47th Legislative Day

May 7, 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 Reverend Jerry Ford of the Third Baptist Church in Marion. Reverend Ford is a guest of Representative Fowler. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Reverend Ford: "Shall we pray. Gracious God and our Father, I ask You to bless these men and women of the House of Representatives. I ask You to give them wisdom, courage and strength to know and do Your will. Inspire them to rise above their differences and see the common task with Your vision. Plant dreams and hopes within them and revive their spirits as they deal with the tedious task of Walk with them and be their support and make government. them blessings for Your kingdom. Teach them compassion for the suffering, the poor, the blind, and the lame. You who shed tears, show them how to live with the deepest emotions and reveal to them how You endured the cross that Your joy might be fulfilled. Touch their hearts the way You touched Peter's heart, when with just a glance after his denial of three times You moved him. Or the way You touched the heart of the rich young ruler. Or the politician, Or the manner in which You touched the Nicademus. disciples as You called them from their vocations to spend their lives in a commitment to wider cause. You are a gracious God who changes those who really know You. to us as to when You spoke to the Synagogue of Capernaum. Or to the multitudes on the Mount of Beatitudes. grace sufficient for the need of our lives within and without, in the manner in which You lived Your life. Мау the peace that passes all understanding possess our minds

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

and hearts. And gracious God, I pray for the Governor of this great State of Illinois. Endow him with wisdom and authority to lead us to prosperity and freedom. And then I pray for the President of this United States and all in authority that they may always remember to look in trust to You as they fulfill their daily responsibilities. And, especially, do we seek wisdom in these times of crisis as we're faced with the loss of lives in Yugoslavia and Kosovo. We also pray for all the people of our state and our nation. We seek justice and freedom and peace. Help that freedom us always to remember comes with responsibility. And peace comes at the price of lives sacrificed. Gracious God, give us Your peace. We pause before You with the words of the psalmist when he said 'show me your ways, O'Lord, teach me Your paths, guide me in Your truth, and teach me for You are God and my hope is in You all day long.' Gracious God, I ask You boldly today, to purify our hearts and renew a right spirit within us through Christ our Lord, I pray. Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
 States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands,
 one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
 for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that

 Representatives Arthur Turner, Lou Jones and Steve Davis

 are excused today."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans are all present

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

and accounted for."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Judy Erwin, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate 441; Representative Sara Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 321; Representative Lauren Beth Gash, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 27; Representative Howard Kenner, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1061; Representative Doug Scott, Chairperson from the Committee on Urban Revitalization, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendments 4 and 5 to Senate 1032; Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 6, 1999, reported the same back with the following

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 827."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black, did you wish to call Senate Bill 149? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 149, a Bill for an Act amending the Emergency Telephone System Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As amended, Senate Bill 149 becomes the cleanup language as we discussed in the Veto Session last fall. This is the Bill you will recall that all telephones have to have a locator device when you dial 9-1-1 on a LAN line. And the intent of the law was that if you called from the John Hancock Building, obviously, the 9-1-1 operator would need to know what floor you were calling from or better yet what office. Because if the emergency personnel would be dispatched to the reception office at the John Hancock Building, they would have no idea where the 9-1-1 call came from and that delay could be costly, not only in terms of, perhaps your life, but of lost property in the case of a small fire in an office or an apartment. It was never our intent to make small offices in 40,000 square feet or less undergo that kind of an expensive transition. They were being estimated at, as high as 30 to \$40,000 in an office that would be about the size of this chamber where all of us can see each other. So, Senate Bill 149 simply clarifies the intent of the 9-1-1 Locator Law, exempts buildings on the size... excuse me, on the square footage of their building, exempts other facilities, like a factory, where they have a full-time safety and fire department and medical response personnel.

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

That's what the Bill does. I know of no opposition. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Scott."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Scott: "Bill, I've done a lot with both the fire departments and with a lot of small businesses in my community trying to work through this particular law. Where did 40,000 square feet come from, as a designation?"

Black: "You know, I really don't know other than the working group of businesses and personnel who worked this out. And it was really under the guidance and direction, I think, of the Illinois State Chamber and they thought that was a point to begin the negotiations. And nobody decided that, you know, it should be anything less than that or more than that."

Scott: "Well, the... the concern... the only concern I'd have is, you've probably come across this too in the course of discussing this, this Bill, you'll find instances where there are small buildings who because of the nature of the way the building's constructed or the number of offices that are there or the types of operations that they run where below 40,000 square feet probably doesn't cover a business that ought to be covered. And then there are things like warehouses, which may be much bigger than that where it's not really necessary either, because everybody can see in there where the problem is, or what's occurring so..."

Black: "Okay."

Scott: "... I'm... I guess the concern that I would have is say for a, you know, a building that... maybe not taking... and I don't want to disparage the work of the working group,

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

because I'm sure they worked really hard on it, but... but is there more that we could do to try to clarify, to try to get out there what instances we really need this as opposed to which ones we don't? Or..."

Black: "Well."

Scott: "... I mean... When I see a blanket of 40,000 square feet it just kind of raises a flag."

And... And you may have a very valid point. Keep Black: "Sure. in mind that if they are in separate locations, the 9-1-1 system must indicate what location. If it goes over 40,000 square feet there has to be a locator somewhere within that The only blanket exemption would be hospitals facility. and factories who maintain a 24-hour response system. Again, I would have thought... had this been a major problem the NENA folks would have raised objections. not aware that they did so. And of course, obviously, if you don't have an enhanced 9-1-1 system in your area, the Bill doesn't apply to you in any respect. But, as far as I know, Doug, all of the parties were at the table; the Public Service... Public Service Answering Points, the National Emergency Number Association, fire, police And it's... it's been reported to personnel, et cetera. me, in all of the conversations I've had, is that this is agreed language and it is a workable concept. Again, if we find that it isn't, obviously, we thought the original Bill was a workable concept."

Scott: "Right."

Black: "And I would assume that this... if this proves to be somewhat cumbersome or doesn't go far enough, the National Emergency Number folks and the Public Service Answering Point people will certainly, I'm sure, be back next fall for additional clarification."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Scott: "And in terms of who is on the working group, you talked about who is on representing the public safety side, representing the people who... on whom this will apply.

I'm sure that the business groups who were represented were schools and public groups also represented as part of that?"

Black: "Yes. That's my understanding, that all of... that all of those entities that have had a concern with the mandated costs as the Bill originally mandated, were at the table to decide who should, in fact, have a 9-1-1 locator on every extension or every floor and who wouldn't. In the case of schools, if you have a central switchboard, you still must have a locator so the switchboard knows exactly where the call came from."

Scott: "Right."

Black: "In a case that happened in my district in January, with a very serious fire in an elementary school, while children were present, of course, we have a E 9-1-1 system. The call came from that grade school and the answering point knew exactly that it was Garfield School and the address. So it didn't have to go through the Centrex. But if your system is set up... I know I talked to somebody in the Rockford school system for example... "

Scott: "Right."

Black: "... If your system is set up so that it goes through a central Centrex, you'll still have to have a E 9-1-1 locator at the point of origin..."

Scott: "To get it to the right building, right."

Black: "... at the building of origin, that's correct."

Scott: "Right. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Black, at some point the hotel industry had some concerns where they already have a system in place and have filed with their local fire and police departments. Were their concerns ever addressed in this Bill?"

Black: "I... I don't know. I... I don't see them in the proponent list. Again, it's my understanding that if you have a huge multistory hotel, you're going to have to have some kind of locator so that, if in fact, you dial 9-1-1 rather than the hotel operator, the 9-1-1 system will identify, not only the name and address of the hotel, but will be able to identify the extension, i. e., the room number where the call came from. So, as far as I know, I've not heard from the Hotel/Motel Association regarding any such concerns."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much. I think all of us are aware of what we're attempting to clarify in the Bill and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved 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', 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Lang."

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

In the life of every pig farmer they must turn 55 years old and so I must announce to you today that Chuck Hartke is

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

55. I don't know how much longer he is going to be with us but we're going to have a cake down in front for him, shortly. And there's also this big sign here that says 'Speed Limit 55' which I think his secretary stole from some roadway in Illinois and there are some pens here. If you all come down and sign this big card for Representative Chuck Hartke for his birthday, we'd appreciate it. So, happy birthday, Chuck."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie, do you wish to call Senate Bill 13? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 13, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure would move from triplicate prescriptions for controlled substances to electronic monitoring by the Department of Human Services of prescriptions for those items. It will save the department money, provide for more effective and timelier monitoring. I know of no opposition and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

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

There being no discussion, the question is,... Mr. Black?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, we have a note on our file that this would... perhaps, this would be held for a Floor Amendment.

Was that not necessary, or?"

Currie: "We amended it yesterday."

Black: "Okay. So that was Floor Amendment # ?"

Currie: "One."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Black: "One."

Currie: "Well, it may have been two."

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

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

Black: "Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, an inquiry of the Chair. And we may have missed it, but our file does not reflect that Floor Amendment #1 was, in fact, adopted.

Just for clarification and before the Bill leaves control of the House, would the Clerk check to make sure that Floor Amendment #1 was in fact adopted?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

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

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady, do you wish to call Senate Bill 336? Mr. Clerk, take that out of the record. Representative Cowlishaw, is Cowlishaw in the chamber? Mr. Durkin. Mr. Durkin, do you wish to call Senate Bill 1067? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1067, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is from the Illinois Department of Public Aid. This will allow the department to receive grants and donations. Right now they

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

are in line to get a, I believe, \$400,000 from the Ford grant... Motor Company for a grant in the (sic-Title)IV-D Program. And under the law right now, they're not allowed to accept that donation, so we are amending the Illinois Statute to allow them to accept this donation."

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

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I needed to get a copy of the committee roll call and I've done that. I see that I voted 'no'. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, as I recall, this Bill in committee...

these donations and grants would be used to allow the

Department of Public Aid to spend such money on job

training. Wasn't that the issue at hand?"

Durkin: "As I recall, I believe that was part of the discussion."

Black: "And I... I think the objection that I raised in committee was that there are so many entities right now dealing with job training and... transitioning from welfare to work, that why do we need to set up yet another avenue for another department to receive grants and dollars to get into a business of job training, of transition training, that's already being done across several state departments. The Department of Human Services, the Job Training Partnership Act, the Community College System? I mean, why does the Department of Public Aid feel that they should be allowed to receive grants and other dollars to do what is being done, in fact, probably being done by too many different agencies, already?"

Durkin: "Well, I believe in this specific situation, this is because there is a... the Ford Foundation has,

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

specifically, contacted them and they were wanted to donate and, you know, 'x' amount of dollars to them for this type of purpose. I don't... I'm not going to answer for the Ford Foundation to why they wanted to go strictly through the child support, Department of Public Aid but that's as good answer as I have."

Black: "Okay. Well, I thought the Ford Foundation maybe could have gone to the Department of Human Services or the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and donated the money to the Job Training Partnership Act or some program that's already set up. So, and I know, we don't know why the Ford Foundation did this, but... To the Bill, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. probably be the only 'no' vote on the Bill. But I'm going to be consistent with what I voted on, or how I voted in the Child Support Committee. We have dozens of agencies involved in job training already. And now along comes the Department of Public Aid, Division of Child Support, to accept... wanting... wanting to accept a grant from the Ford Foundation to get into job training and transitioning from welfare to work. There are already programs set up to We don't need to set up another program within do this. Public Aid and Division of Child Support. It's... it's just a further duplication of government services that once establish it, it'll never go away. And the underlying, the underlying reason for my objection to this and the reason I didn't vote for it in committee, this does not address as I said yesterday, the fundamental issue at hand, is the Division of Child Support going to get the resources necessary to collect back child support or is that function going to be transferred to the Attorney General's Office as was mentioned in the Governor's Budget Address? So, it is

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

for that reason, if I'm the only 'no' vote, at least I'm comfortable with it."

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

- Durkin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Like I said, this is a Bill which I believe that all it is is that the Ford Foundation wants to give money to the Department of Public Aid to help them to expand their child support efforts. I think this is an area where if they can get some help from the outside, I think it's reasonable for us to make the Amendment into law to allow them to do that from a donation or a charitable institution. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? There are 2 people not recorded. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 3 people voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. John Turner."
- Turner, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was previously represented to the Chair that all Republicans were present today. I'd like to correct the roll call and have the roll call reflect that Representatives Poe and Lindner are excused today. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang. Do you wish to call Senate Bill 459?

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 459, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that received no opposition in committee, I don't believe. This is a Bill that deals with the issue of family pets. I've had many reports in my district and many of you may have also, of people who purposely injure your family pet. It could be a dog or cat, or under this statute, a horse. This Bill would say that if somebody injures your pet, purposely, you have a right to sue them for the vet bills and for other damages. That's all the Bill says. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, when we passed a Bill, I believe, yesterday covered... I'm sorry, carried by Representative O'Brien in the House. It was the anticruelty provision to animals and it made eminent good sense. Now, you're here with this Bill amending the Humane Care for Animals Act. What are the significant differences in the two Bills?"

Lang: "Well, I think, Representative O'Brien's Bill dealt with criminal penalties. This Bill deals with the ability to receive damages back from someone. So, if somebody comes over to your property and purposely injures your dog, you take your dog to the vet. You incur expenses. That person may have killed your dog. You incur expenses and this bill would enable you to get those expenses back from the person that caused the injuries."

Black: "Are we creating another cause of action to further clog the courts for civil action?"

Lang: "Well, yes, I guess so. It does two things. Under the

47th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1999
- current statute, with or without Representative O'Brien's Bill, it is a crime, a misdemeanor, to purposely injure someone's animal. This would allow, first of all, the court in that criminal case to order restitution for the veterinarian bills, et cetera, but it would also allow for a cause of action."
- Black: "I'm... I'm having a difficult time, Representative.

 There are a number of ... of opponents who signed in, in opposition to this Bill in committee, and it's a rather diverse group, the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture, the Illinois Farm Bureau."
- Lang: "Mr. Black, I have to tell you that our records shows no opponents to Amendment 1 in committee."
- Black: "No, I think they signed in, in opposition to the underlying Bill."
- Lang: "Well, one of us has incorrect records. But our records show that there were no witness slips in opposition to Amendment #1 which became the crux of this Bill in committee. And indeed, it passed out of committee, unanimously."
- Black: "Well, then maybe we do have some conflicting staff analyses. Would you be willing to take it out of the record until I can get staff up here to review our records with you?"
- Lang: "Of course I will. Of course I will. Take it out of the record, please, Mr. Speaker, so we can resolve Mr. Black's problems."
- Black: "Thank.... Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "This Bill shall be taken from the record. Is

 Mr. Reitz in the chamber? Did you wish to call Senate Bill

 315? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act amending the

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Counties Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 315 deals with death certificates. We're... we're going to... We're going to take the... add-on death certificates, align that this was attributable toward domestic violence. I think this is... our intention is to get statistics on domestic violence cases that result in death. They will be gathered by the State Police and sure appreciate your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair would like to announce that the Rules Committee is meeting, immediately. Mr. Reitz has moved for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Cowlishaw, did you wish to call Senate Bill 1130? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act in relation to marriage and family therapy. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1130, to which there is no known active opposition, creates a new category under the Marriage and Family Therapy Licensing Act for an associate licensed marriage and family therapist. This measure is intended to enable the Department of Professional Regulation which is very much in favor of this measure, to be able to keep track of the people who have

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

completed their master's degrees in this field, but who still have not completed the 3000 hours of work experience which is required, under supervision from a therapist, in order to become a full-fledged therapist. Currently, there are no records of who these people are, where they are, or who is supervising them. Because of this new category called an 'associate', the department would have that information. I think this is important, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, partly because I think it is important for us to know who these people are and who is providing the supervision for them. That's what the Bill does. I would be glad to answer any questions and thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has moved for the passage of the Bill. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 people voting 'yes', 4 people voting 'no'. And this Bill received a Constitutional Majority is hereby having declared passed. Mr. Hoeft. Mr. Hoeft, do you wish to call Senate Bill 933, (933)? Mr. Clerk, concerning Senate Bill 933, place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Krause. Is Representative Krause in the chamber? Did you wish to call Senate Bill 276? Okay, take that out of the record. Mr. Mathias, did you wish to call Senate Bill 144? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 144, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mathias."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 144 reinstates the Sales Tax Reform Act of 1989. This Bill was recently struck down by a judge in the Cook County Circuit Court. And all this Bill does is revalidate the same legislation that this House passed back in 1989. This is a very important Bill for all home rule municipalities, since it validates all of the sales taxes that they previously enacted and clarifies that these... sales taxes are... are valid. I urge your vote... 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 144."

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Lopez in the Chair.

Representative Cross. Go ahead, Representative."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're calling on me to ask some questions?"

Speaker Lopez: "Yes."

Cross: "All right. Representative Mathias, I... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Mathias: "Yes."

Speaker Lopez: "The Sponsor yields."

Cross: "It appears from the reading of our file that the City of Chicago supports this Bill. Is that accurate?"

Mathias: "That is correct."

Cross: "Pardon me?"

Mathias: "Yes, that is correct."

Cross: "Cook County supports this Bill?"

Mathias: "Yes, that is correct."

Cross: "The Illinois Department of Revenue supports this Bill?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Cross: "How about the U.S. Department of Revenue?"

Mathias: "I haven't talked to them."

Cross: "You haven't talked to the U.S. Department of Revenue?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Cross: "Or the Internal Revenue Service?"

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Mathias: "That's correct."

Cross: "How about the Illinois Municipal League, are they supportive?"

Mathias: "The Illinois Municipal League is very supportive of this Bill."

Cross: "How about the Indiana Municipal League?"

Mathias: "I don't think it affects them."

Cross: "Pardon me?"

Mathias: "I don't believe it affects them."

Cross: "I didn't hear, I'm sorry."

Mathias: "I don't believe it affects them."

Cross: "So they haven't put in a slip in opposition?"

Mathias: "No, they have not."

Cross: "There's a thing, I.D.O.T. Are they in favor of it? Is that IDOT?"

Mathias: "Yes, IDOT is a proponent also, as well as, the Taxpayer's Federation."

Cross: "You stole my next question, Representative."

Mathias: "Just trying to speed things up."

Cross: "This Bill reinstates... this Bill reinstates the Sales
Tax Reform Act of 1989. Is that correct?"

Mathias: "Yes. The reason for the Bill is, there was a previous court decision which struck down the Bill based on the single subject matter and, as you know, we've had a series of those Bills before this Body and... it's right now on appeal and the home rule communities, such as the City of Chicago and all of the other... home rule communities throughout the state that have enacted a home rule sales tax, would be in jeopardy on all of the funds that they've collected since the Bill was enacted or since they enacted their own sales tax."

Cross: "Do you know who the judge was that struck down the Bill?"

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Mathias: "I did know that, but I'm trying to remember the judge's name. I believe it was... I don't remember, exactly."

Cross: "Representative, do you know if he's in support of this Bill?"

Mathias: "Pardon me?"

Cross: "Is the judge in support of this Bill or is he opposed to it?"

Mathias: "I actually, did not talk to the judge."

Cross: "Don't you think we ought to talk to the judge before we pass a Bill that he struck down? Don't you think it's fair that maybe we ought to give him a call and say, 'Judge, this is a Bill, you've ruled it unconstitutional we're just trying to get your input.'"

Mathias: "Actually, the judge, initially, found the Bill unconstitutional and then reversed her own decision after argument, and actually, found the Bill constitutional. However, that decision has now been appealed by the opposition and so this just clarifies the law to make sure that no one attacks it in the future. So it may be that the judge is for the Bill."

Cross: "What do you mean by... What was the other subject in that piece of legislation? Was it a dual subject Bill as opposed to a single subject Bill, is what you're saying?"

Mathias: "Yes, it had several other matters in it."

Cross: "What were those other matters?"

Mathias: "I, actually, don't know at the present time. I believe it had... it also had bond authorization for waste water treatment projects, as far as I remember."

Cross: "Is Senator Peterson... Is he in favor of this Bill?"

Mathias: "Yes, this is, actually, Senator Peteson... Peterson's

Bill and my CoSponsor here in the House is Representative

Currie."

47th Legislative Day May 7, 1999

Cross: "Is... Do you anticipate her voting for the Bill?"

Mathias: "Pardon me?"

Cross: "Do you anticipate her supporting the Bill, then?"

Mathias: "I believe so, yes."

Cross: "All right. Representative, thank you for answering all of the questions I had. I appreciate it. I intend to support your Bill. Thank you."

Mathias: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lopez: "The Representative from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Probably, the only tax cut Bill we have in the entire Session. Now, why do I say it's a tax cut Bill? I say it's a tax cut Bill because if we do not pass this Bill, laying hands on all the municipal taxes that were raised in 1989, those taxes are going to go down. They're going to disappear. So, if you want to vote for tax cuts, you vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I... I'm fascinated by the previous speaker's characterization of the Bill. Is it, in fact, a tax cut, a tax increase, neutral? How... How would you characterize this Bill?"

Mathias: "I would characterize this Bill as neutral, since all of the taxes that were enacted, have previously been enacted and this just... in effect... clarifies that the taxes that were previously enacted and of course, those taxes were not enacted by this House. Any taxes under this Bill, have to be enacted by the home rule communities. So we are not enacting any sales taxes ourselves. We're just giving the home rule communities authority, that they had under the previous Bill, to enact those sales taxes."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Black: "So it is in response to a court case, correct?"

Mathias: "That is correct."

Black: "And in case the courts... and as I understand it from what you said previously, there has not been a final adjudication of the case. It's still in the court system.

Is that right?"

Mathias: "That's correct. It's on appeal now and obviously, this would create havoc with all of the communities that have enacted the sales tax throughout the State of Illinois, because there could be the question of... that they would have to refund all the monies that they've enacted since 1989."

Black: "Okay. So, you're asking us to reaffirm the intent of a law passed earlier?"

Mathias: "That is absolutely correct."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Lopez: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, the Chair recognizes the Sponsor, Representative Mathias, to close."

Mathias: "I think everything has been said. I urge my colleagues to support Senate Bill 144. It would be very devastating to all of the home rule communities throughout the State of Illinois if this Bill would fail. Thank you."

Speaker Lopez: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 144 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. For what reason does Representative Skinner rise?"

Skinner: "Didn't this require 71 votes?"

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Skinner, we will get back to you on that issue. On the Order of Third Reading on page 3, appears Senate Bill 459. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, is recognized."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I've explained the Bill and I think Mr. Black is now all right on this Bill. If there's any further questions, I'd be happy to answer them. I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 459."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Chair recognizes the Sponsor, Representative Lang, to close. question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 459 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Meyer, would you like to call your Bill? Senate Bill 932, Representative Meyer. Would you like to call the Bill?"

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lopez: "Hold on... one second. On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 932, appears, Senate Bill 932. Would the Clerk please read the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 932, a Bill for an Act amending the Bond Issue Notification Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Meyer, is recognized."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 932 provides that the governing body or

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

the presiding officer shall set the date, time, and location of the bond issue hearing; provides that notice shall be published not more than 30 days before the hearing; provides that notice shall be posted at the governing body's principal office or hearing building. Also deletes prohibition against placing the notice in the legal notice or classification... classified section of the newspaper. It provides that the notice must be... must include the name and... name of the body's clerk and secretary. It exempts issue of special service area bonds from the Act's provisions. It's effective immediately. And this is, basically, cleanup language to the current Act."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House... Senate Bill 932 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 7, 1999, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'to the floor for consideration' Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 27; Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 37; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 392; Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 423; Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 659; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 805; Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1009 and Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1009."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

- Speaker Lopez: "On the Order of Third Reading, Senate Bill 150.

 Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, are
 you ready for your Bill? There he is. Mr. Clerk, please
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 150, a Bill for an Act concerning the Illinois Building Commission. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 150 would set up... set up and creates the Illinois Building Commission Revolving Fund to accept fees and donations and other sources of income that was mandated by the General Assembly. Now the background of this Bill, in 1996 there was a Senate Joint Resolution #36 was passed to set up a task force. This task force consisted of about 30 Members that put together the problems dealing with the building codes in the State of Illinois and our buildings. They said there was a... reported a fragmented and sometimes conflicting inconsistent building regulations administered by a number of state agencies. There was no coordination. member board that now is... consists of expert advisory commission members, has set up a program that will allow contractors, plumbers, et cetera to come into a database from a booklet that's published by the building commission and allow them to access the building codes from a lot of different agencies, whether it be schools or from the Fire Marshal's Office, CDB, Public Health. All those have had some conflicting building requirements. So, the task of this commission was to set up a one-stop shopping if you would, like that is created in DCCA, that would allow

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

plumbers, for example, to come in and access a database and find the building codes regarding buildings, whether it was public health or schools or whatever. This fee to enter this database is about... would be about 100 to \$150 and that would be a lot cheaper than... from my information from the commission members, than some contractor searching around trying to find statute requirements and having them... having to have them copied and then going from one agency to other to make sure they've got the building codes correct. They're printing right now 4,000 booklets that will have no cost... that will be at no cost and the contractors who are awarded projects would be able to see what... where they needed to access this database in order to receive the proper building codes for facilities. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, is recognized."

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

Speaker Lopez: "He will yield."

Black: "Yes. Representative, this is a very interesting Bill, very interesting concept, and I noticed it passed the Senate, unanimously. It sets up a fee, but it doesn't say what the fee is going to be."

Brunsvold: "No. That question was asked in committee, also. I have checked with the building commission and they indicate that the access to the... to the database would be a 100 to \$150 fee which would be, really, very cheap for the contractors who would have to otherwise have to go around from agency to agency and try to find what the building codes would be. The task of this... of this commission is to have a one-stop shopping center for the codes that the

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

state has for... for buildings."

Black: "Well... and I can understand that, my brother being in a construction-related business. But wouldn't it make more sense to have the commission publish the book, figure out what the costs of the publication is, and then charge the contractors an amount of money to cover that cost? I... I'm very uncomfortable voting to give a public body the right to levy a fee, when I don't know what the fee is going to be."

Brunsvold: "That was a question brought up in committee, also.

And we tried to pin the commission down to say that. And I think the code database that they're talking about is... is... more convenient, if you will, than someone going to get a booklet and they can access them from different points with a code word. And it's an updated process. I've got a number of calls from plumbers, et cetera, that are supportive of the Bill and say this is a lot better for them than having to run to Springfield, for example, to find the codes."

Black: "And I... And I can understand that. To... to clear up some confusion, this is not a public building commission that many of us have back in our home districts. This is not a public building commission that some of us are familiar with. Is that correct?"

Brunsvold: "No, this was set up by Senate Joint Resolution 36 that was passed in the Senate and the Sponsors were Todd Sieben, James Claiborne; in the House they are Arlene Fantin and Jack Kubik were the Sponsors of this commission and their task was to try to draw together all the fragmented building codes that we had in the system so that we could have something that was workable and easier for the contractors when it come to building codes."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Black: "And... And I remember that. This is not... This doesn't have anything to do with your county building, public building commissions..."

Brunsvold: "No. No."

Black: "... that are all over the state. And I remember the enacting legislation. But once again, we find ourselves in a position, the enacting legislation set up this 11 member public, or excuse me, Illinois Building Commission, but there was no mention of a fee in the underlying, enacting legislation. Now..."

Brunsvold: "No, there wasn't."

Black: "... they come back, and this has only been created since 1997. So in 1999 they come back and say, 'Well now we're established and we need a fee to... do... to publish a book.' And I... I don't... I don't have any objections to... to the value of said book, but I do object to any public government body saying, 'Give me a blank check. I'll figure out what it costs and that's what we'll charge.' That's the old 'cart before the horse'. Why don't they tell us what it will cost them to publish a book? And then simply say to contractors, 'If it costs us \$200 per book, that's what you pay.' I'm not comfortable, Joel, in all due respect to you and the Senate Sponsor, I'm not comfortable giving any public entity legal authority to levy a fee when I have no idea what the fee is going to be. I think they've gotten this thing backwards."

Brunsvold: "What would you suggest, Representative Black? I'm, you know, I'm here trying to help Todd Sieben across the... across the rotunda here, and if you're not comfortable with that then that's fine, I'm not comfortable with it."

Black: "Well, what I would suggest... is that a member of the Illinois Building Commission say, 'We think it's going to

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

cost \$200 to print 2,000 books or 4,000 books.' And I agree with the concept. I know my brother would, as well. It would be very convenient to have that book, so that you would know if you're going to bid on a public project anywhere in the state, you're going to have the various building codes and the things you need to know. I'd much prefer to give them the authority to print the book, to determine what the cost is, and then pass that cost on to the contractor. I'd even be more comfortable if we'd amend this Bill on it's face, that the fee is not to exceed \$150 a book or \$200 a book. I'm... I'm prepared to vote for the Bill. But boy I'm not going to be a very happy camper if my brother comes to me in September and says, 'Oh thanks a lot for the book. By the way, a copy is going to cost me \$825.' Wow."

Brunsvold: "I understand. Would a cap, I'm not opposed to that,

Representative."

"Yeah. If we had a cap or if we could say that the fee Black: would be passed on to the contractors to cover the costs. What I'm after is that this does not become a GRF item. think the contractors are, as you said, are willing to pay for the book. And somehow, if we could amend this on face, that whatever those costs are, must be borne by those people who benefit from the book. Hey, I'm all for it. I'll vote for it, regardless, Joel. I don't have any problems with it. But I don't want some Members of this chamber to vote for something and then a contractor calls them in August or September and says, 'You know that book is an outrageously priced book.' And they're going to say, 'Well I didn't vote for that. I didn't vote for a \$500 a copy book.' And they'll say, 'Yeah you did. You voted for the Senate Bill. You said they could charge a fee and this

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

is what they're charging me and I'm not happy.' And we've both been here long enough to know that."

Brunsvold: "Well let's put... Let's put a cap on it. Let's put a cap on it."

Black: "I'll vote for the Bill as it is. I just want to caution some Members of the chamber that this thing can come back and bite you, because we're giving them the authority to charge a fee and we don't know what the fee is."

Brunsvold: "Well, let's put a \$200 cap on it."

Black: "That'd be great with me. And... and I'd even like to see language that clearly states that the contractors, those people who will benefit from this code, and I agree there is a benefit, that they should bear the cost of this. don't want to get into a situation where we have to do a GRF transfer to the building commission to cover the costs of a book. Because in all due respect, to our friends out there in the public entities, sometimes, sometimes, and I know you've been here longer than I have. So you know, sometimes they print a book with a hard cover, with gold embossing, with a, you know, all the bells and whistles. This could just be a simple cloth-bound book and it would be, absolutely, of interest to the building industry. without a cap or without some kind of language that the costs will not be by the taxpayer, in fact, it will be to those benefiting from the book, I'll join with you and vote for the Bill and I think we can probably pass it. All I want to do, there's Members on your side of the aisle, Members on my side of the aisle, that should not vote for a blank check."

Brunsvold: "Yeah. Well, let's... let's just take it out of the record and have the building commission come over here and we'll put a cap on this thing."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Black: "I think that makes eminent good sense. I... I don't want to tell you that we couldn't pass the Bill. I think we could. But obviously, there are people on both sides of the aisle who haven't been here long enough and I don't want them to get embarrassed or upset in August and September if the price of this book suddenly becomes somewhat expensive."

Brunsvold: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Lopez: "Mr. Clerk, will you please take the Bill out of the record. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke, for what reason do you rise?"

Hartke: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lopez: "State your point."

Hartke: "Today we're honored to have in the gallery... a group of school children from my district, from Jasper County,

Newton Junior High. Would we give them, please, a warm

General Assembly welcome."

Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yes, a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lopez: "State your point."

Black: "Since these young men and women are from Mr. Hartke's district and it's his birthday, I thought perhaps, they'd like to sing 'Happy Birthday' to Representative Hartke before they leave the chamber. Obviously, not."

Speaker Lopez: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Andrea Moore, are you ready to present Senate Bill 349? Representative Andrea Moore, Senate Bill 349? Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan, Senate Bill 1116? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act to amend the

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lopez: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1116 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. It replaces provisions requiring the Department of Human Services to conduct a demonstration project regarding electronic fingerprinting of recipients with language authorizing the department to operate the program statewide. It would be effective, immediately. I would be able to answer any questions that you would like to ask and hope for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1116 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, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, are you ready to present Senate Bill 1107? Mr. Clerk, would you please read Senate Bill 1107?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1107, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, is recognized."
- Lang: "One moment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill amending the Nursing Home Care Act. It provides that all persons seeking admission to a nursing facility... the requirement that all persons seeking admission facility must be screened applies only to persons over the age of 17 years old. It's a Bill that I

47th Legislative Day

think passed the Senate unanimously and I would ask your support."

May 7, 1999

Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from (sic-Representative) Durkin is recognized.

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

Speaker Lopez: "Yes, he will yield."

Durkin: "Representative, I am looking through our file and I believe there were a few Amendments done to the Bill. Specifically, was there a Floor Amendment #2 done at one point?"

Lang: "Floor Amendment #2 is not on the Bill."

Durkin: "It's not on the Bill, okay. Is there any intention of this Bill going over to the Senate and perhaps maybe, with that language, perhaps, going into a Conference Committee or is that... you gonna eliminate that material, altogether?"

Lang: "I have filed that language on a different Bill that, hopefully, we'll hear in the next few days, Representative."

Durkin: "Okay. Just for my own edification. I just want to...

'It provides that a person... the requirements that all
persons seeking admission to a nursing home facility must
be screened, applies to persons under the age of 18 or
older.' Now, any person seeking admission... I... maybe
just maybe you ought to educate me a little bit. If I want
to go in and see my grandfather and I have a nephew who is
16 with me, would this... how would that affect them, or is
that completely... is this a special class of individuals,
employees or not, who you're getting at?"

Lang: "Well, this has little to do with visiting somebody in a nursing home, Representative. This has to do with admissions to a nursing home."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Durkin: "Okay. All right. I just wanted to make sure. I wasn't quite sure if it was just what we mean by 'admissions' if somebody who's allowed entry or somebody who is going to be..."

Lang: "So let... Perhaps, I'll... I'll give you a couple more details maybe it would be helpful. So today anyone who's admitted to a nursing home has to be screened to determine the need for nursing facilities regardless of income, assets, or funding of any kind. But this would render that law applicable only to those over 17 years of age, so that someone under 17 years of age would not have to be so screened, because we want to make sure children are appropriately handled."

Durkin: "Right. Well, I think that's wise and it's a great Bill.

And I plan on supporting it."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Lang, to close."

Lang: "I ask for your support."

Speaker Lopez: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1107 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 'ayes', 0 'nays', This Bill having 'present'. received the Constitutional... Constitutional Majority is Representative Myers, Senate Bill 937, declared passed. are you ready to proceed? Representative Pankau, Senate Bill 1109. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1109."

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

Speaker Lopez: "The Lady from Du Page, Representative Pankau, is recognized."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Pankau: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was a Bill that we discussed yesterday. This Bill, you might remember, has been taken out of the record a number of times. But anyway, we feel that it's in the proper order now. If anybody would have any questions, I would stand ready to address them. But without that, I ask for your favorable approval of Senate Bill 1109."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative... Representative Tom Johnson, is recognized."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Pankau: "Yes."

Speaker Lopez: "She indicates she will."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, have you looked at page 7, line 23? I think you might have a technical error there."

Pankau: "Yes, we have checked. And because the very first line references the correct section, that Enrolling and Engrossing can change the other errors in it. It... it... there... There were two numbers that were transposed."

Johnson, Tom: "I understand you had that problem with one of them. Okay. You're sure it's right now?"

Pankau: "Yes, Sir, we are."

Johnson, Tom: "All right."

Pankau: "Numerous people have checked."

Johnson, Tom: "We wouldn't want to support an improper Bill."

Pankau: "Absolutely, not."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the Lady from DuPage, to close."

Pankau: "I ask for your favorable approval."

Speaker Lopez: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1109 pass?"

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford, for what reason do you rise?

Rutherford: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Inquiry of the Clerk, please?"

Speaker Lopez: "State your inquiry, please."

Rutherford: "Mr. Clerk, a number of... a few years ago there was a procedure that was put on the record in regards to being able to file Amendments pretty much anywhere within the City of Springfield, with a member of the Clerk's Office. If one would want to file an Amendment this weekend and the Clerk was out of the state, does the procedure for filing Amendments qualify for a non... does the Clerk need to be in the State of Illinois to be able to receive these Amendments? Or could it be done, for example, in Missouri or Kentucky or Tennessee?"

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Rutherford, we'll study that over the weekend and we'll let you know."

Rutherford: "So, if I had to file an Amendment this weekend and the Clerk was out of the state, I'd just need to hold it 'til the Clerk returns or I could, perhaps, file in Missouri, Kentucky or Tennessee? Your suggestion is to hold it right now?"

Speaker Lopez: "I think so."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Persico on Senate 734. Will the Clerk please read the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 734, a Bill for an Act amending the General Not For Profit Corporation Act. Third Reading of

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

this Senate Bill."

- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Du Page, Representative Persico, is recognized."
- Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 734 amends the General Not For Profit Corporation Act. Basically, it provides that a residential cooperative not-for-profit corporation containing 50 or more single-family units and located in a county with a population between 780,000 and 3,000,000 shall set forth the qualifications for rights of its members. This piece of legislation only affects Du Page County and only a few... one section of DuPage County of 50 dwellings or more. And I would ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 734 pass?' All in for... All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay' and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Righter, Senate Bill 109? Representative Ryder, Senate Bill 1114? Representative Saviano, Senate Bill 368? Representative Stephens, Senate Bill 1198? Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1198."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1198, a Bill for an Act amending the Property Tax Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens, is recognized."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1198 amends the Property Tax Code. It increases the property tax exemption

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

for disabled veterans from 58,000 or to \$58,000. It is now \$50,000. It adds a federal section reference, amends the State Mandates Act to require local governments to implement without reimbursement. Representative Brosnahan worked on this legislation. I appreciate you working with me, Representative. I would be glad to answer any questions. I would move its passage."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak, is recognized."

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

Speaker Lopez: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "Representative Stephens, I'm just... I'm going to support your Bill. I don't think anybody's gonna... opposed to it. I just had a question. I have one gentleman from my area who was a Vietnam vet. He was lost... lost most of his legs in Vietnam and he currently enjoys this property tax exemption for his home. And what is that right now? Is it 50,000?"

Stephens: "That's right."

Novak: "Off the assessed evaluation, right?"

Stephens: "Yes."

Novak: "And this increases it to 58,000?"

Stephens: "That's right. An \$8,000 increase."

Novak: "When was the last... so how many years ago was the 50,000 law put into effect? Do you have any idea?"

Stephens: "What does your analysis say?"

Novak: "Well..."

Stephens: "Representative, there are... there are 369 homes, currently, in the state that are affected. I can't tell you when the last... last time that was changed. I'm not sure, but I am sure that it's overdue."

Novak: "Okay. Thank you very much."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, the Sponsor, Representative Stephens, to close."

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

- Speaker Lopez: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1198 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters on Senate Bill 359. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 359."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 359, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters, is recognized."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 359 creates the Insurance Fraud Task Force. It sets up the number of Members that are on it: the Director of Insurance, the Director of State Police, a number of Governor appointed representatives. We did increase it by four additional Members over the version that passed the Senate, so that we would expand the number of people beyond just law enforcement and insurance interests, but those appointments will be up to the Governor to make. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 359 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Righter on Senate Bill 109. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 109, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Righter."
- Righter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 109 creates the offense of financial identity theft. Which would make it unlawful for any person to obtain identification documents of another for purposes of obtaining money, or credit, or services, or any other property. A similar Bill passed out of this House earlier this spring of a vote of 114-1. And I would certainly be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 109 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Wirsing, Senate Bill 74? Mr. Clerk, please take that out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 150?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 150 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Lopez: "Please move back (sic-Senate Bill 150) to Second

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

- Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 725?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 725 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lopez: "Please move back (sic-Senate Bill 725) to Second

 Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Mr. Clerk, would

 you please read Senate Bill 27?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 27, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lopez: "Representative Hoffman, are you ready to present the Amendment?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Hoffman..., "

Hoffman: "Yeah."

Speaker Lopez: "... would you please present Floor Amendment #2?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. Floor Amendment #2, what it would do is, it would... it deletes everything after the enacting clause and creates a task force made up of people from the criminal justice system to look at the problem of the revolving door of assistant public defenders and assistant states attorneys. The task force would look at ways to try and ensure that we can maintain and keep assistant public defenders and assistant states attorneys from just using that as a stepping stone to a different job. That's essentially it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be... The Gentleman from Logan, Representative John Turner, is recognized."

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

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lopez: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Yes."

- Turner, J.: "Is that a treatment alternative to street crime? Is that what you mean by task?"
- Hoffman: "No, I mean like a task cut, T-A-S-K, T-A-S-K. Not T-A-S-C, task."
- Turner, J.: "Oh. All right. I kind of recall that you presented this in committee and there was some concern whether it took 17 people to study the question of why assistant states attorneys and assistant Pds leave their places of employment and I think you should enlighten the Body with your response to that inquiry that was made by Representative Johnson in the committee process."
- Hoffman: "Well, what we tried to do is, is be as expansive as possible to bring in all different facets of the criminal justice system, so they can begin to attempt to address and to make some recommendations as to why... it's very difficult to retain assistant states attorneys and assistant public defenders, long term."
- Turner, J.: "I believe you opined in the committee process that even without the benefit of the task force you, in your studies, would probably able... probably be able to come to the finding that it's money. That they're not paid enough. Is that pretty much correct?"
- Hoffman: "Well, I think that's one of the issues. What we would like... What I would like this task force to look at is other issues, not only... not only the salary issue. Certainly, I think that has something to do with it. But there are other professions that we provide different types

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

of incentives to in order to enter that profession, remain in that profession. I would hope that a task force would look at all that, also."

- Turner, J.: "Well, they're going... sounds like they're going to have a lot to look at. And a question that I asked in committee and I think we need to make that clear on the record, as well. If we are going to have 17 people studying this very complicated question, we have to know whether the state's going to be spending any money in order for this task force to meet. Are they going to be paid salary? Are they going to be remunerated for expenses and could you comment on that?"
- Hoffman: "We don't intend to pay any money. The Bar Association has indicated that they would lead this effort and they would provide the staff and the individuals to assist. So, it won't cost the state anything except maybe the cost of paper."
- Turner, J.: "Well, as always, you're doing an excellent job in answering the questions that I'm posing and, therefore, I only have one left for you. There was one final inquiry made in committee by Representative Winkel, that had to do with the germaneness of your Amendment to the underlying Bill inasmuch as the underlying Bill deals with the Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act and this Bill, apparently, doesn't have anything to do with it. And for the Body and the record, would you indicate your response to the germaneness question?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. This deletes everything after the enacting clause so has nothing... the original legislation or Senate Bill that was brought over here, initially, has nothing to do with it. Also, as you know, the initial legislation had to do with aspects of the criminal law and when an individual

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

- was... was found guilty of sexual abuse or sexual assault. And this, obviously, because when you're dealing with assistant public defenders and assistant states attorneys, it deals with criminal law."
- Turner, J.: "I really appreciate the fact that you know this Amendment so well. And because of that and because of your responses, which I think were, particularly, salient I intend to support your Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Your support means a great deal to me."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, is recognized."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... hard to follow-up that love fest that just went on but... Representative, I know this, and I being sincere, I know this is important an issue and I think it is one that needs to be addressed. The only thing that I would point out and I don't mean it in any critical way, I really thing we ought to... when the task force starts to meet, kind of look at the idea of county boards... members, because I think, in reality, at least I understand that state's attorneys budgets have to be approved by the county board and we have little to do with the salaries of county board or salaries assistant public defenders and state's attorneys. So, I just would ask you to... somewhere we ought to, Jay, think about including county boards so they feel like they've gotta... some input in the process."
- Hoffman: "I agree with you. We didn't really think of it. We have Amendment #3 which would add the Illinois State's Attorneys Association and Illinois Attorneys for Criminal Justice. But you're right, we don't have anybody. specifically, from the county."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Cross: "Yeah. And, Jay, I'm not, please... I'm going to support this. I'm going to vote for it. I don't want... there ought to just be a way, even without passing another Amendment, to at least get their input, because I don't want us to get caught flatfooted. I know they've been some good assistant state's attorneys that have ended up in the General Assembly. In fact, I think Representative Blagojevich if I'm not mistaken, was an assistant. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yeah. I think he's a better Congressman than he was assistant state's attorney. That's what I hear."

Cross: "Well, I mean. He's, I think... He was responsible for bringing home the the three prisoners and nice of him to take along some of his friends to do that."

Hoffman: "Yes. Yes."

Cross: "So, thanks for your initiative on this, Representative."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lopez: "Seeing no further discussion, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman, to close."

Hoffman: "I just ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Hoffman moves to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 27. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion is carried. Amendment #2 is adopted to Senate Bill 27. No further... no further Amendments. Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lopez: "Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 is

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

just the same as, essentially Floor Amendment #2, but as I indicated to Representative Cross earlier, this would add the Illinois State's Attorney Association and the Illinois Attorneys for Criminal Justice. And I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion. Seeing none, Representative Hoffman moves that Amendment #3 be adopted to Senate Bill 27. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries and Amendment #3 is adopted to Senate Bill 27. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Lopez: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 37, Mr. Mathias. Representative Mathias. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 37, a Bill for an Act concerning tax objections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mathias (sic-Cook), has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias is recognized.
- Mathias: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment makes a technical change, to the Bill as passed. It just requires the petitioner to supply the requisite notices to the county to... in order to notify all of the districts involved. It is just a technical change."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Mathias moves to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 37. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

it. The Motion carries and Amendment #3 is adopted to Senate Bill 37. Are there any further Amendments? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Motion is carried. Amendment #1 is adopted to Senate Bill 37. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lopez: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 392, Representative Dart. Senate Bill 423, Representative Rutherford. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford, is recognized."

Rutherford: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. The Amendment would... the underlying Bill deals with the concern in regards to tree trimming by the electric utilities. The Amendment that I'm asking we adopt today would require the Illinois Commerce Commission adopt, through the rule making process by January 1, 2001, rules and guidelines for the process of regulating tree trimming by the electric public utilities."

Speaker Lopez: "Mr. Clerk, will you please read the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 423, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Second Reading of this Bill.

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

Speaker Lopez: "Is there any question on Amendment #2, on Senate Bill 423? Seeing none, Representative Rutherford moves to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 423. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries and

47th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1999
- Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 423 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Lopez: "Third Reading. Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 659. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 659, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mautino has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, Mautino is recognized."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 corrects an error which was in Committee Amendment #1, and that's the reason that it has been brought back out to the floor. This holds the agreement between the City of Chicago and the telephone companies on the specific language. I'd like to put this in order and then debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Hoff... Mautino, moves that Amendment #1 be adopted to Senate Bill 659. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' prevail. The Motion carries and Amendment #1 is adopted to Senate Bill 659. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Lopez: "Third Reading. Representative McCarthy on Senate Bill 805. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 805, a Bill for an Act concerning grants for fire protection districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Floor Amendment #...Floor Amendment #3,

- 47th Legislative Day

 May 7, 1999

 offered by Representative McCarthy has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, is recognized."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 addressed the concerns of Members of the committee, that while the fund was subject to appropriation the language wasn't as clear as some of the Members of the committee liked, and so we offered Amendment #3 to make it perfectly clear that this is subject to appropriation."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative McCarthy moves to adopt Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 805. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' prevail. The Motion carries and Amendment #3 is adopted to Senate Bill 805. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Lopez: "Third Reading... Senate Bill 1009, Representative McKeon. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 575?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 575 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lopez: "Place Senate Bill 577...575 on the Order of Second Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1171, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles is

47th Legislative Day

recognized."

May 7, 1999

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman from the House. Senate Bill 1171 amends the Municipal Code. this Bill does is it places liens on real estate properties and municipalities possesses due to demolition repair and inclosure of a building, or removal of garbage, debris, or other hazardous, or noxious, or unhealthy substances. this actual lien will do is supersede all prior existing lien, except for taxes. I held this Bill on Second Reading to satisfy some parties that has some interest in the Bill and we met most of those obligations. We now have the Illinois Mortgage Banker's Association has removed the opposition, after we agreed to an Amendment on the Bill and now we're in, we're all in agreement that this is a good Bill. This is a good safety Bill. What this Bill will do it'll allow municipalities to put a little bit more emphasis on... on property owners to secure their In the City of Chicago and I'm sure in other buildings. areas, we have had cases where some individuals have gotten raped or... somehow have been drugged into these abandoned properties. These properties that are not boarded up or not properly secured and we have had some very unwanted And so we're trying to eliminate a lot of activities.

Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross is recognized."

these problems. We're just simply asking the owners of

these hazardous properties to secure their properties.

That is truly the intent of this legislation and we have

worked hard on the Amendment and we have, basically, the

parties in agreement. And Mr. Speaker, I will entertain

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

any questions at this time."

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Speaker Lopez: "He indicates he will."

Cross: "Calvin, I understand the rationale behind this and it makes some sense. I'm a little, I'm a little unsure though, about the issue of existing liens and I don't know that anyone's cleared that up for me and I'm unable to follow the Amendment process with this Bill. But if I'm a bank and I have a lien against the property, what happens to that lien?"

Giles: "Well, if you have a... well, what... what Amendment #1 did was allowed for notice or remediation. And what that did was gave notice. You... A notice will be sent out ot all parties that are interested in this property, who has interest in this property. And this notice or remediation will not hold any interest over a third-party purchaser. But what this notice will do is to notify the owner and the... and that bank that this property must be secured, that your property is unsecured, that your property is a hazardous to the community. And so Amendment #1 gives just notification, in order to do that."

Cross: "I, I, you know I apologize Calvin, it's a little... so what opposition is left on this Bill? Do you know?"

Giles: "Representative, to my understanding after Amendment #1 was drafted, I don't think there's opposition to the Bill, to my understanding. The, The major opposition that I had at one time was the Illinois Mortgage Bankers and after the Amendment was drafted they removed their opposition."

Cross: "All right, so you're not aware of any opposition? All right."

Giles: "Not at this present time. As a matter of fact, we have

Du Page Mayors and Managers Conference in Chicago,

Municipal League, Northwest Municipal Conference in Metro

Counties, Chicago Title and Trust Company all in favor of

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

this legislation."

Cross: "So, if I'm the initial mortgage holder and you implement, you follow this law as the city, is your lien superior to the initial mortgage holder?"

Giles: "Representative, I don't believe so."

Cross: "Can we get some confirmation on that? I think that is rather crucial. And I don't mean that in any sarcastic way, but I don't think we want to penalize the initial or existing mortgage holder."

Giles: "Representative, I truly believe that Amendment #1 cleared some of those questions up, as to the actual mortgage holder having an interest in the... in this piece of property, in which notice or remediation was given to them. And most... and most people who fail to... fail to respond to the notice or remediation, they have 30 days to respond and actually clear up the problem. So, their mortgage company actually has, they will get a notice, the owner will get a notice, and they have the proper amount of time according to..."

Cross: "So the mortgage company has to clean up the property to resolve the problem, or at least have the homeowner do it?"

Giles: "That's correct. Not, not the mortgage holder, they will get notice. The owner has the responsibility, not the mortgage company."

Cross: "In the event the homeowner doesn't respond with that 30 day notice, does the... does the lien of the city then go into place, or is it effective?"

Giles: "Thank you, Representative. First of all, you have to remember that this property is... is on what we call the 'Fast Track', which is in a dire situation at the last stages, Representative. And so if, first there's notice to be sent out to remediate to all parties of interest and

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

after 30 days if there is no respondent to these notice, then the... then the city will... the municipality will take... take further action to begin to demolish the property."

Cross: "Thank you, Representative."

Giles: "Thank you."

Speaker Lopez: "Any further discussion? The Sponsor,

Representative Giles to close."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, this legislation is truly geared towards putting a little bit more pressure on some of these... various home owners who do not want to secure their properties, to keep a safe haven in our communities. I know in my community, I have quite a few and I'm sure there's others across the state. And we truly do not want any parties, especially mortgage companies and any other parties that are in interest, to be subject to a serious law... a serious suit against them because some... one of their clients did not secure their property and someone lives is harmed or endangered, or especially a And, so what we are trying to do is simply to have another measure in which we can, we can truly protect our citizens of the State of Illinois with this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lopez: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1171 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Any Members that want Bills moved from Third to Second, for the purpose of an Amendment, please

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

let us know as soon as possible. I will repeat it again. Any Members that want Bills moved from Third to Second, for the purpose of an Amendment, please let us know immediately. Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Murphy, for what reason do you rise?"

Murphy: "I rise on point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lopez: "State your point."

- Murphy: "I'd like for the House to join me in welcoming Laurel Elementary School, from Harvey, Illinois in the gallery. Give them a big hand."
- Speaker Lopez: "Senate Bill 728, Representative Brosnahan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 728, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sex

 Offender and Child Murderer Community Notification Law.

 Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lopez: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brosnahan is recognized."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senate Bill 728 requires the Department of State Police to... to make available the information contained in a statewide sex-offender database accessible on the internet. Another part of this Bill also requires the Department of State Police to post the photographs, if they're available, of any registered sex offenders in this database. The Illinois State Police are proponents of this Bill. I'm not aware of any opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lopez: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 728 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted on this

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Are there any announcements? Mr. Clerk, you're recognized for the Motion for Adjournment."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Joint Resolution #23, offered by Representative Currie. Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Ninetieth... Ninety-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday May 7, 1999, they stand adjourned until Tuesday May 11, 1999, at 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Lopez: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. All those in favor vote 'aye'... say 'aye'; all those against, say 'nay'. And in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Representative Brunsvold for an announcement."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The day is coming, next Tuesday is the Senate, the infamous Senate/House softball So, let's prepare. I would ask the players to kind of warm up this weekend, maybe go out and play catch with their son or daughter and get ready for Tuesday night. We have not won a game in, I believe, three years, so it's time to do it. I know we got some new Members on the floor. There are... look like pretty good softball So, we'll be out at Lincoln Park. And we'll try to get out there about 5:00 or 5:30, and the game, I think, starts at 6:00. So let's get ready this weekend and get prepared for Tuesday. And we'll get shirts out next week and get ready for the battle between the House and the Senate."

Speaker Lopez: "Thank you, Representative. Everyone get their

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

rest this weekend. The Gentleman from Madison,
Representative Stephens. For what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Well, just to urge the Members on our side of the aisle, we have... you know, on our side of the aisle, we recruited some real softball players this year. We've got some...Representative Hultgren. Look at him, he's anxious to go practice right now. And we have other freshman on our side of the aisle. This is a... this is a tradition that we have to restore and that's the House preeminence in softball. So, Representative Brunsvold, I know'll be working on his running over the weekend. We hope that everybody gets in shape. No drinking on Monday evening. Tuesday we'll celebrate after the victory."

Speaker Lopez: "Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."

- Clerk Rossi: "When the House adjourns today, we will stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Tuesday, but the following committees will meet prior to Session on Tuesday: the Electric Utility Deregulation Committee will meet at 11:15, the Energy... the Environment and Energy Committee will meet at 11:30, the Executive Committee will meet at 11:30, the Judiciary-I Civil Law Committee will meet at 11:00 a. m., the Judiciary-II Criminal Law Committee will meet at 11:30, and the Transportation Committee will meet at 11:00 a. m."
- Speaker Lopez: "Representative Currie moves that allowing time for Perfunctory Session, the House stands adjourn until Tuesday May 11th, 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The aye... In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Rossi: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

 House Bill 2866, offered by Representative Lang. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First

47th Legislative Day

May 7, 1999

Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."