16-year-olds under this... in this way, that you are, in fact, really changing public policy in how we deal with juveniles in juvenile court? Which is, in fact, this..."

Rose: "Representative, I'm not dealing with 16 year olds at all."

Hamos: "What?"

Rose: "I'm not dealing with 16-year-olds at all."

Hamos: "Well, they committed the crime when they were 16, is the example you just gave."

Rose: "The age at sentencing is the operative... is the operative issue..."

Hamos: "Well, okay."

Rose: "...and the age at 16 is 17 years old."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

"Okay. All right. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I do rise in opposition to this Bill based on this exact line of We did have a Juvenile Justice Commis... questioning. Committee last go-round that I served Representative Collins was the chair of. And this whole question of how we handle juvenile cases, crimes committed by juveniles when they're still juveniles at the time they committed the crime. This proposes to change that in a backdoor kind of way by looking at when they are actually sentenced. That may be good public policy but this is not... I don't agree with that public policy. I don't know if ... if this Bill was ever debated in that context but this really does change... for ... it's a much bigger change than I think it was originally purported to be. And I think this kind of Bill drafted in this way, warrants further discussion. So, I urge a 'no' vote at this time until we really look at the overall policy of 16-year-olds in the situation that was just mentioned."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

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

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I may have missed this in debate and if I did, forgive me. Were there opponents to this Bill in committee?"

Rose: "The opponents to the Bill, I believe, were the City of Chicago, Cook County and then the… I think, the Juvenile Justice Initiative. Although, there wasn't any testimony presented as to what their opposition was."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Lang: "There wasn't any testimony from any opponents? Are you aware of why they were opposed?"

Rose: "No, Representative. In fact, that was a question of a previous speaker that... The two people who slipped in opposition were Juvenile Justice Initiative and the Cook County Board president. And we had no... no testimony as to why they're opposed."

Lang: "You did not endeavor to determine why they would be opposed?"

Rose: "No, Representative."

Lang: "Well, you answered my question. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

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

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

Lindner: "Yes. This passed our Criminal Law Committee 10-4. And as the Sponsor just stated, normally when people really oppose a Bill, they're going to testify and there was no testimony against this Bill at all. They had... it was just slipped. They didn't see fit to come and testify against it. And I think we have to figure who are we going to protect in this type of situation? We have to realize this is an adult now who has done something to violate probation. So, are we going to put that person back with 10-, 11- and 12-year-olds? I don't think that's what we wanna do. Who do we wanna protect more? Do we wanna protect those juveniles that would have this negative influence back with them? I think that's what we're trying to do. And this person, unfortunately, that violated the

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

probation, is now an adult and should be placed in adult court... in the adult detention for that kind of thing. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin."

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

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

Colvin: "Representative Rose, and I apologize if I... I've missed this question. Representative, you do represent... you represent Effingham County, is that correct?"

Rose: "No. No, Sir, I've got..."

Colvin: "And I apologize if I'm wrong about that."

Rose: "...Coles, Douglas, Piatt in their entirety, parts of Champaign and parts of Edgar County."

Colvin: "And..."

Rose: "The Piatt County state's attorney was... testified and this is where this came from."

Colvin: "So, he identifies this... he identifies this as a problem in his county. Is that correct?"

Rose: "Yes, Representative. And in fact, the 2nd District
Appellate Court identifies it and specifically references
the fact that there's a loophole in our current statute
dealing with sentencing of juveniles."

Colvin: "And Representative, is it... would it be fair to accept that the... the magnitude and the impact of the problem in Piatt County would probably have an adverse effect in the county the size of Cook?"

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

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Colvin: "Let me... let me repeat that. Get a little closer to the mike."

Rose: "Thank you."

Colvin: "Is... would it be fair to accept that the problem that exists in Piatt County the way that the prosecutors there identified the problem in committee, would create an undue burden or a particular set of problems for Cook County... a county the size of Cook with five million residents?"

Rose: "Representative, the statute applies to all citizens statewide. I think there's an extreme equal protection constitutional problem if you start applying criminal sentencing to different cit... to citizens differently based on the geographic region of the state they live in. From an equal protection standpoint, the... the offender in Cook County should be treated the same as the offender in Piatt County or in the case of In re Dexter 2nd... 2nd sco... Circuit, the offender in Kane County, which is a larger county."

Colvin: "But Representative, and I do understand that the Criminal Code applies to everybody in the State of Illinois. But the problem and the magnitude that we're talking about in Cook County, I think would create such an undue burden that to impose a law like this on the entire state is problematic and... and for some of these reasons. In Cook County, there's a tremendous overcrowding problem with the Cook County Jail. Currently, the Cook County... the Cook County Department of Public Safety is being sued by a number of organizations dealing with the overcrowding of

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

county jails. In fact, at one time, they were being fined \$10 thousand per day for the overcrowding problem at Cook County Jail. In fact, there's still under the provisions of that lawsuit. They're just not collecting the money right now because Cook County just doesn't have it to pay. But beyond just fiscal problems, the fundamental problem with a Bill like this is taking youthful offenders and mixing 'em into an overcrowded powder keg situation that currently exist at county jail. Could you appreciate some of those problems?"

Rose: "Yes, I can, Representative. But I would sa… argue back, that the fundamental problem with the way the law is currently drafted is that a 20-year-old can end up with at 13-year-old in the juvenile detention center. I would also say that this is…"

Colvin: "Would you believe it if I told you that there is not one 20-year-old in the Cook County Juvenile Detention Center today?"

Rose: "I... I would take your word for that."

Colvin: "That I could absolutely give you verification of that, today."

Rose: "I would... I would take your word for it."

Colvin: "Okay. So, say that that problem doesn't exist, that perhaps there may be a different way to approach this problem without imposing such drastic burdens on everybody in the State of Illinois because the prosecutor in Piatt County sees it as a problem."

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Rose: "This is a problem out of Kane County. The 2nd District case came from Kane County."

Colvin: "Kane County, then."

Rose: "And Representative, more to the point, this is not a 'must' sentence. This is merely one of the sentencing alternatives. I might add, that the alternatives would be to send this person to the juvenile detention, Department of Corrections or back to JDC. If they're 19, 18, 19 years old, you don't want 'em with the population of JDC but whatever they did might not be... a severe enough infraction to warrant the Illinois Department of Corrections Juvenile Division. All we're saying is, hey, let the judge come up with the appropriate sentence."

Colvin: "Representative Rose, I should also make you aware that in Cook County right now, with the Cook County juvenile ... excuse me, the Cook County Public Defender's Office, I believe there's individuals from the Cook County State's Attorneys Office and a number of public safety organizations in Cook County are currently dealing with the problem of minority confinement disapportioned minority confinement. They've created this big panel and a large part of the discussions in ongoing discussions, have focused on some of the issues that you bring forth in this legislation. I think this is one of those areas when I think it's best that we share information, ya know, representing different areas of the state and making everybody aware of different things that are being worked on to deal with these kind of problems and perhaps share

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

some more common sensical solutions that would maybe impact your district as well. I would be more than happy to have those folks extend an invitation to you or the prosecutors in Kane County or Piatt County, whoever they may be, to come in and then discuss their ideas and their problems and the pressures that they face dealing with these issues so that, before we pass legislation that has a tremendous and profound impact on 16- or 17-year-olds, not just in Cook the entire state, before we pass County but across legislation to deal with those problems that all of us participate in the discourse in dealing with problems. I think that's a fair way be... before 1 prosecutor or 2 prosecutors or even 10 prosecutors in a state of a hundred and... in a state of a hundred and two counties pass laws that can have a detrimental effect on all of us. Do you think that would be a fair way of doing this?"

Rose: "Representative Colvin, let me say this. The City of Chicago didn't testify in committee. Cook County didn't testify in committee. Apparently, the Cook County Board president filed a slip in opposition. You know..."

Colvin: "But you know what, Chap..."

Rose: "...that's the deliberative process."

Colvin: "Representative Rose, I think, from what we've heard from a number of our colleagues today, I think we've heard some real good testimony right here on the floor. Those of us who live in the City of Chicago. Those of us who represent Cook County. I think it's important that the

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

comments that were made by number of the Legislators here, not just be taken for granted but be part of a discussion. And I think with our law enforcement professionals getting involved with this discussion with respect to some of the programs that I mentioned, the ongoing discussions that are going on, I think it'd be real important. And I think it'd be real fruitful if count... Kane County prosecutors and Piatt County prosecutors also got involved."

Rose: "This gives cou... Cook County the same opportunity as the Piatt County prosecutors, Representative."

Colvin: "I didn't hear you."

Rose: "This gives the Cook County folks the same opportunity as the Piatt County folks as the Kane County folks."

Colvin: "I agree, but I guess, in a piece of legislation like this that obviously didn't happen in terms of having some input in a discussion of a piece of legislation that came out of committee last week."

Rose: "I... I can only say that I appreciate your opinion,
Representative Colvin. But the... there was no opposition
testimony or opposition in the committee and we're here
now. I'm responding to a 2nd District Appellate Court
case."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Colvin: "I can certainly appreciate any prosecutor in this state who deems a problem that exists in his county. And I think where it's incumbent upon all of us when it impacts criminal law statutes in the State of Illinois to take

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

these issues seriously and to weigh them and evaluate them so that we create laws that are fair and balanced, not just for the per... from the perspective of one prosecutor or two prosecutors when we have a state of one hundred and two counties. I can probably imagine if you contacted all of the state prosecutors in coo... in the State of Illinois, they would probably all have different ideas on how to address this problem. In Cook County it would be very specific. And I think where the problem exists the most it's important that they be part of those discussions. I think... my friend, State Representative Chapin Rose, has brought this forth on the behalf of some prosecutors in his district but on the behalf of prosecutors in my district, the biggest prosecutorial district in the State of Illinois, I think it's important that they be at the table and have some input. I can appreciate the fact that no one testified from the City of Chicago nor no one testified from Cook County, but we did get plenty of testimony from Representatives who represent the City of Chicago and Cook County. And I think moving forward with this type of legislation given the impact... given the impact in the change in terms of what we're doing is... is so profound that at this point moving forward with a piece of legislation like this would not be in the best interest of anybody. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Patterson."

12th Legislative Day

- Patterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Patterson: "Currently, what happens with a 10-year-old offender that may of... may be on probation currently?"
- Rose: "Representative, this deals with people who've turned the age of 17. The juvenile detention system as I understand it is set up for 13- to 17-year-olds. Every other adjudications of delinquency are all sorts of possible outcomes depending on the offense and depending on the age and you'd have to follow the Juvenile Code. I'm looking at a Sentencing Code, I'm dealing with people who've turned 17 at the time they've been sentenced."
- Patterson: "So, is this an error in the print that I'm reading on my computer screen, where you have an age of 10 to 20 years of age?"
- Rose: "I don't know where you're talking about, Representative.

 I apologize and I'm not trying to be flip but I don't...

 there's nothing in our Bill that mentions the age of 10."
- Patterson: "I'm... I'm reviewing the executive summary."
- Rose: "Your... can you point me to the place in the Bill,
 Representative?"
- Patterson: "Yea... the executive... the executive summary... well... on mine..."
- Rose: "Rep... Representative, this... aside from technical corrections... drafting corrections from previous statutes, the only thing that we do is that if the minor is 17 years of age or older committed to term of confinement in a

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

county jail is one of the new sentencing options. I don't mention anything about 10-year-olds, Representative."

- Patterson: "Well, what I'm looking at... indicates an age range from 10 to 20 years of age. However, if a juvenile is currently on probation, does a violation of probation... means that he... he or she has committed a new offense... a new criminal offense?"
- Rose: "I don't have what you're looking at, Representative.

 That's your internal analysis. I'm... I'm sorry. What I'm

 dealing with is the sentence once somebody turns the age of

 17."
- Patterson: "Okay. Thank you, I'll confer with my colleagues but mine shows that the… a 10-year-old person can be impacted by this Bill. Thank you."

Rose: "No."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Millner."

Millner: "Can we move the question, Mr. Speaker?"

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

 The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Rose to close."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of you who are concerned about placing a 18-, 19-, 20-year-old in the same juvenile detention center with a 13-year-old, you should vote for this Bill. For those of you who think the court system should have the opportunity to decide what is and isn't an appropriate sentence, you should vote for this

12th Legislative Day

- Bill. And to those of you who have spoken in opposition but who might think… and I was just informed that the City of Chicago is not opposed to this Bill either I might add, they're neutral. For those of you who are in opposition of this Bill, let me address you individually or collectively. This gives the court another option besides the Juvenile Department of Corrections. It's for the judge to decide. I would ask for a favorable 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman's moved for passage of House Bill 371. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Okay, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes' and 31 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"
- Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the… ask… a question prior to him… prior to this vote but… that's over now. The 2:00 Tourism & Convention Committee will not meet this evening. We will meet next Wednesday. Sorry, to disappoint ya."
- Speaker Hannig: "On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Motions, is House Bill 329 and Representative Osmond is recognized to make a Motion."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table House Bill 329."

12th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion is adopted. And House Bill 329 is tabled. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of Second Readings, we're gonna start at the top and work our way down. The first Bill on the Calendar is House Bill 114. Representative Feigenholtz, do you want us to move that Bill to Third? Okay. So, you wanna hold that Bill 'til the Amendment comes around? Okay. So, out of the record. House Bill 166, Representative Collins. Do you want us to read the Bill on Second? Okay, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 166 has been read a second... second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, let's take that out of the record... this Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 179, Representative Leitch. Out of the record. Representative Delgado. Do you want us to do 202? Okay. Out of the record. On... on down the list is House Bill 330, Representative Verschoore? Do you wanna move that from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Rose. Representative Rose on House Bill 368, from Second to Third? Would you want us to read the Bill? The bottom of page 2. Out of the record. And House Bill 369, Representative Rose? Okay, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 369, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

12th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. Tomorrow's Human Services Appropriations Committee that was scheduled for 8 a.m. is canceled."
- Speaker Hannig: "On Supplemental Calendar #1 there are four Bills. The first, House Bill 187 has a note request so we'll skip by that. House Bill 445, Representative Beiser? Do you want us to read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 445, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. House Bill 500, Representative Mautino? Out of the record. And Representative Reitz, you have House Bill 601. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 601, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 97, offered by Representative Kelly; House Resolution 98, offered by Representative Biggins; House

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Resolution 99, offered by Representative Jakobsson; and House Resolution 101, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

Black: "Earlier today there was a... Motion made to... move the previous question. And I wasn't sure of... the number of votes required because we don't have the new rule book. Can we... can we expect the new rule book in a reasonable amount of time?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, Representative Black."

Black: "All right. Well, I remember when Tony Rossi was here we got them in a more timely fashion. Ya know, not... not to criticize the current Clerk's Office, I know they're busy. But will this one be suitable for throwing, do you know?"

Speaker Hannig: "We hope not."

Black: "Oh. The other question I have because I don't like to get up early either. Will the 8:00... 8 a.m. committee meetings meet at 8 a.m. or have they been moved back to 9 a.m.?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, as far as the Chair knows they will meet at the time they're posted. Now, the respective

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Committee Chairmen may make some changes. And we'll ask the Clerk to... to announce the committee schedule."

Black: "All right. If you're gonna change them, could I give you my cell phone number and you could call me so I could sleep... an hour later or something? Now... I got up this morning, snow up to my ankles. Ya know, hitched up the dog team, mushed over here, cold, miserable. And then I get to the committee at a quarter of eight and I'm told it won't begin until 9:00. Had to go home and change clothes by the end of it. My feet were wet. My shoes were all soaked and I'd just would like to a little... ya know, give me constructive notice and I'll... You know me, I'll do what the Chair wants me to do."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black..."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We appreciate that. Representative Froehlich, for what reason do you rise?"

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that I table House Bill 150, 150."

Speaker Hannig: "And you're... and you're the Sponsor...

Representative Froehlich, you're the Sponsor of that Bill?

Is that correct? Okay. So, Representative Froehlich moves to table House Bill 150. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted and the Bill is tabled. Mr. Clerk, would you read to the Members the committee cancelations and those committees that will meet."

12th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Meeting at 2 p.m. is the Labor Committee in Room 118. Local Government Committee is meeting at 2 p.m. in Room C-1 in the Stratton Building. Registration & Regulation Committee is meeting at 2 p.m. in Room 114. State Government Administration will be meeting at 2 p.m. in Room 115. The Tourism & Convention Committee has been canceled. Environment & Energy Committee will meet at 4 p.m. in Room 118. Higher Education Committee will meet at 4 p.m. in Room 122-B and the International & Trade Commerce Committee will meet at 4 p.m. in Room C-1. For tomorrow, the Aging Committee at 12 p.m. in Room 114 has been canceled. And Appropriations-Human Services for 8 a.m. tomorrow on Thursday has also been canceled."
- Speaker Hannig: "Are there any other announcements?

 Representative Reitz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Reitz: "An announcement on... I had a number of Members ask on Revenue Committee will meet at 10:00 tomorrow but it's subject matter only just to assign Bills to subcommittees. So, everyone has an extra week to prepare their... their testimony for the subcommittee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any other announcements? Then Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, at the hour of 1 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading.

 House Bill 1180, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1181, offered by Representative Dugan, a Bill for an concerning fish and aquatic life. House Bill 1182, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1183, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1184, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning natural resources. House Bill 1185, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 1186, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill employee benefits. 1187, offered Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1188, offered Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 1189, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1190, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1191, offered by Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. House Bill 1192, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning state officers and agencies. House Bill 1193, offered by Representative Dunn, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1194, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning motor Bill 1195, offered by Representative fuel. House Washington, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation.

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

House Bill 1196, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1197, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning health House Bill 1198, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 1199, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1200, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1201, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1202, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1203, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1204, offered by Representative Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. House Bill 1205, offered employee Representative Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 1206, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1207, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1208, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1206(sic-1209), offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1210, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1211, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1212,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1213, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1214, offered by Representative regulation. Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning Government. House Bill 1215, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1216, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1217, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1218, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1219, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1220, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1221, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1222, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1223, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1224, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1225, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1226, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1227, offered by Representative Davis, Monique,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1228, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act House Bill 1229, offered by concerning regulation. Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1230, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1231, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1232, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1233, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1234, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1235, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1236, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1237, offered by Representative civil law. Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1238, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1239, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1240, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1241, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1242, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1243, offered by Representative Davis, Monique,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1244, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act House Bill 1245, offered by concerning regulation. Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1246, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 1247, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1248, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1249, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1250, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1251, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1252, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1253, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1254, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1255, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1256, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1257, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1258, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1259, offered by Representative Davis, Monique,

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1260, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1261, offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1262, offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act concerning bonds. House Bill 1263, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an House Bill 1264, offered by Act concerning revenue. Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 1265, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Bill 1266, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1267, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 1268, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to create the Old Man River Anticipatory Design Center Act. House Bill 1269, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1270, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act in relation to homeless persons. House Bill 1271, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1272, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning community revitalization. House Bill 1273, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1274, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Bill 1275, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Act making appropriations. House Bill 1276, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act in relation to property taxes. House Bill 1277, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Bill 1278, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning property tax reform. House Bill 1279, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act to foster economic development. House Bill 1280, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1281, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 1282, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1283, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1284, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1285, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1286, offered by Representative Scully, a Bill for an Act concerning families. House Bill 1287, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1288, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1289, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1290, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1291, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1292, offered by Representative

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Bradley, Richard, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill 1293, offered employee benefits. Representative Hassert, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1294, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1295, offered by Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1296, offered Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1297, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Bill 1298, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1299, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1300, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1301, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1302, offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1303, offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1303(sic-1304), offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1305, offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1306, offered Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1307, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1308, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Act concerning state services and public works. House Bill 1309, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning taxes. House Bill 1310, offered Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1311, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning townships. House Bill 1312, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1313, offered Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1314, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1315, offered by Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1316, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1317, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1318, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning civil immunity. House Bill 1319, offered by Representative Delgado, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1320, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Bill 1321, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1322, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1323, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1234(sic-1324), offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1325, offered by

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1326, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1327, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1328, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1329, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act creating the Southwest Suburban Railroad Redevelopment Authority. House Bill 1330, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1331, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1332, offered by Representative Millner, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1333, offered by Representative Millner, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1334, offered by Representative Millner, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1335, offered by Representative Millner, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1336, offered by Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1337, offered by Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1338, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1339, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1340, offered by Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1341, offered by

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Representative May, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1342, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. And House Bill 1343, offered by Representative Delgado, a Bill for an Act education. House Perfunctory Session. concerning Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 1344, offered by Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1345, offered by Representative Miller, a Bill for an Act in relation to health. House Bill 1346, offered by Representative Munson, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1347, offered by Representative Munson, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1348, offered by Representative Graham, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. House Bill 1349, offered by Representative Graham, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1350, offered by Representative Graham, a Bill for an Act in relation to public health. House Bill 1351, offered by Representative Graham, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1352, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1353, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Bill 1354, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1355, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1356, offered by Representative McGuire, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

House Bill 1357, offered by Representative Lyons, Joseph, a Bill for an Act concerning long-term care. House Bill 1358, offered by Representative Lyons, Joseph, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1359, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1360, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1361, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 1362, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1363, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1364, offered by Representative Younge, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1365, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill 1366, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1367, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning cemeteries. House Bill 1368, offered by Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1369, offered by Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act concerning public relations. House Bill 1370, offered by Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Bill 1371, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1372, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1373, offered by

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1374, offered by Representative education. McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 1375, offered by Representative Delgado, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1376, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 1377, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act in relation to House Bill 1378, offered by Representative vehicles. McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Bill 1379, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1380, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1381, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Bill 1382, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1383, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1384, offered by Representative McKeon, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 1385, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1386, offered by Representative safety. Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1387, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1388, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 1389, offered by

12th Legislative Day

2/9/2005

Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1390, offered Representative Colvin, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1391, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1392, offered by Representative Joyce, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1393, offered by Representative Brosnahan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1394, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 1395, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1396, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. And House Bill 1397, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning children. being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."