46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Randy Ross of the Sidney United Church in Sidney. Pastor Ross is the guest of Representative Tim Johnson. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Ross: "Let us pray. Almighty God, You have plans for us and power to make them happen. Give our Legislators, executives and all government workers the knowledge of Your will for this great state. Let them remember that they serve the public trust beyond personal gain or glory. loving God, come together in this new day. May we be mindful of Your love, Your power in our lives. leaders of this great state gather, remind all of the task at hand. Help them to work together for the good of people. I pray to You as we pause but a moment, amidst all the troubles and conflicts of the world that we may be reminded of Your presence in all our lives. Deal with us as children of God. Calm our fears. Take away from us our burdens of anxiety. Help us to relax before You and forget all the problems of our week. Open our hearts to Your blessings that problems may be smooth and loads lifted from our hearts, doubts from our minds and fears from our souls. Please help each person here, Lord, to live to the full potential that You have for each of us. Give us patience. Guide us, that we not wander from Your presence and renew the spirit within us. Even as the sun did rise to rule the day, to banish the darkness of the night, You, oh God, cast every shadow away, give new life, new hope, new light and new vision. Our everlasting God, grant Your power and presence as each of us pause in this time and throughout

- 46th Legislative Day

  the day continue to reveal and open us to the living spirit. For God in heaven, we do pray in Jesus Christ's name. Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Durkin."
- Durkin et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Representative Art Turner is excused today. And also,

  Representative Steve Davis's mother is deathly ill and so,

  he's at the hospital. I'd ask that you maybe say a prayer

  on her behalf and Steve Davis is excused today, as well."
- Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Lang seek recognition?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Granberg's light is not working. I see that he's present."
- Speaker Madigan: "But he will not be present for the remainder of the Session, so that the record should indicate that the Democrats excused would be Turner, Steve Davis and Granberg. Mr. Poe. Mr. Wirsing. Mr. Wirsing."
- Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that

  Representative Poe will be a little tardy this morning.

  He's attending a funeral. Other than that, all Republicans

  are here."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "My light wasn't working. The box was totally inoperative, but it's on now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 114

  Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

quorum present. The Chair would like to welcome Mr. Black to the chamber. Would the... would the Body acknowledge the presence of Mr. Black, please? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Woolard, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following measure were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 556.

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair would like to read into the record the following statements. Mr. Black. The Chair would like to read in the following statement with regards to the Senate Bill Agreed List #2. The Clerk has certified that all remaining Bills in the Resolutions have received a sufficient number of votes and therefore, the remaining Bills and Resolutions contained on Senate Bill Agreed List #2 have received the required Constitutional Majority and are hereby declared adopted or passed. Mr. Brady. Is Mr. Brady ready? Mr. Brady, do you wish to call Senate Bill It's on page 3 of the Calendar. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to call this Do you wish to call Senate Bill Representative Krause. 276? Andrea Moore. Is Andrea Moore in the chamber? Representative Pankau? Do you wish to call Senate Bill 1109?"

Pankau: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Dart had asked to have some additional time to look at that Bill. And I had promised him through today that I would allow him that. So... Do you think I should call the Bill?"

Speaker Madigan: "We could put that to a vote."

Pankau: "I don't see him in the chamber. I will find him as soon as he comes in and I will ask him if it's okay to call the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Hartke. "

Hartke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Hartke: "Tuesday, my nephew and his wife made me a great-uncle four times. I'm happy to report that all four of the children are doing fine today and the mother's doing well.

So, I'm the proud great-uncle four times, Tuesday."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke, do you wish to call Senate Bill 43?"

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm waiting for Amendments on (sic-Senate Bill) 43 and I'm also waiting on... I just filed Amendments on 786. So, when the Rules Committee meets and or has these processed, they're no-brainer Amendments, but I have to go through the process. When they're accepted, I'm ready to move 'em."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Ryder. Is Mr. Ryder in the chamber? Mr. Wirsing? Did you wish to call Senate Bill 74? Mr. Ryder, did you wish to call Senate Bill 1114? (1114). It's on page 4 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, take that out of the record. For what purpose does Mr. Parke seek recognition?"

Parke: "Thank you. I've just filed Amendments to (Senate Bill)

786, for the purposes... I would need it to be moved back
from Third to Second Reading to... attach the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, relative to Senate Bill 786 put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McKeon. Did you wish to call Senate Bill 1158? Mr. McKeon."

McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1158 amends the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act relating to JCAR,

- 46th Legislative Day

  provides an extended period of notice from 45 to 60 days

  for hearings. I'll gladly answer any questions... of the

  Members."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1158, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McKeon has presented the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Black: "Representative, has the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules looked at this Bill and if so, have they weighed in with an opinion?"
- McKeon: "During the committee presentation, there... they made no comment on the Bill, either in favor or in opposition to it. I've heard no opposition except for some concerns from Representative Ryder yesterday."
- Black: "Well, I think Representative Ryder's concern focused on Committee Amendment #1. Did the... your staff and ours look at that Amendment? Our staff indicates that they think it is a technically flawed Amendment which could endanger the Bill. I just wonder if they've had a chance to resolve that issue or they've looked at it and come to some agreement."
- McKeon: "I spoke to staff yesterday and Representative Ryder contacted me this morning and his concerns apparently are resolved."
- Black: "What... what was the genesis of the Bill, Representative?

  Is there something... something not working properly with
  the.. JCAR procedure or...?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

McKeon: "My understanding, Representative Black, was that there were concerns about the posting requirements and changes to posted Rules without posting. This Bill clarifies that extensive requirements and insures that any changes made by an agency to the Rules are given appropriate public notice."

Black: "All right. My last question isn't... isn't

Representative Hannig... I can't remember who, on your side

of the aisle is the cochair of JCAR? Is it Representative

Hannig or who is that?"

McKeon: "My understanding it's Representative Turner."

Black: "Representative Art Turner."

McKeon: "That's my understanding. I may be..."

Black: "Okay. And he isn't here?"

McKeon: "That's correct, Sir."

Black: "All right. Okay. Thank you very much, Representative.

I appreciate your indulgence."

McKeon: "Thank you, Representative Black."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McKeon, to close."

McKeon: "I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 107 people voting 'yes', 7 people voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Representative... For what purpose does Mr. Mitchell seek recognition? Is Representative Andrea Moore here? Mr. McCarthy, did you wish to call Senate Bill 110? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 110, a Bill for an Act amending the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 110, actually, through the House Amendment #1 in the Revenue Committee, has shelled the Bill out, but the initial intention of the Bill remains the same, which is to extend the research and development tax credit that is currently available to corporations and sole proprietorships in our state, to 'S' corporations and also members of partnerships. This is a interpretation of this research and development tax credit which was passed under the Leadership of Senator Severns back in 1990. I'm under the belief that the late Senator, as well as the supporters at that time, believe that all of the businesses of Illinois would be included. The Department of Revenue interpreted as the 'S' corporations and partnerships should be excluded from this and I think that this is an oversight that we need to correct here. So, while this Bill is basically a shell right now, it is intended for that use and that would be the only use it would be used for in order to keep the issue alive later on in the Session. proponents of the Bill are the State Chamber of Commerce, Taxpayers Federation of Illinois, the Illinois Municipal League... "

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy. Did you say this is a shell Bill?"

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "I see. Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Black: "Would the Clerk confirm that Committee Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

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

Black: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Bill because of Committee Amendment #1. Committee Amendment #1 strikes the enacting language and as the Speaker himself just said very clearly and we appreciate that, this is a shell Bill, a vehicle Bill. I don't doubt the Sponsor's intent. He's a man of his word. I respect his integrity. I'm sure that he has every intention that this Bill'll come back and address the subject that used to be in the Bill. But, these are... these are strange times. This is a... this has been a remarkable week and there's going to be Bill's used for a number of things. I'm certain of that in the next two or three weeks. And I don't know what the Senate will do with the Bill. I have no idea how they'll amend the Bill. And I would just simply encourage Members on my side of the aisle that... to look at this... it's a vehicle. It's an Income Tax Act Bill. It could come back in a form that you, perhaps, would not want to be recorded as voting 'yes' and in all due respect to the Sponsor, who I think is well-intentioned and I'm sure will fight hard to keep the original intent of the Bill, I cannot support an Income Tax Bill at this point in a Session that is, fact, a vehicle Bill and I would urge the colleagues on my side of the aisle to vote 'no' or 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy..."

McCarthy: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "... to close on behalf of a shell Bill."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

McCarthy: "Thank you for illustrating that point. The... I have been informed that this is the vehicle that can keep this issue alive. I think there's a lot of employers in our state that deserve this research and development credit. The companies that would be eligible for this are companies that bring good jobs into the state, research development, technical, scientist type jobs. I have a company in my district, Panduit Corporation, which is one of the people in the area that actually pay a fair wage, a living wage to their employees. And I think that this was an oversight. And I would hope that we'd be able to keep this issue alive by keeping Senate Bill 110 alive for the final negotiations at the end of the Session. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote, as would the major proponents of in our state the Chamber of Commerce, the Taxpayers Federation, the Illinois Municipal League and the Illinois Manufacturers Association, as well. I thank you for your consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy moves for the passage of a shell Bill which is endorsed by several business organizations in the state. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 42 'noes' and 59 'ayes' and the Bill fails. The record should read 42 'ayes' and 59 'noes' and the Bill fails. Mr. Lang are you prepared to call Senate Bill 849? Representative O'Brien, do you wish to call Senate Bill 202? Representative O'Brien? The Lady does not appear to be in the chamber."

Clerk Rossi: "The House Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

Speaker Madigan: "Andrea Moore. Do you wish to call Senate Bill 349? Do you wish to call Senate Bill 536?"

Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 536 allows county treasuries to transfer money for not-for-profit corporations for a specified uses. And the Act actually says, 'establishment of the county university center pursuant to a plan approved by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. And the county may make appropriations from county treasury and may transfer monies into a not-for-profit corporation recognized by the General Assembly pursuant to its Section 5, the Higher Education Act.' Cooperation I'd be happy to answer to any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 536, a Bill for an Act in relation to the establishment of a county university center. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill and the Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, one very quick question and I checked with staff, I don't have the answer. How do you establish a county university center? Is it by act of the county board, by public referendum... how do you do that?"

Moore: "We are in the process of attempting to do that through this legislative Session and there are many mechanisms that we are using to do that. This is a recommendation that comes from the Board of Higher Ed and they are assisting us with this. So we... there has been another Bill that we

#### 46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

have already approved that made a small change in listing the university center in one area of the statute. Then there have been other... there's an appropriations Bill that is being discussed and then this is one other way because the... there's a match proposed for the establishment of this county center and this will allow counties to be able to appropriate money because they're going to be the... they will... "

Black: "Okay. What I'd like you to focus on, if you could, would all 102 counties be able to do this under the legislation... if they chose to do so?"

Moore: "If they had a plan that was approved by the Board of Higher Ed and could fund it."

Black: "So, no county is excluded... "

Moore: "No."

Black: "... under the legislation... "

Moore: "No."

Black: "... and the plan, therefore, is permissive. So, I assume it would require some kind of public action by the governing entity of the county, i. e. the county board."

Moore: "I'm not sure that the county board actually has to take a formal action, Representative. But, this will allow them to participate, because currently if... that's if they... if they are going to be the holder and the collector of monies, for this match, we have to give them the authority to appropriate it. Because currently counties do not get involved in education, as you know."

Black: "All right and I don't want to belabor the point, but I'm a little confused. If it doesn't take an act by the governing body or the governing body of a county, i. e. the county board, I don't know how this gets done."

Moore: "Well..."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Black: "I'm sorry... what?"

Moore: "Procedurally, I guess you're correct, as I think about how it would work. This gives them the authority. They would have to take some kind of action to set up the fund in order to collect and appropriate those monies."

Black: "Okay."

Moore: "These are not anticipated to be tax monies. These don't provide..."

Black: "Okay."

Moore: "... any levying or anything like that. This is allow them to have a fund."

Black: "But this is not something that someone can come into a county and establish and then ask for funding. In other words, it has to be an act by the peoples... it has to be enacted by the peoples' representatives in a county."

Moore: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Fine. And it's permissive?"

Moore: "Yes."

Black: "And it could be implemented by all counties in the state?"

Moore: "If... if there were a plan that was approved by the Board of Higher Ed."

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

Moore: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Franks. Do you wish to call Senate Bill 469? Mr. Franks.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

- Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 469, a Bill for an Act regarding interest on support obligations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Franks: "Illinois law does not currently require the payment of interest on support obligations that are late. Senate Bill 469 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code, the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act, the Non Support of Spouse and Children Act and the Illinois Parentage Act, to provide a support obligation or any portion of a support obligation which becomes due and remains unpaid for 30 days or more shall accrue interest at the rate of 9% per year."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. John Turner."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Turner, J.: "Representative, are there any opponents to this Bill?"
- Franks: "I don't believe there's any that have been on record."
- Turner, J.: "I thought I heard you mention 9% per year. What does that affect? What is that?"
- Franks: "That's the same rate of interest as we charge on judge... on post-judgement interest under the Code of Civil Procedure."
- Turner, J.: "So, this sets up a procedure for post-judgement interest. I thought we already had that."
- Franks: "We don't have that for a support obligations."
- Turner, J.: "So, we have a system in our Civil... Code of Civil

  Procedure that allows for post-judgement interest in civil

  cases except for support cases."
- Franks: "Well, it hasn't been interpreted to include support cases and this would make the law clear. That it's been at

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- the discretion of judges in the past."
- Turner, J.: "The... I guess I'm curious, would this not be within the discretion of the court as opposed to something that we need to do legislatively?"
- Franks: "I think we need it legislatively because according to the Illinois Department of Public Aid there are no provisions to provide for interest on the back... on back support owed."
- Turner, J.: "Oh, yeah. Oh, my question is, does the court not
   have this authority? Is it not within the court's
   discretion to charge interest if a support order becomes
   delinquent?"
- Franks: "It would be in the court's purview."
- Turner, J.: "All right. So, why do we need this Bill, then?"
- Franks: "Because I want to make it mandatory. There needs to be a penalty to encourage deadbeat parents to pay their bills. If you don't pay your property tax bill, you get to pay a penalty. You get to pay extra interest. If you don't pay your income tax bill, you have to pay interest. If you don't pay your phone bill, there's interest. There is nothing more important than supporting your family."
- Turner, J.: "If a support order is entered and... the parent is paying... noncustodial parent is paying the support, continues to pay it, but then loses his or her employment, would interest then begin to accrue or would that be an exception to interest accruing if the employment was lost."
- Franks: "No. That person would have an affirmative obligation to go to the court and to have a new entrance of an order for the new support payments if their lifestyle changes."
- Turner, J.: "Yes, but my question is, would the interest begin to accrue before the petitioner got into court to modify the support obligation, because I mean it could take anywhere

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

from 30 to 90 days to get a court hearing to modify a judgement."

Franks: "Well, this is if you're in arrearage of 30 days."

Turner, J.: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear what you said."

Franks: "The... this Bill, if you are in arrearages for 30 days or more, that's when the interest would kick in."

Turner, J.: "All right. And so, if it took 60 days to get to court, my question is, would the interest be accruing between that 30 and 60 day period, in spite of the fact that the petitioner had lost his or her job and had not had an opportunity to get before a court to modify."

Franks: "The way this Bill reads, yes."

Turner, J.: "So, that is your intention then?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner?"

Turner, J.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Let me interrupt you for the purpose of recognizing Mr. Moffitt. Mr. Moffitt. Listen very closely, would you Mr. Turner."

Turner, J.: "To what."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Moffitt is... wants to address the Body.

Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity for... to rise to a point of personal privilege and I know Representative Turner was happy to allow this. I appreciate it. I'd like to recognize the sixth grade students from Alwood School in Henry County over here in the west balcony. Would you please make them welcome?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Turner."

Turner, J.: "Welcome students."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you for your loud applause."

Turner, J.: "So, the interest rate is 9% then and... this is consistent with the rest of the Civil Practice Act. Is

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

that correct?"

Franks: "That's correct."

Turner, J.: "Is there anything in the Bill that would allow for... as interest rates change in the economy, for the interest rate to change within the statutory scheme with regard to these judgements?"

Franks: "No."

Turner, J.: "And how would that then be modified?"

Franks: "Well, right now I'm bringing it, so it conforms with this Code of Civil Procedure. If there needs to be a change in the future, that can be done legislatively."

Turner, J.: "Do you know if any court has ever ordered interest on support? It seems to me that that occurs. I don't practice in that area, but it seems to me that the court's already order this."

Franks: "I'm... I'm not aware of any anecdotal evidence where the courts have ordered this."

Turner, J.: "Well, then who brought you this Bill? Was there a problem that someone was not being paid interest..."

Franks: "Right."

Turner, J.: "... and therefore came to you and said, 'You know, we need to change the legislation. Put interest..."

Franks: "Yes."

Turner, J.: "... within this... the Code?'"

Franks: "Yes. But it's also something I had thought of as well, because one of the first Bills that I passed through the House was tough on deadbeat parents, as well. Those that failed to pay their child support, who would lose their professional license or their drivers license. This is... this is just an extension."

Turner, J.: "Is the Bar Association in favor of this?"

Franks: "I don't know if the bar has taken a formal position, but

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

I know that I've received correspondence from a number of family law practitioners that are very much in favor of this legislation. One in Woodstock, Illinois by the name of Joe Gitlin, who has written <u>Gitlin on Divorce</u>, which is probably the best book on divorce in the State of Illinois, is a strong proponent of this."

Turner, J.: "Sometimes, you know, there are cases where support becomes in dispute... with modification you put the interest on. You say this is a mandate on the court. But this... if we do have a mandate, would it still allow litigants on support questions to barter or bargain or make a reasonable settlement in waiving interest or would it preclude that, as well?"

Franks: "No, I think any agreed order that you bring to the court, you can do, just from personal experience."

Turner, J.: "Well, I would think so, but you said earlier this would be a mandate on the court. And if it's a mandate on the court, the court may not be able to accept an order even if agreed upon by the petitioner and respondent in a support case."

Franks: "No, I think the court can accept agreed orders among the litigants, as you know."

Turner, J.: "All right. So, you don't think the language of the Bill precludes that from happening, then?"

Franks: "No, I'm going to keep the language as it is."

Turner, J.: "All right. Thank you for your responses. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Cross: "Representative, our analysis, and I wasn't in committee, indicates though that you had promised to hold this Bill on

- 46th Legislative Day

  Second Reading, to work out some questions that were brought up in committee."
- Franks: "Right. I talked to Mary K. O'Brien, who had the question, and she was satisfied... and asked... and had her permission to call this for Third Reading."
- Cross: "Did you... can you address for us the concerns she had and that were brought up in the committee? There were some undesired... potentially some undesired effects from what I read... am reading that people had concerns about and I'm just... it's rather unusual to move a Bill once someone's committed to holding it."
- Franks: "I held it for Representative O'Brien to have her questions answered and her questions were answered.

  Thereafter, I called the Bill."
- Cross: "What were those questions?"
- Franks: "You may wish to ask her. I just asked her if her questions were answered and she said they were and I should call the Bill. If you'd like to ask her, you may, but I'm not sure what those were."
- Cross: "One of the questions... that maybe we can... since... apparently, you guys have forgotten what they were. One of the questions, my understanding was, that there may be cases where a judge orders higher interest than the 9%.

  What was the ... what did you find out about that?"
- Franks: "That might have been a concern, but I don't think that would be a valid concern. I've... the court has mandated with post-judgement interest at 9% on other civil matters, but at this point, they don't have any for the support obligations."
- Cross: "Why wouldn't we do some prejudgement interest? I know the... hasn't the bar association encouraged prejudgement interest in litigation cases? If we really care about

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

child support, wouldn't we impose prejudgement interest?"

Franks: "Well, I... But... no. Because they wouldn't have an obligation if there... prejudgement."

Cross: "Well, maybe if there had been a history... yeah, this would... if there has been a... if there is a one-time delay of making payments... if your... make a payment on the 31st day, if I read your Bill correctly, the 9% kicks in?"

Franks: "That's correct."

Cross: "Does 90%... does 9% carry on for all future child supports?"

Franks: "No, just until the arrearages is taken care of."

Cross: "Where does it say that, 'only until the arrearage is taken care of,' in your Bill? Guess... if you could read this Bill, that would say all further or ongoing obligations would be... there would be interest accruing."

Franks: "The... it's clear in the Bill that the unpaid portion accrues interest."

Cross: "So, it's your intent, 'cause I'm not sure that it's really that clear, Representative, that any fu... so, any future obligations of child support after the one-time late on a 31st day we pay 9%. All future obligations become... are not assessed the 9% interest?"

Franks: "No, as long as you catch up your arrearages and you're back on time then there wouldn't be any further penalty."

Cross: "And judges have absolutely no control over this?"

Franks: "This would make it mandatory to impose interest."

Cross: "Would I, as a person receiving child support, have to petition the court to have the interest awarded or does it automatically start to accrue?"

Franks: "It accrues on the unpaid balance automatically."

Cross: "With... Without court action?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Franks: "Yes."

Cross: "So, oftentimes, you know, you have clerks' office determining... clerks' offices determining child support or at least keeping track, so in their billing system or in their computer system on day 31, automatically 9% starts to accrue."

Franks: "Well, I know... whenever you receive a judgement, post-judgement interest occurs at 9% until the judgement is paid in full. Here, after 30 days of an arrearage, which the petitioner would have to inform the court of, because not all payments come through the courts, some are paid directly to..."

Cross: "A good number of them though... all right, I understand on the ones where they aren't paid through the court, you're going to have to come into court and ask the judge, but on those that... Well, let me ask you this, let's go back to the ones that aren't paid... that aren't paid through the court system or there's not an Order of withholding. We go for a period of a year and the personal support maybe's a month behind for that whole year period 'cause of a mistake, whatever. I mean... maybe not a mistake, he or she's just a month behind. Could the petitioner, under your Bill, come in and ask for an additional amount of money for that past year on the interest or does it have to happen subsequent to the petition being filed? 'Cause there's nothing in here that's... you don't have any... you don't clarify that in the Bill."

Franks: "I'm not sure I understand your question."

Cross: "You have an ongoing late payment for a year and it's a month behind."

Franks: "Right. Would that..."

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Cross: "On all of that is there a 9% charge?"

Franks: "Yes."

Cross: "Without court approval. It's just... it's automatically assessed just by your Bill. The court has no say in it."

Franks: "No. You'd have to petition the court."

Cross: "It doesn't say that in your Bill."

Franks: "Well, that's how you go for arrearages. You petition the court for the payment of the arrearages and..."

Cross: "So..."

Franks: "... once the court determines that you're 30 days behind, then interest would also accrue on the unpaid portion."

Cross: "So, none of this happens. No one's entitled to interest, at all, until there's a petition coming in asking that the interest be assessed. It's gotta be done by court approval."

Franks: "No. That is incorrect."

Cross: "Well, you just said that."

Franks: "Because this is... no that... I talked about the people that had to petition, that aren't getting it through the courts system. 'Cause that was your initial question, but..."

Cross: "All right."

Franks: "... this a statutory provision calling for that. Now, if they have to pay through the courts system and they are late, by more than 30 days, then that would kick in there."

Cross: "Without court approval?"

Franks: "They owe it... it would be statutory."

Cross: "Right. But the judge... the judge doesn't have to make a finding that it's..."

Franks: "No."

Cross: "... willful or that there... "

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Franks: "No."

Cross: "... wasn't an excuse... "

Franks: "No."

Cross: "... for the 30 days late. That it automatically... the clerk will assess... start assessing 9%."

Franks: "That's correct."

Cross: "But we're going... still we're going to treat that person differently than the person that doesn't pay through the clerk's office."

Franks: "No."

Cross: "'Cause the person who doesn't pay through the clerk's office, doesn't pay the 9% interest until the other... the receiving person comes in the court with a petition."

Franks: "Well, how else could they know? Obviously, they're getting paid differently."

Cross: "I'm just ask..."

Franks: "Right."

Cross: "So, we're going to treat two different... treat classes differently."

Franks: "Yes."

Cross: "That answer's 'yes'?"

Franks: "Yes. And this is because of the manner of the way they're being paid, that's all."

Cross: "Don't you think in all of these, the judge should have some say in whether or not the interest should be accruing or not?"

Franks: "No. The judge doesn't have say right now for post-judgement interest in any other civil matter. Because once you get a judgement, the interest starts accruing."

Cross: "So, are you saying that once you're 30 days late a judgement enters?"

Franks: "No. This is already post-judgement. I'm talking in

46th Legislative Day

Other cases."

May 6, 1999

Cross: "Well, if it is post..."

Franks: "Right now... let me give you an example. Right now, if 'x' sues 'y' and 'y' is found to be liable, judgement starts accruing from the judgement date at 9%."

Cross: "Well, if this is a post-judgement scenario that you're describing, then why do we need this if... the law already allows 9% on post-judgement cases, why do we need your Bill?"

Franks: "Because they haven't done it in support... in the support area. And that's why we need this Bill."

Cross: "But they could."

Franks: "But they haven't. So, it's time to protect our families and those children that aren't getting the money because someone is not paying. And because that person doesn't pay the custodial spouse might be missing a mortgage payment or a rent payment or a car payment or being... being able to pay for the childrens' school or for their medication. So, let's make sure people do what they're supposed to do."

Cross: "Why are you waiting 30 days if you're so concerned about kids? Why don't you just do it automatically? Say anyone that's late... "

Franks: "Because they're not... because they're not late on the first day. There is some room because you have to give time for mail..."

Cross: "But the..."

Franks: "... or from other things. Thirty days, I think, is a reasonable amount of time."

Cross: "But once the judgement's entered it automatically kicks in?"

Franks: "That's right."

Cross: "Yeah, I guess I'm concerned that, you know, 9%'s rather

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

weak in this day and age. Shouldn't the interest be
higher?"

Franks: "I think 9 is fair because that's what we're getting on other civil judgements. The State of Arkansas does charge 10%."

Cross: "Well, that's nice to know we're at... least... we're least progressive or not as progressive as the State of Arkansas. That says a lot about this piece of legislation and nice to know that President Clinton's state is doing so much better that us. Thank you, Representative. I don't have any other questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the greatest respect for the Leaders on that sponsorship of this Bill. them, I'm sure, are extremely well-intentioned. But I believe that adding 9% interest, to child support payments that are late, will very, very significantly harm people who may be having difficulting paying child support anyway. I think as men and women of substance, we realize some child support payers are taking care of two families. There is wife #1 with children. There is wife #2 with children. Very frequently those payments are made on time, but some emergency could occur to family #2 and wife #1's payments may be late. Should that entire family have to suffer with the 9% increase or 9% interest because those payments are late? We may be thinking we're punishing the person who is paying the payment late, but actually, you are punishing, frequently children. You are punishing that innocent second wife and I don't think we want to do that, here in the Legislature. And before we even consider this kind of legislation, we should consider a greater portion of all collected child support going to the individual to

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

whom that money is being paid. Considerably large amounts of those dollars are used for administration. Now, until we correct that terrible problem, we should not be adding punishment to the person who must pay that fee. We know of cases in which the second family: there's illness; where there is a huge in... influx of some educational the payment will be made, but it will be late. Now, should all of those people suffer. Perhaps the child support payer is unemployed for a short period of time. So, when that person returns to work, he has an additional burden of paying 9% interest. In good conscience, Ladies and Gentlemen, and with all due respect to each of those Sponsors, we should not add insult to injury and hurt those families that need this money. Thank you. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise... I'm somewhat speechless because Representative Monique Davis and I are in absolute, total agreement on this Bill. And I think that might be a first. But, I think Representative Davis has given you reasons to vote 'no' and I'd like to just, if I could, carry some of her reasons on. And I... I, too, respect the Sponsor. I respect what he's trying to do. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the issue is not adding interest to child support payments. The issue is collecting child support payments. There is approximately \$1,000,000,000 in unpaid child support in the State of Illinois. The issue is not 'feel good' Bills, 'sound good' Bills, 'look good' Bills. The issue is working with the Division of Child Support to get that unpaid billion dollars collected and distributed to children. That unpaid child support is putting an unbearable burden on state

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

resources and community-based organizations all over this state. Now, this Bill may be good-intentioned, but give you just a scenario that's happened in my district. You have a construction worker and he or she may be making The weather goes sour in the winter. \$700 a week. person's laid off. He goes to court, has his petition the court for a modification order in his or her child support. The judge... the courts are so backed up it may be 10 months before they hear the modification order. But at the end of 30 days, interest accrues at an unrealistic level of child support. Now, you know what that human being's going to do? He or she's gonna 'That's not right. That isn't fair. I'm only making unemployment. I can't pay it. And I won't pay it.' the spouse has to go court, which may be another 10 months. And in the meantime, no child support is collected, period. Don't get hung up on interest. Don't get hung up on punitive measures. All the punitive measures we've done, haven't worked. We take away their drivers license. can put them in jail. We can take away their professional I have no empathy with a deadbeat. I have no sympathy for a person who doesn't meet his or obligations to children that they bring into this world. But, this isn't going to help. This is not going to accomplish a thing except somebody is going to get a press release to say, 'I'm getting tough on child support.' once, the Body should rise up and say, 'The issue isn't punitive. The issue isn't adding 9% interest. is how can we as a General Assembly work with the Division of Child Support and collect the child support that is ordered by the court.' That's the issue. We are not doing it currently. Our state ranks almost dead last in child

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

support collection. And until we change that, we are putting children, young boys and girls, at risk and that's not right, it's not fair and we should work together to collect the support payments. Don't add interest on top of bill that isn't being paid. That doesn't do any good. This Bill won't accomplish what the Sponsor wants to accomplish, no matter how well-intentioned he is. issue is let's work with the Division of Child Support and let's find a system that collects money from deadbeats. This isn't gonna do that. Do you think a 9% interest is gonna make a deadbeat want to pay his or her child support in a timely fashion? No, it simply will, in my opinion, I've seen it happen, steel their resolve that they aren't being treated fairly and they won't pay. This is a Bill you can vote 'no' and 'present' on. And I would say this, I think Tom Cross was absolutely right when he pointed out some issues about this matter. It's the wrong way to go. It doesn't solve the problem, and in fact, I think will exacerbate the problem. So, if you're worried about a mail piece, I'll come to your district. Send the mail piece to my district. It's well-known in my district I have no empathy for deadbeats. But I'm more concerned about working on the problem of collecting child support rather than trying to simply add another punitive factor for those who don't pay. Let's solve the problem first. you want to come back, when we've got a system that really collects child support, if you want to come back a year or two after we really solved the problem and add interest, I'll cosponsor it. But until we get a system that works and actually collects the child support, this isn't the answer and I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Lang."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in Lanq: support of Senate Bill 469. The previous speaker, while well-intentioned, is wrong in his analysis of this piece of legislation. Illinois ranks 50th out of 50 states in the collection of child support. Fiftieth. And while the previous speaker is correct that we need to pay more attention to the method by which we collect child support, we need to provide additional resources for the collection of child support. In fact, this Body, agreed with me with my legislation to do a better job collecting child support. Nevertheless, any tool we can put on the table to help collect child support payments is a worthy one. Now, the assumption that every deadbeat that doesn't pay child support can't afford to pay it is incorrect. If you want to say there's a lot of poor people that are supposed to pay child support, who can't pay it, and adding 9% interest to them would create a worse problem, I could almost buy that argument. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, there are hundreds, in fact thousands, of deadbeats that don't their child support who can afford to pay their child support, who should be paying their child support, who are simply using the court system and the laws of the State of Illinois to avoid those obligations. And because there's no hammer over their head, they simply say, 'Well, I won't pay today. The worst that'll happen to me is I'll get hauled into court tomorrow and I'll be forced to pay what I owe today.' But if a person owes thousands of dollars in child support and they know that 9% interest is going to be tacked on day after day after day, they'll say to themselves, 'Boy, you know, I'd better pay this now because when a court requires me to pay it later I'm going to be paying that amount plus 9% compounded annually. So, those

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

that can afford to pay who are avoiding the payment simply because they're using the court system, they're using the fact that we don't have sufficient leverage on them to avoid their payment, will say to themselves, 'If I pay now, I will save money.' And that, of course, is the most important hammer of all. This is about money, Ladies and Gentlemen. Yes, we should fix the system. Yes, we should make it work better. And we're starting to work on legislation that will do that. Taking away peoples' licenses of every kind, perhaps putting people in jail where they belong if they willfully refuse to pay, but can afford to pay. This is a small step in that direction. says, 'if you can pay, we're not going to allow you to use the court system anymore. It's a delay.' It says, 'if you can pay, you better pay or when you do pay, it's going to cost you 9% interest compounded.' And for those that can afford to pay, who are working, who are willfully refusing to pay, that 9% will mount up in a big hurry. And so the economics of this would require them to pay. So, for those that say we need to fix the system, they're right. But for those to say that this won't help, they're wrong. This is a good step forward to make people pay because it induces them to pay because there's monetary inducement to pay now as opposed to paying later. Please support the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. According to the appropriate Rules, that I'm joined by enough Members on our side, I'd like to remove this Bill from Short Debate. It was on Short Debate."

Speaker Madigan: "We're well beyond Short Debate."

Mulligan: "Thank you. I just wanted to make sure."

Speaker Madigan: "Did you want to speak to the Bill?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Mulligan: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I notice by our analysis that there were a number of questions asked in committee and you agreed to hold this Bill on Second 'til those concerns were addressed. It appears to me that from the questioning there are a number of concerns that haven't been addressed. I'm curious to know because one of the questions that was brought up was the percentage of judges that already do this. Did you get figures on that? That was in our analysis. That you were supposed to get figures on the percentage judges that currently allow this."

Franks: "Representative O'Brien had asked that question and she was going to follow up on that. And she told me today that she was happy with the answers, but I do not know, personally, what the answer is."

Mulligan: "Well, I think if this is discretionary, that's what we need. I mean, what do we have judges for? I have a problem with passing legislation that has to examine every individual situation and yet, we passed 'blanket' legislation that automatically mandates that this is going to happen no matter what the individual situation is. I think that's what we have judges for. They're to take a look at this situation. You still need a court order entered anyway, so you have to be in court. Why would you put a solution out that would make the situation worse than the problem we're trying to solve? And that's what it appears to me you're doing here."

Franks: "Presently, on post-judgement, once a judgement's been entered, automatically 9% interest accrues. We're not... we're trying to level the playing field here. We're trying

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

to protect families. I'm trying to stop deadbeats from getting interest free loans that all of us are paying."

Mulligan: "Representative, I certainly agree with you. For a portion of my life, I did marital settlement agreements and I've also been in that position, personally. disagree with you trying to collect child support. disagree with the situation that compounds the problem both for the Department of Public Aid, for Representatives, who are in their office. If a judge already has this discretionary ability to go in and look at a case and say, He's 'This one... this guy's a real true deadbeat. avoiding it. Add 9%. Another case, this guy's lost his job or he's ill. Why add 9%.' I agree with Representative Black on what he said. I agree with Representative Cross. Having done marital settlement agreements in the past, I understand that we sometimes have problems getting into court. But, I think, this solution goes beyond what we want to do because it creates more problems in the long run than what you're trying to solve. I... To the Bill. I... I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. I certainly think that it does create a lot more problems for all entities involved, including the Department of Public Aid, when you take a look at why people potentially may not be able to In many instances, it would be valid to add the 9%. pay. That a judge has that discretion currently to go ahead and add the 9%. In many instances, you may find someone that ill, has lost a job, has legitimate reasons for not having to add the 9% and then we're automatically agreeing to go ahead and do it. In many instances, you make such a punitive situation out of a situation that may have not been that way to begin with, because now you have both sides disagreeing on what should be paid. Sometimes the

#### 46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

spouse who's getting a payment even agrees with the fact that the divorced spouse who's paying, is ill or has lost a job and is understanding. We're creating an additional advert... adversarial position. We're making a really bad situation out of one that a judge already has the discretion, currently, to handle. I would urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Bill Mitchell for the purpose of an announcement."

Mitchell, B.: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Mitchell, B.: "I would like for the Illinois House to welcome Holy Family School from my hometown in Decatur, Illinois. Everyone give Holy Family a big welcome. Stand up. And also, a very special welcome to Jared Kennedy, who's 13 today. So, Happy birthday, Jared. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Biggins."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Biggins: "Representative, this... does this Bill allow a person that owes money to pay their lawyer before they pay their child support?"

Franks: "There's no provision in there on how the monies are to be allocated."

Biggins: "Would you be willing to put this back to Second Reading, so that we can put an Amendment on that would permit the lawyers to be paid only after the child support is paid. So, the lawyers that would benefit from being paid when the child is not getting support would have to

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

wait."

Franks: "I'd be glad to do a separate Bill on that. I think this

Bill as it stands is a well-written Bill and if you'd like
to draft that Bill, Mr. Biggins, I would certainly
cosponsor that with you."

Biggins: "And doesn't this Bill take a... have a 30 day waiting
 period before it would kick in for some interest payments?"
Franks: "Yes."

Biggins: "Well, the statute that I have in front of me says, currently, we have on the books a tighter standard, that says immediately, judgement to be entered."

Franks: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you."

Biggins: "Why would we loosen the standard?"

Franks: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear what you said. I'm sorry.

I didn't hear what you said."

Biggins: "According to the statute that I had in front of me, it says that 'judgement will be entered immediately in the amount of each payment or installment of support.' So, in each judgement we'll have the full force effect and the attributes of any other judgement of the state. So, why would we pass a Bill that weakens the collection?"

Franks: "It doesn't weaken it, because right now..."

Biggins: "It gives them more time."

Franks: "No. The Illinois Department of Public Aid has indicated there are no provisions for interest in this type of situation."

Biggins: "And do you have any statistics...?"

Franks: "So, we're making sure... we're closing that loophole."

Biggins: "Do you have any statistics on what percent of people that owe child support, what their average annual income is?"

Franks: "No."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Biggins: "Well, I think there are statistics out that I've seen that indicate that a large number of the people that owe child support have very little income. So 9% of nothing is going to yield you nothing. And going to court and charging the public with court fees, you giving free lawyers or lawyers... that they pay their lawyers part... it's when... it's kind of a... to me a pointless effort."

Franks: "I disagree wholeheartedly."

Biggins: "So, it's okay to go ahead and go through laws that don't mean anything they have no..."

Franks: "I think you whole premise is misconstrued."

Biggins: "... portance of collection?"

Franks: "I think your entire premise is off the mark."

Biggins: "Is there anything in here that allows people that are drug dealers that owe child support to attach future earnings to make them pay for that child support in past years? Let us suppose you decide to deal drugs in 10, 20 years and you have... that's what you do do. Are you required to pay back child support at all, for the kids you didn't pay for?"

Franks: "I don't think drug dealing has anything to do with this."

Biggins: "Well, would you be willing to put this back to Second Reading, so we can put an Amendment on it that requires people to attach later incomes to pay their child support, even though the children may be older and not in need of it."

Franks: "If you'd like to do another Bill on that, again, I'll be glad to work with you, Mr. Biggins. I'm happy with the way this Bill reads and I think..."

Biggins: "Well, if we had more time, I'd be glad to do more Bills with you, but right now we have this Bill in front of us,

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

which, I'm afraid, weakens our current law in regards to child support."

Franks: "It actually strengthens our current law and it closes loopholes and it protects our families."

Biggins: "Is the State Bar Association taking a position on this Bill?"

Franks: "Not that I'm aware of."

Biggins: "Well, I'm beginning to wonder more and even more.

Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis because her name was mentioned in debate."

Davis, M.: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Representative Black mentioned my name in debate and he was absolutely correct when he stated that if a person is a construction worker or a seasonal worker there will be a time in which dollars will not be available on a monthly or 30 day basis. And based on that, I think we should look to the Circuit Clerk of the Court, the Department of Public Aid's Division of Child Support and the Attorney General to be more vigilant in what they do. Now, if they're having trouble collecting, we need to ask them, 'What are you doing to address this issue? What are your problems that are preventing you from carrying out the laws that are already on the books?' We don't need to continue adding laws after laws. Representative Black is always talking about how big our Code book is becoming. And when it becomes so big, until people no longer can find the issue that needs addressing, nobody obeys that particular section of the law. I think Bill Black is absolutely correct when he states that the time for this Bill has not come. want to injure innocent children and innocent don't families. We need to know from the Attorney General.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

need to know from the Circuit Clerk. And we need to know from the Division of Child Support from Public Aid what will assist you in being more vigilant in collecting child support, not adding penalty, penalty that will affect children, that will affect innocent wives. Save our families. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate. I simply want to rise and again commend Representative Davis for her insight on this issue. As I've said often on this floor, Representative Davis, when she wants to, has clear vision of the issues at hand. And her vision has never been more clear tha it is on issue. And in all seriousness, if you'll just focus on one or two issues. A judge... it's my understanding, from hearing this Bill in committee and I was the only Member of the committee to vote 'no', one Member of the committee voted 'present'. A judge can assess an interest penalty on past due child support now, if the judge wishes to do so or the attorney wants to include that in an order that he takes... he or she takes to the court. So, the Bill... the Bill doesn't do anything that we can't already do, number And number two, and I not being disrespectful to the Sponsor, this makes a good press release and you can write it in such a way that you're, in fact, trying to toughen up on the problem of unpaid child support. But I would submit to you, as Representative Davis has said, that's not the issue. The issue is trying to get Illinois from one of the lowest states in the country in the collection of child support. That's the problem. That's the issue. the legislation we need to focus on. And we did this in the House. We sent a Bill to the Senate that would

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

significantly change the way we collect child support in this state. And I don't know what the fate of that Bill is going to be in the Senate. What we really need to do, Ladies and Gentlemen, is not clutter up the statutes with something that judges can already do or that the attorney can all... can ask the court to do in a modified court The issue is a billion dollars in back and uncollected child support. Now, you can put 9% interest on the billion dollars, if you want to, if you think that's going to help you collect it, fine. I don't think it will. I think it will just exacerbate the problem. We've already spent 30 minutes on this Bill. If we would collectively as a legislative Body, spend that much time on the actual issue, why are we not collecting child support that is due and payable and necessary and vital for the welfare of children in this state? That's the issue. And all of these other Bills simply distract and take attention away from that issue. Let's not go down the forks in the road. Let's go right down the center of the highway and say to the Department of Public Aid, to the Governor of the State of Illinois, there is something wrong with the way we collect child support in this state. And we want it fixed. with 'patchwork' measures, not with 'feel good' measures, not with 'sound good' measures. We want the problem fixed and we want it fixed now. And once we get it I'll be more than happy to cosponsor any kind of interest Bill you want or any kind of punitive measure you I have absolutely no empathy for people who are deadbeats. This isn't gonna help a deadbeat. This gonna motivate a deadbeat to pay. What's gonna motivate the deadbeats to pay the billion dollars in uncollected child support, is to get a system in the State of Illinois

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

that goes after them from day one and says, 'We won't tolerate it. We will not tolerate your refusing to accept your responsibility to children that you brought into the world.' That's the issue. Everything else simply takes away from that issue and that's why I again stand in opposition to this Bill and urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Fowler."

Fowler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Fowler: "I'm happy to have today in the gallery, up on the west side up here, a group of students and the teachers from one of my schools in the 118th District, Pope County High School. I'd like for the House Representatives to give them a warm welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise on a point of personal privilege. Today we are honored to have with us from the Jewish Community Centers of Metropolitan Chicago a wonderful group of women and I would like everyone to give them a wonderful welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Black used my name in debate... debate. If I could have... some time ago... If I could just have a moment, to ask a couple more questions, pursuant to that."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Cross you know we've really been very liberal on this..."

Cross: "I understand."

Speaker Madigan: "... during this debate. And my understanding of speaking when your name is used in debate is not to reopen the debate again. We've... We've been on this Bill

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

for close to an hour."

Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's some questions I... that I...

looking at the current statute that haven't been asked with

respect to this issue, that I think need to be asked, that

the perception and the way this is written would say...

suggest that this Bill eases up the restrictions on payment

of child support and I think the Sponsor should address

those. I've made... perhaps that's one of..."

Speaker Madigan: "I would just... I would just suggest, Mr. Cross, that you try to be brief."

Cross: "I will be as brief as I can. Representative, I would direct your attention to the statute that... part of law that we've already passed, dealing with judgements and specifically, dealing with child support orders; under the family section of the Illinois Revised Statutes or compiled statutes; 750 45-14. I'm sure you're familiar with it. You're obviously concerned about child support. And I'll... let me read it to you if you don't have it there, Representative. 'Any new or existing support order entered by the court shall be deemed to be a series of judgements against the person obligated to pay support Each judgement to be in the amount of each there under. payment. Each judgement shall have the full force effect, and attribute... attributes of any other judgement of this state, including the ability to be enforced.' So, read that, any support order entered, automatically becomes a judgement. Once it becomes a judgement, it's entitled to a... the ability to enforce the 9% interest automatically happens."

Franks: "That was..."

Cross: "Your Bill..."

Franks: "That was not specifically stated in the legislative

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

language that you just read to me."

Cross: "'Each judgement shall have the full force effect, and attributes of any other judgement of this state.' And I know you know, as a lawyer, that all judgements in this state, with the exception of local government, have to pay interest at the rate of 9%, local government at 6. So, what you're doing under this Bill and I want to make sure you know and everybody else is, under the current law the judgement goes into effect immediately and the 9% interest goes into effect immediately. You're giving people that don't pay child support a 30 day grace period. Now, I don't know if you want to do that, but that's what you're doing because you're changing the current law. You're changing the current law that says the judgement becomes immediate."

Franks: "What you just read to us had nothing to do with back child support."

Cross: "Yes, it does."

Franks: "No, I don't believe so."

Cross: "All right, Representative. I've think I've made my point. If you want to take a Bill and soften up the child support obligation, give... give deadbeat parents 30 day grace period, then go ahead with your Bill. I think it's pretty clear... it's very clear if you look at the language of the existing statute, that the judgement takes effect immediately on any child support order. So, you do how you want to handle it, but I think it's... you have now softened up the law and I don't intend to vote for your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks, to close."

Franks: "Thank you. I appreciate the attention and indulgence of this chamber. This tightens up our law. This... the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

system isn't perfect as some of my learned colleagues had stated and we need to do better with child support enforcement and collection. This is certainly not a 'feel good' Bill. This closes a loophole where we have been giving interest free loans to deadbeats. This will make it stronger. It will protect our families by keeping a penalty for those who fail to take care of there societal and familial obligations. I encourage everyone for a 'yes' vote. This is a good Bill and regardless of what the previous speaker had stated, it does not weaken our present law. It strengthens it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 89 'ayes', 16 'noes'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 20, on the Order of Motions in Writing, there appears Senate Bill 144. Mr. O'Connor. Mr. O'Connor."

O'Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing side, pursuant to Rule 65, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 144 passed."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 144. Mr. Black."

Black: "Later."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is 'Shall the Gentleman's Motion be adopted?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is a Motion to Reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 144. Please record yourself. Please record yourself. Please record yourself. Please record yourself. The Clerk shall

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion is adopted and the vote by which Senate Bill 144 passed is hereby reconsidered. On the same Order of business, there appears Senate Bill 1066. Representative Currie. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Having voted on the prevailing side and pursuant to Rule 65, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1066 passed."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves to reconsider the vote on Senate Bill 1066. Those in favor of the Motion will vote 'aye'; those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 90 'ayes' and 19 'noes'. And the Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1066 passed is hereby adopted and the vote is reconsidered. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: floor for consideration' 'to the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 13, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 109, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 149, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 163, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 215, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 242, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 288, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 315, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 331, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 359, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 459, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 680, Amendment

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

#1 to Senate Bill 734, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 741, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 932, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 937, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1015, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1024, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1054, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill Bill 1055, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1088, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1116, and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1117. Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4."

Speaker Hartke: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of parliamentary procedure and an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "State your question... your point."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I take... this is one of the more unenviable tasks that a Floor Leader gets to do. I take no satisfaction in what I'm about to do and to those Members I may offend, I apologize. I understand why we sometimes do what we think we must do in this chamber, but Mr. Speaker, the introduction of guests has gotten out of hand in this chamber and I would ask the Chair to rule that in accordance with House Rule 51 number 'e'... letter 'e', 'recognition of guests by any Member is prohibited except that the Speaker or the presiding officer may recognize an honored guest.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking that you enforce that rule to the letter. What I am asking, is that we observe what used to be the case on this We never interrupted Third Reading debate with floor. introduction of guests. I know it's very important to some of you when you have friends, family, schools, athletic groups, elected officials from your hometown and I'm not

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

asking that we ignore them and I'm not asking that we not be allowed to introduce them. All I'm asking the Chair to rule, is that in accordance with our House Rules we not allow Third Reading debate to be interrupted by a clear violation of House Rules. That last Bill that we debated was interrupted five times for the introduction of guests in clear violation of Rule 51(e). I would ask the Chair to remind the Members of the rule and to enforce the rule, at least when we're on the Order of Third Reading. There is a time that we can introduce people, but when we're in the middle of Third Reading debate, I would submit, in all due respect to my colleagues, that's not the time."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Black, your point is well taken and Members should take heed to Representative Black's admonition. We will follow that rule. If you do have guests that you would like to introduce, please inform the Chair. We will not be interrupting Third Reading from this point on. You had an inquiry, as well, or your point?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker. I respect the ruling. And again, I mean no disrespect to any Member, but there is a time and a place as we draw this Session to a close, things are gonna get hectic. And at some point, it disrupts the business of the House and if we would just all remind ourselves of the rule that we passed, unanimously, and we would attempt to work with the Chair at a proper time in the Order of House Business to recognize guests, I think that's wonderful. I just submit that I... in the middle of Third Reading debate, I don't think that's the time. And I do appreciate the indulgence of the Chair."

Speaker Hartke: "Please advise the Chair if you have guests that you would like to introduce and we will try our best to work it in. This Chair's prepared to move some Bills from

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- Third back to Second. Then we're going to move Bills back from Second to Third that have Amendments that have been approved by rules. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 667 by Representative McGuire?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 667 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill to Second for the purposes of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. On page 2, Senate Bill 79. Representative Delgado."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 79 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. On page 4, Senate Bill 849. Representative Lang."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 849 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill to Second for the purpose of an Amendment and at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1066."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1066."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."
- Clerk Rossi: "That's a Motion."
- Speaker Hartke: "Take that Bill out of the record. Now moving all our Bills from Second Reading to Third Reading. Some of these have technical Amendments on them. Senate Bill 13. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 13, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Currie has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The underlying Bill deals with an improved, more efficient way of... of monitoring prescriptions for controlled substances. This is a technical Amendment. I'm responding to some concerns over timeliness by the Department of Professional Regulation and deleting some language that is superseded by other language in the statute. It is technical in nature, but I'd be happy to answer your questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 13 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 215. Representative Gash. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act amending the School Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Gash has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Gash. Out of the record. Senate Bill 242. Representative McKeon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 288. Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Senate Bill 315. Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act amending the Counties Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Reitz has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Reitz."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this Bill will... Yeah, this Amendment is at the request of the Illinois Medical Association and it clarifies what we're going to do on the Bill. We're trying to have domestic violence listed as a cause of death and this will clarify that."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, given the... the seriousness of domestic violence and all of the time and energy to combat domestic violence that's going on in our country today, why... why would you want to amend the Bill to take out a provision that would list, specifically list, domestic violence as a cause of death on a death certificate? I... I would think that for future prosecution... that that's exactly what you would want on... the death certificate."

Reitz: "The... the medical examiners who have said that there is not a place to list exactly what it was and the intent is mostly to keep a record, to get a record of what is a contributing factor as other things. And their argument was, basically, that whatever caused the fatality was the cause of death, not actually and that's their problem. Just the same in a car accident if it... if... crushing your chest in or something of that nature was what caused your death, than cause of death, than that would be listed on the death certificate not the car accident."

Black: "Well, couldn't... couldn't that be settled simply by saying death was caused by a... blunt force trauma due to a domestic battery incident or repeated blows to the head caused by domestic violence incident? I, oh... I just

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

think it would... it would assist the prosecutor if the cause of death was delineated as some medical term caused by a domestic violence incident."

Reitz: "That is... that is basically the intent. As I said, the intent is just to try and keep a record and try to find out... report to the State Police, so that we can have a record of what deaths..."

Black: "Okay."

Reitz: "... are caused by domestic violence. But the problem that they have with it, the medical examiners and the medical association have with it, is that in a lot of cases it's not really determined that... that domestic violence was the cause until after they... "

Black: "Okay."

Reitz: "... needed the death certificate... "

Black: "All right."

Reitz: "... and it would... may cause undue delay for the families."

Black: "With the addition of the Amendment, it does not remove the support of the Coalition Against Domestic Violence or any of those groups? Are they..."

Reitz: "No. Everyone's fine."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussions? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 315?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 459. Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Lang has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 459 deals with the civil cause of action for purposeful... causing purposeful harm to somebody's pet. It was suggested by Representative John Turner in committee that we add this Amendment dealing with attorneys' fees and accordingly, this is agreed with Mr. Turner. I haven't heard any objection to it. I would move adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 459?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 937. Rich Myers. Representative Myers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 937, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Rich Myers has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is a technical Bill that excludes the City of Chicago from the provisions of the Bill."

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

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 937?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1117.

Representative Winters."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1117. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Winters has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Yes. Amendment #1 is an Agreed Amen... Amendment, would urge its adoption."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1117?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1024.

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1024. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Bugielski has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate

#### 46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Amen... Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1024 removes one section of the Bill. When with this Bill was heard in committee, everyone was in agreement for the majority of the Bill. There was one part that had some controversy and I agreed to keep this Bill on Second Reading until there was an agreement reached on this one section. No agreement was reached. So we took that one part of the Bill out of... the one section out of the Bill. So, the rest of the Bill now stands as it was originally and there's total agreement to it. There was no agreement reached on this one section and we removed it. And I ask for the adoption."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise in support of the Amendment. What the Gentleman from Chicago has said is, in fact, correct. This Amendment simply peels out a part of the language which was not agreed to and makes the Bill from that point agreed by all parties."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1024?' All those is favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 149. Representative Black. Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 149, a Bill for an Act amending the Emergency Telephone System Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No

46th Legislative Day

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

May 6, 1999

Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Black has been approved for consideration."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 was added at the request of health care facilities in the State of Illinois. This deals with the Bill, you'll remember, requiring each phone to have a locator when you dial into a 911 system. And we're trying to clean that up as best we can. All this says is that health care facilities are presumed to meet the requirements of this paragraph if the facilities are staffed with medical or nursing personnel 24 hours a day and if an alternative means of providing information about the source of an emergency call exists. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It takes hospitals and health care facilities out of it. I stand in support and ask your

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 149?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

support of the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 331. Representative Lindner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 331, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Equal Justice Assistance Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Lindner has been approved for consideration."

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This takes out the tax checkoff and because the Department of Revenue did not agree with this because they have a separate process that they have to go through committee for a tax checkoff, so this deletes that portion of the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 331?'

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 163. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 163 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Bost has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 simply adds in the same language that we moved from the House and over to the Senate that dealt with the goose pit not being able to be moved if a property line had been established for over ten years. I would just ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 163?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 359. Representative Winters. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 359, a Bill for an Act amending the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Winters has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 increases the number of people to appointed to the insurance task force by four. These people will be appointed at the discretion of the Governor in... answer to some concerns of not an insurance groups that were interested in this task force."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 359?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1054.

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1054 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Bassi has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that provides some technical cleanup of the language that was in Committee Amendment #1. It was agreed to in committee and

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

I ask for its acceptance."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1054?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 734. Representative Persico. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act amending the General Not-for-profit Corporation Act of 1986. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Persico has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, ma... Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. Amendment #1 is an agreement with the title companies and answered all their concerns to the underlying Bill. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Sen... Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 734?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 109. Representative Righter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 109. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Dale Righter has

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Righter."

- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 109 is largely technical in nature and would remove all opposition from the Bill. And I'd appreciate your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 109?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1107.

  Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1107... Senate Bill 1107, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

  No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 932. Representative Meyer. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 932 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Jim Meyer has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Repre..."

Meyer: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair..."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Meyers (sic-Meyer)."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 is a technical Bill in nature. It removes a line that... of the original Bill that would require that publication of notices in the newspaper would

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

also include the seal of the clerk or secretary of the governmental unit. And the notice still would have to be filed and also the name of the clerk of the... or secretary of the unit, but would remove the requirement for the seal to also be reproduced."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Hou... Senate Bill 932?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. House Joint Resolution #4.

Representative Boland. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by

Representative Boland has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1... what it does is set within a ten year period the State Senate in two classes of terms of six years and four years for one class; four years and six years for the other class."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Senate Bill 1055. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1055 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Currie has been for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The underlying Bill provides an opportunity for people whose check is rejected to have a chance to find out why. This Amendment narrows the places in a retail establishment where that information needs to be posted. This was a request of the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association. And I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1055?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1116.

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Mulligan has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor

Amendment #1 would allow the Welfare-to-Work Annual Report

which was authorized in 1986 and submitted to the General

Assembly on Project Chance Program to be eliminated. This

has never been modified to keep pace with the welfare

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

reform changes that alter the composition of the department's employment and training programs and all... Since the report was first submitted over ten years ago, many changes have occurred in the state Welfare-to-Work Programs. So, basically, it makes this report no longer pertinent and they'd like to eliminate having to do it. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1116?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Hamos in the chamber? Representative McKeon. Senate Bill 242. The Amendment is out of Rules. Has been a... approved for consideration. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 242 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative McKeon. He has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative McKeon."

McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 is an Agreed

Amendment with the Chicago Bar Association Condominium Law

Committee, has the state... support of the State Bar

Association. I urge its approval."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes... Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 242?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Saviano. Out of the record. Representative Gash are you prepared to call your Bill? From Second to Third? Representative Brunsvold in the Chair."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Senate Bill 741. It's on Second Reading."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 741 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Hartke has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Hartke on Senate..."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate... Floor

  Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 741 is simply a technical

  change. There was a misprint on the numbering of the... of

  the Bill. And I ask for your consideration."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Seeing no... no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Third Reading. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."
- Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 384?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 384 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hartke: "Move that Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 385."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 385 is... is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Hartke: "Place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor for the purpose of an Amendment. Representative Hamos in the chamber? Representative Hamos. Senate Bill 680. Your Amendment has been approved and is out of committee. Take that Bill out of the record. Mr. Ryder, you're recognized for a point of personal privilege."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we go to Third Readings."

Speaker Hartke: "Before."

Ryder: "I don't want to infuriate anyone on my side of the aisle."

Speaker Hartke: "State your point."

Ryder: "Thank you. I have the pleasure of introducing some students who have traveled from my hometown of Jerseyville. The Student Council from Illini Middle School have the pleasure of sitting in the Speaker's Gallery right before us and I was wondering if it would be possible for us to welcome them and their advisor, Mr. Larry Decker. We welcome you to Springfield. Hope you have a good time."

Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. Anyone else have announcements before we go to Third Reading? Mr. Skinner.

On page 2 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 202.

Representative O'Brien. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 202, a Bill for an Act in relation to sex offenders. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 202 would require that a sex offender not only register in the county in which they live, but in the county in which they are employed, if that is a

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

different county. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 202?' All those in favor will vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is Third Reading Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 202, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1109. Representative Pankau. Are you ready to call that Bill?"
- Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe Representative Dart has asked for a few more moments to thoroughly review this quality piece of legislation. So, for the moment, may you take it out of the... record?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Take it out... Take that Bill out of the record.

  On page 2 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 43.

  Representative Parke. Out of the record. On page 2 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 74. Representative Wirsing.

  Representative Wirsing. Out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 412. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 412, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois State University Law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Essentially, what this would do is it would address the problem with regard to land at Illinois State University that essentially, is in the middle of... is in

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

the middle of the town of Normal and it's their agricultural area that they use for agricultural studies. What they would like to do, is be able to develop that land and move the agricultural study area to a more appropriate setting out more... out in the country. This would insure that the money that is... that is garnered from any sale of this land is actually used to create a new... a new facility for agricultural studies at Illinois State University."

- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to disclose a potential conflict of interest and will vote 'present'."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Stephens from Madison County."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."
- Stephens: "Representative, is this something you forgot to to when you were attending college at ISU?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I'll tell you what. I never really was involved in the agricultural study program, but I have high regard for everybody who was. And when I was a Redbird at Illinois State University, I... I drove by this land and often wondered, 'Why is it in the middle of town?' So, this is gonna address... address that..."
- Stephens: "Well, Representative rumor has it that you frequently stopped on this land. Is that true?"
- Hoffman: "I... I got to tell ya the... no... I... no...
  I..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Ve... Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Speaker Hartke: "The Sponsor will yield."

Black: "Representative, under current law if... if the institution of higher education located in Bloomington-Normal was to sell the parcel, where would the money go?"

Hoffman: "Representative, I... I'm not... I'm not exactly sure under current law. Maybe you can enlighten me. I would assume what would happen is, it would go to the General Revenue Fund. Here's what this is going to do. It will... it will provide that the money must be used to develop a similar facility in a more appropriate setting. If it is not... if it does not do so, or if Illinois State University does not do so, does not use it for that purpose, then it will go back into the General Revenue Fund. And I believe there's a time limit in the Bill that they have to do that in."

Black: "Does the Bill permanently change the law on how a university can handle monies received for property that they sell or is this just for a specific purpose?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding this is only under the section concerning Illinois State University and... and concerning their agricultural facility or their agricultural college."

Black: "All right. Is there language in the Bill that specifically says the renumeration (sic-remuneration) received for the parcel can only be used to purchase a like parcel for the same or similar reasons?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it specifically indicates that monies from the development fund account used for any other purpose must be deposited into the approp... an appropriate... appropriate to the General Revenue Fund. I belie... I believe what it does, it specifically says, and my staff tells me, I can't find the... the right section, but I know that it

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

specifically says it must be used for that purpose."

Black: "All right. So, we're not setting up a situation... my concern is where the university might sell highly developable land in a community that is growing very rapidly. I don't know what this land... Well, let me ask you this before I get into that point. I assume that this sale will be in accordance with all applicable state laws; i. e., public notice, appraisal, fair market value. This is not gonna be a closed sale is it?"

Hoffman: "Yes. This doesn't affect that in any way. And I found the section, Representative, of your earlier question."

Black: "Let... let... let me just focus on... on the issue, now.

I want to make sure I understand this. This is not going to be a closed sale. What I... what I... what I want to make sure that doesn't happen. Does the university already have a buyer for this land and another prospective buyer would be excluded from bidding on the purchase of the... of the property to be sold?"

Hoffman: "I don't have any information regarding that, whether they do or do not have a prospective buyer. I don't... I don't know. I would assume that... it's my understanding that... that the property is considered fairly valuable. Okay, because it's in the middle of the city. And it's agricultural land that could be developed for whether it's economic development for the City of Normal or some other reason. I've not been told by the university as to whether they have a... a prospective buyer or not."

Black: "Would you be willing to take the Bill out of the record until we can find a representative from Illinois State?

What I'm concerned about is that you're absolutely on target. Bloomington-Normal is a very fast growing area.

And this land... I have no idea... This land may be worth a

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

considerable amount of money and I would like, for my own edification before I vote, to know whether or not there's been an appraisal and whether the sale will be a public transaction and any and all interested bidders have an opportunity to purchase the land."

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that the land has... has not been appraised, recently. And I think I'll take the Bill out of the record, but... "

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "... the question with regard to this does exem...

exempt it from the State Property Control Act, if that was
your question."

Black: "Yeah."

Hoffman: "So..."

Black: "See, I'd like to know why it does that."

Hoffman: "Well, I think... and then it sets up the whole procedure in the Bill as to how this sale can occur and where the money... and what the money is to be used for."

Black: "I know there are people here who live in that community and if you're willing to take it out and Mr. Speaker, certainly not my intent to... to defeat the Bill. I just have a couple of questions for my own edification I'd like to get answered. Will you take the Bill out of the record for a few minutes if you promise to get back to it? I'm sure we can get this answered in a very short period of time."

Hoffman: "I'd be willing to do that, Mr. Speaker."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record temporarily. On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 168. Representative Wojcik. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 168, a Bill for an Act to amend the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Fire Protection District Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 168 amends the Fire Protection District Act and the section concerning disconnection or territory located in a municipality in which more than 50% of the district's total territory is located. It also provides that the court shall hold a hearing four to eight weeks after a petition for disconnection is filed. And it provides that a notice of hearing on a petition to disconnect must be given 21 days. It also provides that if the conditions for disconnect sha... disconnection are met, the court shall order a referendum on the question of disconnection if a petition requesting a referendum, signed by at least 1% of the registered voters in the district is filed with the court, at or before the hearing. I would... entertain any questions."

Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 168?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 168, there were 112 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no' and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1025. Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1025, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of this House

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The original Senate Bill simply extends a Tax Increment Financing District for the City of East St. The Amendments that were added in the Urban Revitalization Committee provides for the extension of TIF district, an old TIF district, in the City of Kankakee for a downtown development project. In addition, there are other TIFs... TIF districts for the City of Swansea in Madison County. It's a wonderful place to visit. As well as, two other communities in, I believe, Representative So, essentially, Saviano's district. noncontroversial TIF extensions. The governmental bodies have signed off on them and that... certainly, that is encouraging because we all know sometimes TIF districts can create a little controversies. But, I know of no opposition. I ask for your support."

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

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

Speaker Hartke: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, your last sentence is the only thing I want to focus on. TIF districts have and continue to be somewhat controversial. Just for the record, there is nothing in your Bill that makes any significant changes to the TIF law."

Novak: "Correct."

Black: "It doesn't impact any TIF district in the State of Illinois that is not specifically mentioned in your... in your Bill."

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Novak: "Correct, Representative."

Black: "That's... that's fine. That's all I wanted to know.

Thank you very much."

Novak: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1025?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 1025, there were 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Brunsvold. Would you come to the podium? Representative Pankau, are you ready now? Representative Pankau? Are you ready to call Senate Bill 10 or 1109?"

Pankau: "Yes, I am."

Speaker Hartke: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act in relation to child welfare. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Senate Bill 1109 was requested by the Department of Children and Family Services. It basically does three It requires DCFS to establish a minimum of three citizen review panels for the purpose of evaluating... evaluating the extent to which public and private agencies are effectively discharging their child protection responsibilities. Then, secondly, it repeals a Section of the law that requires them to submit quarterly reports to Department of Public Health. And, thirdly, t.he clarifies that group homes may admit persons between the ages of 18 and 21. I know of no opposition to this Bill.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

I even got the 'high sign' from Representative Dart. So, I ask for the approval of the Body on Senate Bill 1109."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Brunsvold in the Chair."

Speaker Brunsvold: "The Lady has asked for passage of Senate Bill 1109. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, will you bear with me just a minute? It would be easier for me to just ask her a question, if I can just walk over there. Take me about 30 seconds."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Go ahead."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Brunsvold: "We'll go to Mr. Dart. The Gentleman from Chicago or from Cook, Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Tha... thank you, Mr. Speaker. One second. I'm gonna ask the Sponsor just yield for a couple quick questions."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Sponsor yields. Representative, Mr. Dart.."

Dart: "Yes."

Speaker Brunsvold: "... would like to ask you a question."

Dart: "Just..."

Pankau: "Thank you."

Dart: "Just a couple quick questions. The citizen review panels that are gonna be set up, who are they gonna be comprised of?"

Pankau: "That will be determined, basically, by the department through their rule making authority. That section of this particular Bill was left rather vague, because although, it is a... federal requirement that they have to meet, they don't exactly know how to meet it yet. So, in the rule making, that will be determined, exactly how it's gonna be done. They do know the number no... though. There will be three."

Dart: "Okay. Do we have any assurances that the individuals on

#### 46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

the citizen review boards are not going to be individuals who have had criminal background problems and the like? I mean, is there any criteria that they've made you aware of, so that we're assured that the individuals on these boards are not individuals that we don't want involved with kids?"

Pankau: "I... I think by your asking the question right here that they will make sure that in their rule writing that there is no person on the board that would cause them embarrassment, since that tends to be an issue with them anyway."

Dart: "Okay. Now,... these citizen review boards, are they gonna be more policy oriented boards as opposed to ones that will actually be determining where money goes?"

Pankau: "Representative, I believe it's more policy oriented. I don't believe that this particular section deals with any of the money issues."

Dart: "Okay. And... and will they have any impact or are they... would they be like an overlay to the LANS that are out there... the Local Area Networks? Is that... How's that gonna work with them?"

Pankau: "I... I hon... I don't... I have no idea, Bi... "

Dart: "Okay. The provision in here with the repeal of the section about the reporting of infants who are born with drugs in their system is that... is that... I... I read the analysis, which I was given from the department. They made it sound that the reason they're repealing that section is not because they don't want to get that information, but because it's already being done elsewhere. Is that correct?"

Pankau: "Right. The hospitals already get that information from the Department of Pu... I'm sorry. They have to report that information to the Department of Public Health, so the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Public Health already gets it through another source."

Dart: "Okay."

Pankau: "So there's no reason for two people... two agencies to be supplying the same information."

Dart: "Okay. So... so then we won't be losing information, then?

We'll still be getting this information in?"

Pankau: "That is correct."

Dart: "Okay. And then one final area I want to talk a..."

Pankau: "And also in the same form that they were getting it, previously."

Dart: "Okay. And in the one final area I want to talk about, is in respect to the group homes... the change. Why... why is that necessitated, that we have to make that distinction?"

Pankau: "I think in some of the definitions there was not an age, specifically listed. It might have said, you know, 'like children.' You know, 'what is considered a child, et cetera, et cetera.' This just clarifies it to say, 'okay, if you're between the ages of 18 and 21, you can be admitted.'"

Dart: "Okay, I don't have any further questions. Thank you very much for your patience."

Pankau: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Brunsvold: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "The Sponsor and I have talked. We may have a technical error. In the Bill, on page 1, line 6 and 7 of the Bill, it references 20 ILCS 505-71(a)13 is referenced as the new statutory provision. The statute should read, '20 ILCS 50 fa 505-17(a)-13.' The question, and it may be to the Chair, the Sponsor and I have talked about it very briefly.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

We don't know whether we need to get this corrected or whether we can correct it on its face or... I'm really not sure how we handle this."

Pankau: "If I could ask a question of the Speaker, Mr. Black."

Black: "Fine."

Pankau: "On the paper..."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Proceed."

Pankau: "... work that came over from the Senate, how the Bill was passed, it is correct. However, on the computer the inversion of the two numbers is on the comput... it is incorrect on the computer. Which takes precedence, the computer or the actual paperwork?"

Speaker Brunsvold: "Well, let me check with the parliamentarian."

Pankau: "Thank you."

Black: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Brunsvold: "Yes, Mr. Black."

Black: "You know, as long as staff can assure us on that, the Bill... I, certainly, intend to support the Bill. But I just want to make sure that we aren't referencing the wrong statute. It looks like there was an inversion of a letter... or a number."

Pankau: "Right."

Black: "And it should read..."

Pankau: "The 17 was made into a 71. And it shouldn't be."

Black: "Right. Now... now the 71 is on my paper printout of the Bill. Now, is that... is there a corrected copy of the Bill, somewhere?"

Pankau: "Well, the copy that I have that came over from the Senate says, '17(a)-13.'"

Black: "Uh huh."

Pankau: "However, on the computer and if you print it out from the computer, it says, '71.'"

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999

Black: "Okay. Well..."

Pankau: "So, that's why I ask the question."

Black: "Giv... given the... given the extra attention that we seem to receive from the Supreme Court, lately and I don't... whatever the Chair or parliamentarian should rule, obviously, I think it's a good Bill. I just hope that there hasn't been a glitch somewhere, so that we're, in fact, going to pass a Bill if the Supreme Court said we didn't correct an error and then it comes back. It's... I think it's a good Bill. I just... I would defer to the parliamentarian, just to make sure that we pass the Bill we think we're passing. That is, in fact, a good Bill and I believe passed the Senate, unanimously. So, it's just this little technical glitch I hope we can get straightened out with the advice of the Chair."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Representative Pankau, would you please take this Bill out of the record..."

Pankau: "Yes, I will, thank you."

Speaker Brunsvold: "... momentarily? We'll... we'll check and see if we can correct this error."

Pankau: "Yes, there seems to be a pattern developing, here."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 989. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 989, a Bill for an Act concerning motor carrier safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Brunsvold: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House. Senate Bill 989 is a piece of legislation that deals with the commercial drivers license in the State of Illinois. Current law requires that there be a fee paid for your cu... CDL drivers license of \$40 and for an

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

instruction permit \$30. This legislation would raise that permit by \$20. A permit and license are issued for a four year period of time, so this should be an increase of \$5 per year for a CDL. This would raise approximately 2.2 million dollars subject to appropriation, of course, the money is going to be used by the State Police to hire an additional 28 individuals. We will have training for them to inspect commercial vehicles. What we're talkin' about is the large trucks over the road to make sure that they are road worthy and safe. This Bill had quite a discussion in committee. Representative Black was concerned that they would be not replacing State Troopers in our district now to retrain them to do something else. He had requested at that time a letter be put in the file that it was the intention of the State Police to hire new hirees to train them to be safety specialists in inspecting commercial vehicles in the State of Illinois. And I'm confident that Representative Black has that letter in his file. And I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have. There's also a provision in this... also that would re... allow the Secretary of State's Office to use funds that are now there for an expanded purpose. Right now, they regulate the CDLs and this would allow them to purchase additional equipment to use for testing of the applicants for our commercial drivers license and the maintenance of that equipment. Current al... law does not allow them to buy this equipment. This will allow them to buy that equipment and maintain that equipment for the automated commercial drivers license to... to avoid any question about the legality of the CDLs that are granted in the State of Illinois. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Brunsvold: "The Gentleman's asked for passage of Senate

Bill 8... or 989. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman

from Vermilion, Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Brunsvold: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "I'll get it right here in a second. Chuck, I... I'm sorry. I was talking to one your staffers and I... I think you covered the concern I raised in committee. If you could..."

Hartke: "Am I confident you have that letter, I ask."

Black: "Yeah."

Hartke: "I asked them to put that letter in your file to... from the Secretary of State's Office indicating... not Secretary of... State Police's Office that they were going to be using those funds for new hirees."

Black: "Okay. I... I don't see the letter, but that's my only concern. These will be new State Troopers not transferring Troopers..."

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

Black: "... so that we go further short staff. These will be new hires."

Hartke: "That's... that's my understanding."

Black: "Okay. Fine."

Hartke: "Commitment by the State Police and they were to put a letter in your file. I requested it, that our staff make sure that you had that in your file."

Black: "Okay."

Black: "No. No, that... that's fine."

Hartke: "Great."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Black: "I... here... no, that's a fiscal note. And if... your word's good with me and I know we talked about it in committee and as long as they're new hires and... and we don't further deplete our State Police force, that's a real problem in some of our downstate areas. It's fine with me. I intend to support the Bill. I appreciate your indulgence."

Hartke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Logan. Mr. Turner."

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

Speaker Brunsvold: "Sponsor yields."

Turner, J.: "Representative, what is the current license fee?

Trucker's fee."

Hartke: "The current license fee in the State of Illinois for a commercial drivers license is \$40."

Turner, J.: "And you're increasing it how much?"

Hartke: "By \$20."

Turner, J.: "Fifty percent increase in the CDL."

Hartke: "Five dollars per year."

Turner, J.: "Excuse me?"

Hartke: "That's five dollars per year."

Turner, J.: "I... I don't understand your math, there. I
 thought..."

Hartke: "Well, a commercial drivers license is issued for four years. So a \$20 increase would be a \$5 increase per year for the CDL, for that individual who's applying for a CDL and is granted a CDL."

Turner, J.: "But... but it would be a 50% increase?"

Hartke: "Or 12 1/2% increase a year, yes."

Turner, J.: "And the money's going to be used to hire State
 Troopers, correct?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Hartke: "The money will be used to hire an additional 28 State Troopers, to train them, to finance their... to put a... put them in a vehicle, to do specifically, commercial vehicle inspections on our highways. We have many concerns about the road ability and... and safety of the many commercial vehicles that are traveling up and down our... You know, as we increase the weight on our roads and... and possible speeds, we want to make sure that they're road worthy and safe. You all heard about the horror stories and the accidents of ... of the trucks that are falling apart and pieces off of trucks, brakes locking up and various things that... that cause accidents. These 28 State Troopers will be trained, specifically, in safety inspection of these vehicles. They could be done at our weigh stations or other stops that these inspectors may do. And they'll be trained, specifically, in that purpose."

Turner, J.: "How much revenue will the 50% CD increase generate?"
Hartke: "This revenue will... the fiscal note indicates that it
will probably generate 2.2 million dollars for the training
of these 28... 2.2 million dollars per year for these
additional 28 individuals. That figures out to about... I
don't know... a hundred thousand dollars or so per Trooper
and that would include their salary, their training, as
well as the vehicle, that... that puts them in and all the
other things that go along with that, you know, worker's
comp and... "

- Turner, J.: "Okay. You said the fiscal note indicates there's a 2... what was that? A 2.2 million dollar cost?"
- Hartke: "Two point two million dollars per year and of course, that would be a subject to our appropriation process."
- Turner, J.: "But, surely, we can hire more than 28 Troopers at 2.2 million dollars per year? I don't understand..."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Hartke: "Well..."

Turner, J.: "Go ahead."

Hartke: "That's my understanding, that... that... that's what the fiscal note said and I don't want to argue with the... the estimate. There will be start-up costs, of course, if we're buying an ex... an additional 28 cars. I don't know what a squad car costs for the State of Illinois. I imagine more than my automobile's worth, but... "

Turner, J.: "Okay, that's the cost side, but how much revenue is the increase in the fee gonna generate?"

Hartke: "The revenue's going to generate 2.2 million dollars."

Turner, J.: "All right. Why... why is it that we're going to increase the CDL fee only, and that's the only revenue source, in order to hire 28 new Troopers? Why do the truckers have to bear the entire onus?"

Hartke: "Well, it's not only truckers, Representative. It...
it's anyone who purchases a CDL, cabbies, bus drivers.

Anyone who drives commercially or for hire, is required to have a CDL, would be paying for this."

Turner, J.: "Okay. Why? Why if we're hirin..."

Hartke: "Because that is what we're gonna be inspecting."

Turner, J.: "... hiring 28 new Troopers."

Hartke: "We're gonna be inspecting commercial vehicles. We'll be not inspecting cars on the road. We're gonna be inspecting trucks. If I were to look at a semi or... or a bus, how do I know if it's road worthy, whether it is or not, whether the brakes are worn, whether the hook-ups, the connections and chains and everything else that go with it or... are road worthy? These Troopers will be trained in the aspect, what to look for. Checking the tires... "

Turner, J.: "I'm just wondering. Is this going to be an additional cost or are school districts in to handle the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

increased fee for the bus drivers... school bus drivers?"

Hartke: "It is... it is my understanding, that anyone who applies for CDL, which is a requirement to be a... a bus driver, right now it costs them \$40 and this additional \$5 investment for that per year, for that CDL, would be a good investment."

Turner, J.: "How do we compare with other states if we put this..."

Hartke: "I don't have an answer."

Turner, J.: "... 50% fee increase for the CDL?"

Hartke: "I don't know. I don't have an answer for that. I don't know."

Turner, J.: "How does it compare just to the regular or standard license that..."

Hartke: "Standard drivers license..."

Turner, J.: "... persons?"

Hartke: "... in the State of Illinois today, I believe, costs \$10."

Turner, J.: "Thank you for your responses, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Mr. Hartke to close."

Hartke: "I would just ask for your support. You know, we've all heard the horror stories about some of the equipment that is running up and down our roads. And in order to make our highways safer in Illinois, it is... it is my hope that we can approve this piece of legislation and help the Secretary of State bring credibility back to the CDL program with the authorization for the use of funds for automated equipment, computerized equipment to give the testing, so that your roads are safer for you and I. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

- Speaker Brunsvold: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 989

  pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'.

  The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Parke, do you wish to call Senate Bill 43? Mr. Parke?"
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're waiting for an Amendment and until that comes I can't move it. So, matter of fact, would you move Senate Bill 43 back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment that'll be coming?"
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Please place this Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Hartke in the Chair."
- Speaker Hartke: "On page 3 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 487. Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 487, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Roofing Industry Licensing Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Burke"
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate
  Bill 487 is identical to a House Bill that passed in our
  last Session. It would ask that roofing contractors be
  given an examination in order to qualify for state license.

  I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hartke: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thanks for recognizing me. Will the Sponsor just for a few questions?"
- Speaker Hartke: "Indicates he will."
- Cross: "Representative, are there any opponents or proponents

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

of... on this Bill that you know of. And you might have told us and we just can't hear over here."

Burke: "The Department of Professional Regulation is opposed and they have cited that opposition in committee."

Cross: "They are... right. Our records show that the home builders in... as well, are opposed as amended. Do you know if that's..."

Burke: "They are no longer opposed. In fact they..."

Cross: "And the home builders are no longer opposed?"

Burke: "No, Sir. They are no longer opposed. And if you like, I could tell you who the proponents are, that would be the Illinois Consumer Justice League, the Illinois Council of Senior Citizens, the Illinois Construction Industry Council, the AFL-CIO, the Chicago Roofing Contractors Association, the Downstate Illinois Roofing Contractors Association, the Illinois District Council on Roofing and the Home Builders Association of Illinois."

Cross: "So, the only opponent, at this point, that you're aware of, is the Department of Professional Regulation."

Burke: "That is correct."

Cross: "All right. All right. Thank you, Representative."

Burke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one is seeking recognition, Representative Burke to close."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. The matter has been discussed in previous debate and..."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, my light's still on. I feel like I shouldn't be arguing the Bill. I'm gonna vote for it."

Speaker Hartke: "Will you turn off Mr. Cross?"

Cross: "Yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Hartke: "Would you turn Mr. Cross off? Mr. Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker. Again, this is a matter that would

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

protect consumers. Another level for security for those that would require the services of roofers, a very, very expensive undertaking. And as many of you might have experienced in your constituencies, there's some disreputable business people out there that are performing this service. And this is another measure to protect consumers in our state and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

- Speaker Hartke: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 487?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 487, there are 100 Members voting 'yes', 14 Members voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Gash? Would you like to call Senate Bill 215? How about Representative Saviano? Senate Bill 288. Any Member who would like to move a Bill from Second to Third, please advise the Chair. On page 14 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1071. Representative Krause. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1071, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Officer of Prohibitive... Prohibited Activities Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. The Chair's going to start on the page 5... on and move down the Calendar on Second Reading. For those that do not have fiscal notes requested, if you would indicate to the Chair if you want that Bill moved or... or not. Please let me know. On page 5 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 19. Representative

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 26. Representative O'Brien. Senate Bill 27. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill... On page 3 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 412. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 412, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois State University Law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill with regard to the agricultural land at Illinois State University in Normal, Illinois. I've discussed with Representative Black and I believe, that... that there now is... is no opposition and his concerns have been rectified."

Speaker Hartke: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly appreciate the cooperation of the Sponsor, Representative Hoffman. My questions have been answered. This will be a fair market value public sale. Bidders will be encouraged. That answers any of the concerns that I had expressed to me and again, with the... with the thanks to Representative Hoffman for his cooperation, I stand in support of the Bill."

Speaker Hartke: "Further discussion? Seeing that no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 412?' All those in favor will signify by 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On Senate Bill 412, there are 114 Members voting 'yes, 0 voting 'no' and 1 person voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a

#### 46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, on Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 53. Representative Stephens. Out of the record. On page 5 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 150. Representative Brunsvold. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 150, a Bill for an Act concerning the Illinois Building Commission. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar, on Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 171. Representative Reitz. Out of the record. On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 203. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 242. Representative Righter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 224. Representative Righter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 287. Representative Burke. Out of the record. Page 6 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 311. Representative Garrett. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 322. Mr. Turner, Representative... Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 355. Representative Osmond. Representative Osmond? Out of the record. Senate Bill 356. Representative Meyer, Jim Meyers (sic-Meyer). Out of the record. Senate Bill 376. Representative Kenner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 376, a Bill for an Act in relation to truth in taxation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 391. Representative Meyer. Representative Jim Meyer? Out of the record. Senate Bill 392. Representative Dart? Out of the record. Senate Bill 423. Representative Rutherford. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Rutherford you have an Amendment in Rules, do you want to move it to Third, anyway? Out of the record. Senate Bill 427. Representative Lyons, Eileen Lyons. Out of the record. Senate Bill 441. Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw. Senate Bill 441. Representative Cowlishaw, would you like to move that Bill to Third Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 441, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Representative Cowlishaw?"

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker. I believe there are a couple of Amendments that have been proposed to this Bill. Although, I have not been personally informed about that from any of the people who are sponsoring those Amendments. So, from my point of view, I think it appropriate we should just move this to Third Reading, which I understand we have already done. But I just want to mention that those of you who may have proposed an Amendment to this Bill and if not, let me know that you have done that, maybe we'd better get together and kind of straighten that out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hartke: "Senate Bill 441 is on Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ap...

- 46th Legislative Day

  Acevedo."

  May 6, 1999
- Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like my colleagues from the House to help welcome some of my colleagues from the Chicago Police Department. Some of Chicago's finest here are visiting for the Police... Police Memorial today."
- Speaker Hartke: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 452.

  Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act amending the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act of 1993. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  No commit... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 460. Representative Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 480. Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 480, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedures. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 498. Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 498, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois... Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 561. Representative Hamos? Would you like to call that Bill? Mr. Clerk, call the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 465. Senate Bill 564. Mr. Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 564, a Bill for an Act concerning

- 46th Legislative Day

  May 6, 1999

  business organizations. Second Reading of this Senate

  Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No

  Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 575. Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 575, a Bill for an Act concerning the Chicago Park District. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 646. Representative Woolard. Larry Woolard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 646, a Bill for an Act concerning health care providers. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amend... Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 648. Representative Krause."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 648..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Representative Krause? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 648, a Bill for an Act concerning charter schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Hold that Bill on Second. Senate Bill 659.

  Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 659..."
- Speaker Hartke: "Do you have a Bill in Rules... or an Amendment in Rules? Out of the record. Senate Bill 658.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Representative Parke. Representative Parke in the chamber?

Out of the record. Senate Bill 666. Representative Andrea

Moore. Out of the record. Senate Bill 668.

Representative Brady. Mr. Brady, would you like to move that Bill to Third? You have two Amendments in Rules. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 668, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hartke: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 680. Representative Hamos. Representative Hamos. Senate Bill 680. Representative Hamos. Out of the record. Senate Bill 800. Representative Kosel. Representative Kosel. Senate Bill 800. Out of the record. Representative Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 805. Representative McCarthy. Please call the Bill. Representative."

McCarthy: "There's an Amendment in Rules."

Speaker Lang: "Well..."

McCarthy: "I'm waiting for the Amendment to be released from Rules."

Speaker Lang: "So, you want it out of the record for now? Out of the record."

McCarthy: "That's probably a good idea."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 827. Representative Hoeft. Out of the record. Senate Bill 910. Representative Stroger. Out of the record. Senate Bill 946. Representative Stephens. Out of the record. Senate Bill 962. Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1009. Representative McKeon. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1011. Representative Tenhouse. Out of the record. Senate

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- Bill 1029. Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1030. Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 441?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 441 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Please place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1061.

  Representative Fowler. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1067. Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1067, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1079. Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1121.

  Representative Kenner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1130. Representative Cowlishaw. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act in relation to marriage and family therapy. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1131. Representative Holbrook. Mr. Holbrook, out of the record. Senate Bill 1171. Representative Giles. Read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of this Senate

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions have been filed. No Floor Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1198. Representative Stephens. Mr. Stephens. Mr. Stephens, do you wish to move 1198? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1198, a Bill for an Act amending the Property Tax Code. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1227. Mr. Black.

  Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1227, a Bill for an Act amending the Military Code of Illinois. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1148. Mr. Osmond. Do you wish to proceed on this Bill, Mr. Osmond? Out of the record. Senate Bill 109. Representative Righter. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1024. Representative Bugielski. Are you ready to proceed on Third Reading? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1024, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "For what reason does Mr. Stephens rise?"
- Stephens: "Would it be appropriate to question a quorum? We...

  there's a vast number of chairs on the other side of the
  aisle that seem to be empty. Is there a caucus?"
- Speaker Lang: "None that I'm aware of, Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "You... you weren't invited again."
- Speaker Lang: "It wouldn't be the first time. Mr. Bugielski."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Bugielski: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I don't have my right notes here.

Take the Bill out of the record, now. I'll get 'em."

Speaker Lang: "It'll be taken out of the record. Senate Bill 1054. Representative Bassi. Out of the record. Oh. Representative Bassi's ready to go? Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Bassi, your Bill's on Third Reading, so you want to present it? Are you ready to go on your Bill? Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1054, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that... that was originally set up by a teacher who is from my district who is a national board certified teacher. And, in effect, what it does is to allow for national board certification which would be allowable interstate and intrastate. Allows reciprocity. It provides for a... a teacher to receive a stipend upon attainment of the national board certification which involves 200 hours of rigorous work. Ιt nationally recognized ability of a teacher to prove their... to demonstrate their effectiveness as a teacher. They... there will be a remuneration when they attain the certificate. There will also be a possibility for a teacher to receive remuneration if they are willing to mentor, either in their own district or in an 'at risk' school district which provides for additional support for teachers to gain... to improve their profession. would ask for a vavor... favorable vote. And I'm prepared to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Is there discussion? Seeing none, the Lady moves for the passage of Senate... Sorry. The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner. I apologize, Representative."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Skinner: "Yeah. I understand. It used to be elbows and now it's... and now it's pieces of paper that are over the... the light. I wondered if the stipend is still in here."

Bassi: "Yes. The stipend is... is \$3000 upon attainment of the national board certification. A thousand dollars if they mentor within their own district and they would receive a thousand dollars if they mentor in a district which is an 'at risk' district. And I might add that the proponents are IEA, IFT, CTU, the Illinois Business Round Table, who are prepared to provide for some of the scholarships to attain national board certification, the State Board of Education, ED-RED, Large Unit District... School District, regional superintendents and the national board certified teachers, themselves."

Skinner: "Where is the money..."

Bassi: "And no known opponents at this point."

Skinner: "Where is the money from... for the stipend coming? I think you said 1,000 would come from the local school district."

Bassi: "No. I said that it would be a stipend remuneration amount of \$1000 if they... if they mentor within their own district, the money would be coming through the State Board of Education. It would be an appropriation from the state board..."

Skinner: "And..."

Bassi: "... who also supports the Bill."

Skinner: "This is a one-time payment?"

Bassi: "It is a one-time payment upon attainment of national board certification. The... the stipend... the annual stipend can be earned more than once."

Skinner: "Does the stipend or the annual payment increase the teacher's pension base?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Bassi: "I don't believe so. It's not part of salary. It is a... it is a stipend."

Skinner: "Well, I'm sure that's a Bill for another year. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ronen."

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

Speaker Lang: "We will yield. Lady will yield."

Ronen: "Thank you. Representative Bassi, just a few quick questions. What is the cost to the state of this proposal?"

Bassi: "There are... we only have 34 national board certified teachers, presently. We have about 90 in the system. In order to... to achieve this amount, they have to attain the certification. The state board has indicated it's not a horrendous amount, at this point. They would be delighted to have national board certified teachers. So, I do not have the exact figures, Senat... Representative."

Ronen: "So, we'd be... but, you would think that there was no cost to the state is what you're... "

Bassi: "No. I didn't say there was no cost to the state. There is... the cost is something that the state board is willing to assume."

Ronen: "And is... is... is the bonus due... still, even if the state provides no money? Is there still a bonus that's due? Is this bonus due?"

Bassi: "I'm sorry. Would you say that again?"

Ronen: "Is the bonus still due even if the state provides no money?"

Bassi: "The bonus is due if... if we have a teacher who goes through national board certification and attains the certificate at the... at the end of 200 hundred hours of... of work. They will receive the \$3000 stipend through the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

State Board of Education. Yes."

Ronen: "Okay. Okay. And what are you trying to accomplish with this proposal?"

Bassi: "What we're trying to do is make sure that we... that we actually put our money where our mouth is and say that when a teacher becomes a master teacher to share their expertise with kids, that we are saying, not only are they good, but they deserve to get somewhere with it."

Ronen: "And you're trying to give them an incentive to do this more often..."

Bassi: "Exactly."

Ronen: "... with the bonus. Great. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bassi to close."

Bassi: "I would ask for your... your acceptance of this Bill because it is a great way to say to teachers and to the teaching profession and to those who care about education that we are willing to work with it. So, I ask for your... your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'. All those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 163. Representative Davis. Out of the record. Representative Zickus, for what reason do you rise?"

Zickus: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My switch was not working and I... I would have voted 'yes' on Senate Bill 1054."

Speaker Lang: "The Journal will reflect your wishes. On page 6

46th Legislative Day

- May 6, 1999
- of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 242. Representative McKeon. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 242, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. McKeon."
- McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 242 combines a Bill that originated in the Senate by Senator Cullerton and the language from House Bill 38, which I introduced here in the House that a... a moved over to the Senate. It is, basically, a consumer protection Bill. It protects condominium buyers, owners and associations from the fraudulent and inappropriate activities of disreputable developers. The language on both Senate Bill 242 and my Amendment here in the House is approved by the Chicago Bar Association, Condominium Association and supported by the Illinois State Bar. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I'll gladly answer any questions."
  - I'll gladly answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 242. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Black: "Representative, I've been scrolling through the computer and I'm... I'm not able to find a proponent. I... I've been here long enough and I've never voted on a condominium Bill that I didn't hear from former Representative Ellis Levin."
- McKeon: "I haven't heard from him either, Representative."
- Black: "And is... is... is former Representative Levin in favor of this? He... he was our condominium expert here for...

46th Legislative Day May 6, 1999 for many years."

McKeon: "I've ... I've had no contact with the former Representative about this Bill or any other Bill."

Black: "All right. I... So that... we... we don't know whether... I... I thought he was the condominium expert.

I... I'd be much more comfortable if we had heard from him, but we haven't heard from him?"

McKeon: "No. In fact, he doesn't live in my district either,

Representative Black."

Black: "He... he still does... I assume he still practices condominium law in the state."

McKeon: "I'm not aware of what he's practicing."

Black: "Well, I... I was never aware of what was practicing when he was here, but I... So, the realtors have no position... taken no negative position on the Bill?"

McKeon: "None that I'm aware of."

Black: "And the Chicago Bar?"

McKeon: "Chicago Bar... it's the Chicago Bar language."

Black: "And Representative Bugielski says it meets with his approval, so..."

McKeon: "Thank you, Representative."

Black: "I... I... fine. Well, I... Well, I'm disappointed. I...

I know that we used to have an Order of Condominium Law back when we had special orders. And it was always several pages of condominium law and it was always one of the highlights of the Session for me, but things change and...

But I'm glad you're picking up the slack and I... I wish you the very best."

McKeon: "Thank you, Representative."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

voting open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 504. Representative Acevedo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 504 flew out committee 13 to 0. Basically, it will enable the courts to impose an extended term sentence, so that when a defendant is convicted of predatory criminal sexual assault against a person under age 18, the court is permitted to impose an extended sentence of 13... 30 to 60 years. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 504. And on that question, is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 315. Representative Reitz. Out of the record. Page 11 of the Calendar, Senate

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Bill 741. Representative Hartke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 741, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

Senate Bill 741 is an attempt to make our railroads safer in the State of Illinois by increasing some of the fines of violators of railroad property. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 741. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like acknowledge the presence of the students and teachers from Oak Grove Elementary School in Green Oaks, Illinois. These folks are constituents of Representative Andrea Moore and Representative Susan Garrett. Welcome to Springfield, wherever you are. Where are you? Up, over there. Page Bill 1024. 13. I'm sorry. Senate Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Senate Bill 1024 is the Bill that came out of the Insurance

Committee. It's... we're changing the... where the

Illinois Department of Insurance, we had presently, that if

a insurance company was going to be changing its entire

policy, for instance, if they were going to be dropping

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

towing insurance or adding towing insurance to all of their automobile insurance policies, previously, they would have to send out a cancellation notice to all of the insurers first and then renew it with another mailing showing them what the change is. What this will do, is make it much easier as long as the insurance companies send out a notice 60 days prior to the expiration of the policy explaining the change. They will be able to do it that way with one mailing rather than with two mailings. It was a confusing to the insurers before. It was very costly to the insurance companies and this will now modify this and all of the insurance companies are in favor of this."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, let's read the Bill on Third Reading.

  I'm not sure if we read it last time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1024, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "You've heard the explanation of the Bill. The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1024. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. If the Clerk would be kind enough... are both

Amendments... Floor Amendment 1 and Floor Amendment 2 are

both... have both been adopted to the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Only Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill."

Black: "All right. In... in that case, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Black: "Thank you very much. Representative, in the absence of

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Floor Amendment #1, I assume that Floor Amendment #2 addresses the concerns expressed in committee by those insurance agents who are independent agents and may... "

Bugielski: "Correct..."

Black: "... write business for a number of companies."

Bugielski: "Correct... Amendment #1 was supposed to do that, but it was inadvertently drafted. So, that's why they came out with Amendment #2."

Black: "Okay."

Bugielski: "Which that takes out the part that was controversial.

There was no agreement reached and in committee we said, if there's no agreement, we are gonna drop that whole controversial pa... part of that Bill... of the Bill. And they will address that in the future, next year, hopefully.

But, now the... the part that stayed in the Bill, this is agreed upon by everyone."

Black: "Okay."

Bugielski: "The controversial part..."

Black: "All right."

Bugielski: "... is taken out with Amendment #2."

Black: "Fine. Thank you for your indulgence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I wasn't quite sure when you explained the Bill. Would there be a period of time when you could not be covered the way you think you're being covered and they don't... an insurance company does not have to notify you right away?"

Bugielski: "No. No, this is... all it is... What is was is if they were changing a part of the policy, for instance,

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

let's say your insurance company was going to add towing as a part of the... of all insurance companies. Before, because there was a major change in the policy and the coverage, they had to first send out notices that would... where does it say here... they had to nonrenew you first. And then what they did, is they would have to send another letter out renewing the policy, stating what the change was. This way, now, as long as they send it out 60 days before the renewal of the policy explaining the change, everything is taken care of. But you would not be in a situation where you would not be insured."

Mulligan: "All right, so if they were going to eliminate flood insurance, they couldn't do it in the middle of your policy without telling you?"

Bugielski: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 932. Representative Meyer. Mr. Meyer. Out of the record. On page 15, there appears Senate Bill 1117. Representative Winters. Mr. Winters, you wish to proceed? Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act concerning rehabilitation of persons with disabilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1117 is necessary to conform Illinois law to changes that were enacted in the Federal Work Force Investment Act of 1998, suggested by the Department of Human Services in order to meet the changes made at the federal level. We just did an Amendment this morning which changes a reporting time from March to September, where it allowed DHS to have adequate time to do their reports. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1117. Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, please take the record. question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Page 14 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 1055. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1055, a Bill for an Act to create the Check Acceptance Firm Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a simple proposition. It came out of the Financial Institutions Committee with no negative votes. The idea behind it is is that if you go into a... a store... a K Mart or whatever, you present your check with your identification to pay for the product and they turn you down, this gives you an opportunity to find out why. The Bill provides that the... the retail merchant will indicate

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

what 800 number you can call to find out what went wrong. And the telecheck operation at the other end of the 800 number will have a period of time in which to respond to your request for information. I know of no opposition. And I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1055.

Is there a discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

'Shall this Bill... I'm sorry. Representative Black is recognized."

Black: "Mr. Speaker. May I just say for the record, in all due respect to you, I'm shocked and appalled that you are willing and almost ready, in fact, almost did, ignore me once again. Please Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair... the Chair is admonished. However, your light..."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "... was not on when I turned away from the board."

Black: "Well, I think it burnt out earlier. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "It's possible."

Black: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield? Representative..."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Black: "Will there be a fee and... I'm not sure I understand this, so bear with me. I assume that what we're doing here is if the... I see these little signs where I... where I do business. They say, 'our checks are verified by Payday Loans or ABC Company.' And so my check... all of a sudden the merchant says, 'No. Your check isn't valid.' Now, this Bill will give me then the ability to tell the clerk or the owner of the store, 'Call, is something wrong here?'"

Currie: "You... you... It will give you the opportunity to call that number and they would have, I believe... I believe, a

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

week to respond to your request for information."

Black: "Okay. So, it..."

Currie: "You know... you know, right now, right now, if they call

Visa card and Visa card says, 'Don't... don't put

that on Representative Black's charge."

Black: "Well, I wouldn't blame them."

Currie: "You have the opportunity to call Visa card and make...

they let you know. They say, 'Well, Representative Black,

you have maxed out.' And you know, that's the way it goes.

Well, they... there isn't that same clarity of information

when it's your check that they reject."

Black: "Yes. Well, I..."

Currie: "And that's what this Bill is about."

Black: "That happened to me last night at Taste of Chicago. I went to Eli's Cheesecake and... and maxed out. And... and... and then somebody told me that it was free. So, I wasn't treated, but downstaters are used to that kind of treatment by Chicago. But, anyway, all this does is to give me the... the means to check on why I was denied or why my card was denied. Am... am I right in assuming that it has nothing to do with my personal check?"

Currie: "What do you mean nothing to do with your personal check?"

Black: "Well, I... I was just curious and... and forgive me, I'll be very honest with you, I have not read this Bill. It... it becomes more and more difficult to use a personal check, even... even in your hometown I mean, when I... and when I go to Chicago, why even bother to take my checkbook. But, I do see businesses that say we verify checks with a certain company, et cetera. Is... if my check is not accepted or they say, 'No, we cannot accept your check', am I going to be able to access a reason for that, as well?"

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Currie: "That... that's what... if the policy of the merchant is to refuse all checks... "

Black: "Right."

Currie: "... then this Bill isn't about that."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "This Bill does not require merchants to accept checks as a general proposition."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "But, it does say that if they take my check, but if they refuse to take your check, you, under this measure, will have the opportunity to find out why Bill Black's check wasn't good enough when Barbara Flynn Currie's was."

Black: "And... and in a... "

Currie: "And I think you'd want to know the answer to that question, Representative."

Black: "Eminently fair. Absolutely. I... I intend to utilize this Bill at the earliest opportunity. And it... other than the call, there is no charge to me for accessing this record. They... they can't send me a Bill or say, 'Well, sure we'll send you a... we'll give you the reason, but you have to send us \$5.'"

Currie: "No. There's no provision for a fee."

Black: "Does... does it... does it give me a cause of action, if they say, 'Oh my, we're sorry.'"

Currie: "No."

Black: "'We made a mistake.' Does it give me a cause of action to seek redress in a civil suit?"

Currie: "No, unfortunately, it doesn't."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Representative, I think I've done my job.

I trust that everybody's been notified of how we're gonna

vote in this Bill. I appreciate your indulgence. Thank

you."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Lang: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1055. This is final action. All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 4, appears Senate Bill 1033. Representative Schoenberg. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1033 provides the Illinois Toll Highway Authority with the necessary tools to deal with chronic toll violators. Their... the Toll Highway Authority estimates that, in some stretches of the tollway over 10% of the motorists do not choose to pay the tolls. As a result, millions of dollars are being lost every year for the Toll Highway Authority that could be used to pay for the new IPASS system and other improvements. And this is a Bill that has been agreed with both the Authority and the Secretary of State's Office. It states that after five violations, a chronic toll violator wo... would be eligible to have their license or vehicle registration suspended by the Secretary of State's Office, very much the same way we do with unpaid tickets. As I indicated, this has been worked out in agreement with the Authority as well as the Secretary of State. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1033 and on that question, Mr. Black is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, many years ago, I voted for a Bill to suspend drivers licenses for those who didn't pay tickets. And then I discovered it was for those who didn't pay 'phantom' parking tickets in the City of Chicago. A Bill that has caused me a great deal of grief and my district office staff a great deal of work. I will, however, say that after I dropped in a Bill that said they would enforceable to anyone who didn't live in the City of Chicago, I will commend the Mayor and his Department of Revenue for working on the 'phantom' parking ticket issue in the City of Chicago. And those constituent concerns have... have diminished greatly and I do appreciate that. But, I want to make sure that I'm not gonna get into another situation with this Bill that we got into with parking tickets issued by the City of Chicago and... and in fairness, other... other cities, as well. understanding that these violators of tolls, will be apprehended by taking a picture of the license plate of their vehicle. Correct?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct."

Black: "And what... what triggers the camera to take a picture of my license plate?"

Schoenberg: "Passage through the toll... the cameras are programmed so that passage through the toll plaza, whether it is an eye... an electronic toll collection lane or a regular lane, those cameras would trigger photographs as you're passing through. What has happened with this, is

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

that while we have the means of identifying who is going through the toll plaza and who is not paying, we have, up until now, lacked the sufficient enforcement mechanism to ensure that the... that the violations are being paid. As a result, many people feel that they can abuse this and not pay the toll."

Black: "That's all well and good. Let me ask you some questions about due process. If I get a notice... when I drive to my daughter's house in Aurora, I may take the toll road and then get on the East-West Tollway. What... what due process... If I get a notice from the toll road that I didn't pay a toll, is a picture of my license plate included in the notice that I did not pay a toll?"

Schoenberg: "No... no Sir, it's not. But if you get a... if you get a notice, one of the things that this Bill does is set up an administrative procedure very much the same way the City of Chicago set up an administrative procedure, so that these cases would not clog up the courts. But rather, you could seek through an administrative process, an appeal. People like yourself and your daughter, who may, for example, accidentally go through an IPASS lane... find yourself in an IPASS lane without the right change, this is not addressing your situation. This is for people who are known violators time and time again who just, blatantly, disregard the law. And what happens is, honest toll payers end up paying disproportionately for the system."

Black: "Representative, bear with me and let me make it perfectly clear. The administrative procedure as established, originally, by the City of Chicago was deficient, deficient with a capital 'D'. Particularly..."

Schoenberg: "That's certainly true, but you will acknowledge that they ha... as you did in earlier remarks, that they have

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

taken... "

Black: "Absolutely. I will acknowledge that within the last three years they have made light years of progress, on not only due process, but in reducing the number of errors made on the... on the initial ticket and... and all of us downstate appreciate that. My question to you is, this due process, will I be able to avail myself of the administrative hearing via the telephone or via mail or will I have to travel up to the headquarters or... or of the tollway to protect my rights under... under my right of due process?"

Schoenberg: "To appeal, you may indeed, at some point in the procedure, need to make some personal appearance. However, what I should point out is that what we wish to do is pattern this from the procedures which have been out... which are being implemented in the Northeastern United States with their electronic col... toll collection system, where there are several good faith administrative efforts made to address the situation before it ends up requiring your visit in person to address the problem."

Black: "When you send out the notice of violation... excuse me... when the Tollway Authority sends out the notice of violation, will there be an 800 number that I can access to, at least, do some due diligence on what this is all about?"

Schoenberg: "I believe there will be and if there's not, I believe the Authority would be inclined to do that. I would, certainly... I think that's a very... that's an excellent idea if it's not explicitly incorporated within the Bill."

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "It should be a practice."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Black: "Well... I... I think that would be very helpful because many people who use the toll road... the toll highways in Illinois, do not live in the immediate area. Let me continue. Assuming that I am utilizing my right of due process and at some point I see this picture of a license plate and I say and can prove, at some point, that license plate was issued to a car that I sold in 1996. That is not my license plate nor is it my car and this happened time and time again with the City of Chicago on unpaid parking tickets. And it would take weeks to trace through the Secretary of State, that in fact, the registration did not catch up with the sale of the automobile. So, I had people who were being threatened with their loss of a drivers license for unpaid parking tickets on a license plate that, lawfully and legally, did not belong to them and hadn't for more than two years. What... what kind of guarantees are we going to have in this system?"

Schoenberg: "The Authority would not be in the position of... the Tollway Authority would not be in the position of unilaterally being able to bring about that kind of outcome. The Authority would need to interfa... if... the authority would need to interface closely with the Secretary of State's Office in order... to notify them. The Secretary of State would have a procedure where they would check it and then the notice would be... then the notice would be sent out. Again, as I indicated, this is... this is to address chronic toll violators, not people who... "

Black: "All right."

Schoenberg: "Not people who..."

Black: "I... I understand and I... "

Schoenberg: "... do this se... "

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Black: "... I'm relying on... on the history that many of us downstate had with the Chicago parking ticket system. And again, for the record, let me say how much we do appreciate the improvements that the City of Chicago has made in that Our constituent complaints have fallen off probably by 90% and we... we, certainly, appreciate that. But, I can tell you that many of us downstate, Democrat and Republican, went through a... a period of three or four or five years where this... this, absolutely, drove us nuts. And I don't want to get into the same... the same kind of problems with the Tollway Authority. Now, let's assume that you have a picture of a license plate on seven different occasions for not paying a toll. individual... I assume that the license that would be suspended will be the license of which... to which the car... the owner of the car is registered, which presents a What if the owner of the car is not, in fact, problem. driving the car? What if a relative or a friend or a babysitter is running to the grocery store? And so, I assume the only license that could be suspended would be the drivers license of... of the registered owner of the vehicle, which presents another set of administrative problems."

Schoenberg: "Excuse me, Mr. Black. If I can direct you to the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the Bill, the Bill, it provides that the astor... provides for how the Authority can establish the grounds for a challenge which addresses those situations that you've outlined. Namely, that the... the person hasn't been the owner of this vehicle... "

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "... which has been a... in chronic violation or on

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

the follo... or on the top of page 3, that they've already satisfied those conditions. What occurs is that... So, the Authority would... would have limited power to establish rules to address those very situations... "

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "... that you've outlined. And by doing so, I think, they've learned from the experience of the City of Chicago in how to make this a more efficient and less burdensome process."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. I... I appreciate your indulgence and let me just say for the record, I appreciate the fact that the representatives of the Toll Road Authority took the time and the energy and effort to come and talk to me about this Bill and... and answer some of my concerns, as you have done. listen to the rest of the debate. I... I, certainly, understand why you'd be interested in this, a tollway cheater just simply makes it more expensive on all the rest of us. I... I do appreciate the constructive notice I was given and if I'm convinced that due process administrative procedures here are to protect... sufficient to protect the interests of people, then I very well vote for the Bill. And I do appreciate your indulgence."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1033. It's an attempt to make people pay the tolls they're supposed to pay. If they don't pay them, the roads will either get more crowded or close down or they'll have to look for other sources of revenue to pay to maintain them and that means the road fund or some other source such as a gas tax. Right now the road... toll roads are pay as

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

you go and we just have to enforce current law, not create additional toll increases at all. So, I urge a 'yes' vote on this matter."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Meyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Meyer: "I just wanted to, first to clear up possibly as a misunderstanding on my part, I... I thought over the years I've seen your name associated with articles in the newspaper that indicate you don't want anyone to pay your tolls."

Schoenberg: "That's incorrect, Sir."

Meyer: "Oh. Okay, I well... "

Schoenberg: "Mr... Mr. Meyer, how this issue came a... this particular came about is the result of a hearing that my committee had last year on the costs associated with the new IPASS program. We had changed vendors. We had identified what the costs were and in the process, we identified how that system were to... was to be financed. And we learned that in contrast to the Northeastern United States, which was looking to pay for their entire electronic toll collections system through violation enforcement revenues, it had sold nearly \$500,000,000 worth of bonds to do so. We, in Illinois had only collected \$70,000 in 1997. So, it's my thinking that honest toll payers, like you and me and our neighbors, are already paying a disproportionate share in the suburbs of the state's transportation Bill. And millions of dollars, which could be paying to install this new IPASS system, should be coming out of the violation enforcement revenues and not out of the toll revenues, so that maintenance does

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

not have to be deferred, so we have sufficient police on the tollways. And so the tollway system can be the best that it can possibly be."

"So... so, in other words, I... I would understand I was Meyer: mistaken in believing that you are advocating that we should do away with toll roads. If I could move on, I also would express concern with part of the Bill that would deal with tickets would be issued from those toll booths that might have camera surveillance, but are unattended. And I know there are some of 'em and I use the toll road very frequently and I... I agree with what you're stating, you and I both do try and pay our tolls. But, some of them, invariably, I can just count on probably every other time that I use that unattended toll booth, that you put your change in and the light still remains red. And of course, if I move through that toll booth at that point, well, I... I run the risk of being captured on camera and even though I put the sufficient of money into pay for that toll, yet the camera would indicate that I... I did not. Is there any... what... what is a guard in there that what's part of the Bill would address those types of conditions where even though a lot of people pay tolls, while probably every second or third person that it still registers as not paid?"

Schoenberg: "Well, Mr. Meyer, first of all, to reiterate, this is for chronic toll violators. This is not for someone who may, inadvertently, find themselves in the IPASS lane or someone who may have paid their toll and then find the light to be red and proceed on their way."

Meyer: "Could... could I interrupt this just on that one point?

And I... I am serious on this point. You're saying chronic violators and yes, I probably would not be a chronic

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

violator 'cause I might use that toll booth maybe once or twice a... a month or three times a month something like that. But that person's going back and forth to work everyday and if it's every second or third time that they use it, well, all of a sudden now they do become a chronic violator. And that would be my concern on those types of instances."

Schoenberg: "Mr. Meyer, the way that the technology works at the toll plazas is that each violation is videotaped... the violations are videotaped and maintained on computer disks and that these virtual pictures eliminate the possibility of incorrect identifications, tra... transposed license plate numbers, or other errors. In addition, the video identification of the supposed vio... of the alleged violation also detects the toll amount which was deposited, which registered, or if the machine's out... or if the machine was malfunctioning, in order to eliminate finding those people like yourself who may have already paid the bill. So, the amount that was deposited is registered as part of that virtual record along with the photograph... along with the virtual photograph of those alleged violations. So, where as you may go... you may pay your money and the light still remains red and you may go on your way, the technology in place, that's being installed throughout the system, on an accelerated basis, is not only capturing the license number, but it's ca... registering the amount that was paid and that... that's being stored on computer disk, so that it can be run for errors and duplications."

Meyer: "And would that information be available to that person that's been issued a citation for being a frequent violator, so they can use that as their defe... in their

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

defense?"

Schoenberg: "First of all, it would be hope... I would. certainly, hope that that information, I believe, as does... do the Authority and the Secretary of State, that information... that that technology information which would eliminate many of those errors, that people, like yourself, would not be inconvenienced with receiving notice that you were in, possibly in violation. I would anti... I... I would, certainly, hope that in establishing those rules for an administrative process, it's my intention, my legislative intention, that that information be available to people like yourself, so that your rights could be protected. But, I don't think we'd be getting to that point based on what the technology does for us."

Meyer: "Well, I... I appreciate the fact that you've indicated your legislative intent and thank you for your cooperation on answering questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Schoenberg to close."

Schoenberg: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Millions of dollars have been lost up until... because up until now the Toll Highway Authority has lacked the tools to effectively pursue chronic toll violators and as a result, honest drivers have been paying more than their fair share for the costly new IPASS system and other tollway improvements. Honest toll payers simply shouldn't be shouldering higher costs for those who deliberately and repeatedly avoid paying tolls. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1033. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' This is final action. Those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 667?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 667 has been moved to the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Place that Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

  Senate Bill 667. Mr. McGuire. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 667, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workers Compensation Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thanks for bringing that Bill back. We... were working on this Bill the other day, there was a miscommunication about an Amendment, so we're back on Third Reading. This Bill, as I mentioned the other day, it authorizes the corporate officers of corporations liability companies to elect to exempt limited themselves as individuals from coverage under the Workers Comp Act. And it also requires any sole proprietor or member of a limited liability company, who elects to exempt himself or herself from coverage under the Act, to file a waiver with the industrial commission. I know of no opposition to the Bill. We've got labor people who are in favor of the Bill. We've got business people who are in favor of the Bill. And I'll try to answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

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

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Black: "This Bill has been moved back and forth so many times it should be seasick. How many Amendments are on the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Amendment... Committee Amendments #1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill."

Black: "Committee Amendment 1 and 2?"

Clerk Bolin: "Yes. Committee Amendments 1 and 2."

Black: "Bear with me just a second. I... I only have in our file... I only have Committee Amendment #1 and I only find Committee Amendment #1 on the... on the Etch-A-Sketch. So, has Committee Amendment #2 somehow been lost in the system?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Amendment #2 was adopted on April 22nd."

Black: "Mr. Clerk, in all due respect, there's no Committee

Amendment 2 listed on the computer and we have no Committee

Amendment #2 in our analysis or in our floor file."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, it appears to be on LIS. Computer's up in the Clerk's well have this Bill and this Amendment."

Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't have it. It is not on our system. It is not in our file. Could... could you just take the Bill out of the record until I find out why our computers and our file does not reflect Committee Amendment #2?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll... we'll take it out of the record, momentarily."

Black: "Thank you."

McGuire: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Both sides have reviewed the Agreed Resolutions.

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

- Mr. Black, now moves that the Agreed Resolutions be adopted. Those in favor say 'aye'; those o... I'm sorry.
  Mr. Clerk, please read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 250, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 251, offered by House Resolution 252, offered by Representative Black; Representative Delgado; House Resolution 253, offered by Representative Coulson; House Resolution 254, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 257, offered by Representative Ronen; House Resolution 258, offered by Representative Reitz; House Resolution 259, offered by Representative McKeon; House Resolution 260, offered by Representative Coulson; House Resolution 261, offered by Representative Winkel; House Resolution 262, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 263, offered by Representative Granberg. And House Joint Resolution 21 offered by Representative Howard."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black moves that the Agreed Resolutions be adopted. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcement."
- Clerk Bolin: "The Executive Committee will meet immediately after Session in Room 114. The Higher Education Committee will meet 30 minutes after Session in Room C-1 Stratton. The Human Services Committee will meet at 2:00 p. m. or immediately after Session in Room D-1 Stratton. Judiciary II Criminal Law Committee will meet 30 minutes after Session in Room D-1 Stratton. State Government Committee will meet immediately after Session in Room C-1 Stratton and Urban Revitalization Committee will meet immediately after Session in Room 122B."

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, have you located that Amendment?"

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We... you're right, LIS has the Amendment. We've, evidently, lost it or... or didn't pick up Committee Amendment #1. So, if you want to get back to the Bill, that's fine."

Speaker Lang: "May... may we proceed?"

Black: "Yes. Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 667. Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you... thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry for the confusion, but we'll try to proceed. I don't think there's any need for me to repeat the Bill. I just read it a few minutes ago, so if there are any questions."

Black: "Well, I forgot."

McGuire: "If there are any other questions, let's put it that way."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

McGuire: "Or any other questioners."

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

McGuire: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields, again."

Black: "Representative, the only... honestly, the only question I have and maybe you can... and it's just that my antenna, after a period of years, I see a... an election to withdraw from workers' comp a... sponsored by... the Chief Sponsor is a Democrat... that just doesn't compute with me. I... What... what... something doesn't compute here. What... who is withdrawing and why is... obviously, labor must be in support of this, but usually, if you want somebody to withdraw from workers' comp, your side of the aisle would not be in agreement."

McGuire: "Well, I guess I've been very confusing to a lot of

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

people, lately, but this Bill came to me from the Honorable Joel Brunsvold. And I think the Senate Sponsor was the Honorable former House Member Dan Cronin. So, it's not really a labor issue, although workmen's comp, as you point out, is kind of a labor topic. But, it's... it's not a labor issue, so labor's not in opposition at all. So, I hope that answers your question."

Black: "Well, in other words, if... and I've gone through the...

the file. We're not putting any working man or woman at

risk by this Bill. No. The owner of a business, as I

understand this, may elect to not be covered. That doesn't

mean they can withdraw from the statutory provision,

assuming they have employees. We're not putting any

employee at risk here, are we?"

McGuire: "No. Not at all, Sir. No. And I think that's specifically mentioned by the fact that its mentions corporate officers and... and other people like that, sole proprietors, such as that. So, that..."

Black: "Okay. I... I mean fine. If... As long as... and I certainly appreciate your... your answer to that question, as long as we're not putting the employees at risk... I... fine. It's okay with me and I... I do appreciate the indulgence and I appreciate the indulgence of the Speaker to let us find out why we couldn't find the Amendment. Thank you very much."

McGuire: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to announce that tomorrow morning at 9:15, there will be a COWL meeting in Conference Room... in 'M' wing, 9:15. The Conference of Women Legislators."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black, do you have that information on the

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

COWL meeting?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker? That's a violation of Rule 51 Subsection

(e). We're on Third Reading Debate. Strike the record.

She'll have to say it when we're not on Third Reading Debate."

Speaker Lang: "No. She said it enough. Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "The Brotherhood's not meeting."

Speaker Lang: "Can you repeat that."

Stephens: "The Brotherhood is not meeting."

Speaker Lang: "That's fine. Mr. McGuire to close."

McGuire: "I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 667. This is final action. Those in favor shall vote 'aye'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all goted... voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hartke now moves that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow, Friday. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House... allowing time for... allowing the Clerk Perfunctory time is hereby adjourned until 10:00 a. m. tomorrow, Friday morning."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Committee Reports. Representative Younge, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bills 588, 591; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bills 371,

46th Legislative Day

May 6, 1999

582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 589, 590. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Standard Debate' Senate Bill 632; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bills 593, 594, 595, 614. There being no further business the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."