42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Rules Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports following committee action taken on April 12, 2011: approved for floor consideration; Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 30, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1130, Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 1218, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1368, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 1576, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2066, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2067, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2942, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2955, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3129, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3157, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3469 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3486. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 1967, offered by Representative Cunningham, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading."

Speaker Colvin: "The House shall come to order. Members should be in their seats. This morning we shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Father Robert Zwilling who is with St. Theresa of Avila Church in Salem, Illinois. Father Zwilling is the guest of Representative Cavaletto. Members should... Members and guest should... are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off their cell phones, their pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Pastor Zwilling."

Pastor Zwilling: "Thank you. If you would bow with me in prayer. Blessed are You, O Lord, merciful God. Forever blessed and honored is Your holy name. We praise You, we

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

bless You, we thank You as we call upon You for we are nothing without You. We call upon You in our need for You to continue Your work in us. We, the work of Your hands, need Your strength and insight to continue the labors You We call upon Your aid for ask of us. these Representatives, and all who support them. represent well those who have called them to service along with the common good of all. We call upon You to grant them the courage to look with a keen eye, and listen with a discerning ear, so that with an understanding mind and a compassionate heart they may decide all things aright. they reach out toward You as they seek to come together with all whom they are called to work. Lord, many concerns weigh upon the minds of these Representatives. We pray for their families, their friends, and their neighbors that they take lead from so that they can serve all. May You take from them all that would hinder the work before them. May You give them the peace necessary to consider the hard questions. May You lead them and help them to choose solutions that lead to the fullness of life, liberty, and the pursuit of true happiness. Lord, fortify them for this day's work and keep them turned to You, and lead them to one another. We ask all this and all that we need in Your great name, Amen."

Speaker Colvin: "We shall led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Colvin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that not a single House Democrat has an excused absence today."

Speaker Colvin: "As it should be. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Republican side of the aisle, Representative Mulligan and Beaubien are excused. Now, I have a question on the Democrat side of the aisle. How about the married ones? Are they here?"

Speaker Colvin: "With 116 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1130 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 300... 3034. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 340, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1948, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2833 and House Resolution 89. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2011: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 350. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

April 13, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2292. Representative Bradley, Chairperson the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 13, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Floor Amendment #1 to House Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy reports the following committee action taken on April 13, 2011: Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 390, recommends be adopted. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 270, offered by Representative House Resolution 271, offered by Representative Dunkin. And House Resolution 273, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Nybo, on a point of personal privilege"

Nybo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I... I've got some special guests here, if I can get the attention of the Body. They're up in the gallery and, at this point, I'd like to ask them to stand if they could. Joining me today are some special people. My aunt, Sherry Lynch, is down here from up in the Chicago area. My father, Larry Nybo, is down here visiting from Chicago. And... and my grandfather's down here, as well. And if I could have the attention of the Body, my grandfather was not allowed... or was not able to make it down here for the swearing in ceremony. So, this is his first visit to Springfield. This is his first visit to the House of Representatives. And it's his first visit seeing me here in action down on the floor. My

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

grandfather, what I want to call the Body's attention to, is a veteran of World War II and ... and I've seen on other occasions, when we have a veteran with us, that we give proper recognition and... and acknowledgement, and thanks for their service. And so, I want to give thanks to my grandfather. He... he served in the Navy during World War II. He served on the USS Manila Bay, which is ... is, if you are familiar with World War II history in the Pacific, it saw some of the most savage sea battles during the war. That included the... the very vicious battle of New Guinea, and also the battle of Leyte Gulf near the Philippines, which is generally considered to be the largest Naval battle of World War II. And it's also the first battle where the Japanese aircraft begin running Kamikaze suicide missions. I just want to thank my grandfather for his service, and I would ask that everybody in this Body join me in... in thanking him, as well, and welcome him... welcoming him down here to the House of Representatives. He's a true American hero, but... but he's also a very personal hero to my entire family, and he's a personal hero to me. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome the Nybos to Springfield.

Representative Brauer is recognized. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Brauer: "Up behind me in the gallery is Catholic Carroll School from Lincoln, Illinois. They are in the sixth grade. They

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

are joined by their teachers, Anne Stoltzenberg and John Kocha, and the mother of one of the students, Vanessa Tibbs. Please give them a Springfield welcome."

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative D'Amico is recognized. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had... I'd like to withdraw a Motion on House Bill 161, and change my vote from a 'yes' to a 'no'."

Speaker Colvin: "The record will reflect your intentions.

Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Winters: "Representative Sacia, Sosnowski, Jefferson and I would like to welcome to the House chamber the group from Rockford, Illinois, called Next Leadership, a member of our Chamber of Commerce. A number of young leaders in the business community in Rockford, if they'd rise, and welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Mayfield is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise?"

Mayfield: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Madam."

Mayfield: "I'd like to draw everyone's attention to the gallery to my left. We have Alderman Sam Cunningham, representing the 1st Ward of Waukegan. If I... just like everybody to give him a round of applause and welcome him to Springfield."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Sommer is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Sommer: "I'd like the Body to welcome today members of the Illinois ASCD, the Illinois Association for Supervision and Circ... Curriculum Development. They're standing behind the Democrat side of the aisle. They're visiting us today to join us in promoting education for children, Pre-K through 16 and 18... through Pre-K to 12 in our state. They're a nonpartisan group that exposes educating the whole child. Please join me in welcoming ASCD to the House of Representatives as well as the person leading them former Representative Gordon Ropp, beside me."

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Phelps is seeking recognition."

Phelps: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like for all of you to join me in wishing a very happy birthday, 32nd birthday, to one of our favorite liaisons from IDOT, Nick Williams. Happy birthday, Nick."

Speaker Colvin: "Happy birthday, Nick. Representative Hatcher is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Madam."

Hatcher: "If you would all look at the gallery behind us, we have a group of about a dozen women representing leadership all over the State of Illinois. It's the Illinois Lincoln

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Series. They are here studying government, and they're watching us in action. So, behave everyone and welcome the Illinois Lincoln Series."

Speaker Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Nekritz is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise, Ma'am?"

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

Speaker Colvin: "What's your point, Madam?"

Nekritz: "Today is my 20th wedding anniversary, and I have to say I can't think of a better place to be celebrating than 200 miles away from my husband, with all of you, going to 12 receptions tonight. It's just the perfect anniversary gift."

Speaker Colvin: "Congratulations on 20 years of marriage.

Representative Turner is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Turner: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today's... I know there's a lot going on with the receptions, but it's also the annual House-Senate softball game. We brought the trophy down and it's... it's in the well, and we're looking to bring it back again, this year, to the House where it belongs. So, if you're... if you're able to play, come on out and play, or just come support. Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "All right. So, the softball game at Washington Park, 5 p.m. Representative Jakobsson is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Madam."

Jakobsson: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to introduce, in the gallery, right up in back of me, a group of students... now I've lost them... who are here from the Montessori School of Lake Forest. And the reason I introduced them... there they are. I'm not from Lake Forest, as you know, or Lake County, but their lead teacher, who is wearing the beautiful green sweater and scarf, is my daughter, who teaches there, that's Beverly Adamczyk. And her students represent areas... Representative May has a constituent there, but Representative Sullivan has many constituents who are up there with her. So, let's all, please, give them all a nice round welcome."

Colvin: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Reitz is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

Reitz: "Representative... or Leader Currie suggested that as an anniversary present for Representative Nekritz tonight, that the House win the softball game. The trophy's up front, so all come out tonight and root everyone on so the House can beat the Senate, once again."

Speaker Colvin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, I want to remind all Legislators, all Members of the House, with regard to Amendments, that Members should plan on getting their substantive Amendments filed by today at noon. They must be filed, and all technical Amendments must be filed

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- by Thursday, April 14, tomorrow at noon. So, once again, all substantive Amendments have a deadline of noon today to be filed, with technical Amendments being filed by April 14, that's tomorrow at noon, right here at the well. Mr. Speaker (sic-Clerk), what's the status of House Bill 700?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 700 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Colvin: "Mr. Speaker (sic-Clerk), move that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Speaker (sic-Clerk), on the Calendar, on page 8, there appears House Bill 1726. Mr. Farnham. Read the Bill, Mr..."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1726, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Colvin: "Out of the record. Mr. Speaker (sic-Clerk), on page 17 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1195, offered by Representative Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Clerk, are there any Motions pending?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Colvin: "Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 is an Amendment that changes the language. Instead of just saying police dog, it's what is used in the rest of the Code. So, that's why we added Amendment #5."
- Speaker Colvin: "The Lady moves for adoption of Amendment #5.

 Seeing no objection, the Amendment is adopted. Any further

 Motions?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Motions."

Speaker Colvin: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 18 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1600, offered by Representative Ford. Representative Ford, House Bill 1600. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1600, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I move for the adoption of House Bill 1600. There's been a lot of work done on it. And I think when we are in our communities, we say that we're going to go to Springfield to fight for a better quality of life for the people, and I think this Bill does that. And I ask for the adoption of 1600."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman's moved for passage of House Bill 1600. And on that question, Representative Eddy is recognized."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, you have worked a long time on this and I... I think that your passion for attempting to... to get something done to... to improve the quality of food that is served is admirable. Now, our concern was the cost of... of implementing this. You made this so that... that cost factor is not there and it's permissive?"

Ford: "Correct."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Eddy: "So, the goal here is for school districts and other providers to work together to attempt to eliminate, to the extent possible, trans fat."

Ford: "Correct."

Eddy: "Well, I appreciate that, Representative, and hopefully, as this moves forward, we'll be able to do more. It's a difficult issue for some areas because it's just hard to get food that meets the requirements that students will also have any interest in... in eating. So, thank you, again. I think in this... in it's... in it's form, this is something we should move along and... and hopefully, continue to work on. But thank you for your hard work on this."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Reboletti is recognized."

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

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Reboletti: "Representative, with all of your Amendments, does this remove the opposition, or are there still opponents to the Bill as it… as it is now?"

Ford: "I know of no opposition at this time."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... I do appreciate your hard work.

And some of the Members of this Body will recall, one of
the times you ran this Bill there was a couple tornados
that came by. So, hopefully, we can avoid that part and
see how this moves in the Senate. So, thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Harris is recognized for a question."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Colvin: "The Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, so that I understand, if you can, you say there's no opposition to the Bill. The Amendment that was adopted, my analysis says that beginning on July... January 1, of 2013, no food containing artificial trans fat may be made available in a vending machine operated by or within a private school or public school. Is that how the Amendment reads?"

Ford: "What Amendment is that?"

Harris, D.: "I have Floor... or, House Floor Amendment #2."

Ford: "That's not exactly right, no."

Harris, D.: "I'm... I'm sorry."

Ford: "That's not right."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. Just one moment, if I may. But does it... does it prohibit the sale of foods containing artificial trans fat? Does it prohibit the sale of those foods in a vending machine operated by or within a public or private school district?"

Ford: "In vending machines."

Harris, D.: "In vending machines. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Colvin: "Seeing no further... in... Representatives seeking recognition, Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "I want to thank Leader Eddy for really putting his best foot forward to make sure that we do something to move the ban of trans fats in Illinois, and the Republican staff, and all of the Democratic staffs for making this move for Illinois. And I believe that soon we will be banning trans

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

fats in Illinois because the Federal Government will provide the support to do so in school districts, and we can show the federal administration that we care about our students in Illinois by voting for this legislation and asking for support to ban trans fats in Illinois. And I move for passage of House Bill 1600."

Speaker Colvin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1600 pass?'
All in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost, Brady, Cavaletto, Brady. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 73 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no',0... 0 votes 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, shall hereby be declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 17 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 653, offered by Representative Greg Harris. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 653, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, and Members of the General Assembly. I'm here today to talk about one of the most tragic and unfortunate incidents that has befallen our state, and it is our responsibility as a state, in quite some time. You may have seen, in the news media recently, stories about a group home for disabled children and adults called the Graywood Foundation, which manage several facilities across central Illinois. For several years, there were ongoing reports of abuse and neglect.

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

There were a certain number... Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order, please?"

Speaker Colvin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, would ask that the chamber to quiet down a little bit while Representative Harris presents his Bill."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a number of years, there was a variety of reports of abuse and neglect, but none of them were treated substantial or timely enough to have ameliorated them the tragic outcome that resulted. Since 2008, 43 investigations were launched by the state into this... into this facility. Two young people were murdered by the workers. And Ladies and Gentlemen, we have the family with us today of one of those murdered children. And at this point, I would just like to, before I present this Bill, which I am doing in memory of Paul McCann, recognize his mother Lois McCann, his sister Kathy Slovick, and her husband, Jeff, who are with us in... in the gallery today, and thank them for their courage in seeing this issue through in memory of their son. If the Slovicks and... Paul was a wonderful child and did not deserve to be beaten to death because he took a cookie without permission. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, you heard me correctly. He was beaten to death by an employee of this home, who was entrusted with his care, because he took a cookie without permission. And he was the second child to die at the hands of these people and we as a state did nothing because our laws were permissive and did not require action to be taken. I'm not going to go into all the, you know, horrible allegations of abuse and neglect that have taken

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

place in this institution, but suffice it to say, they're terrible, they're frightening, they're bone-chilling. have them here on my desk if you would like to review them. But what I'm here today to do, along with the cosponsors of this Bill, and our... my cosponsor in the Senate, Pam Althoff, is to be sure that nothing ever happens to a family again that's happened to Paul McCann. House Bill 653 amends the Department of Human Services CILA Licensing Act to do a number of things, and I'll go through them briefly. It would require the department to initiate funding and licensing review and revocation of licenses in cases of disproportionate claims of egregious neglect or exploitation. It would require the department to assign independent monitors or receivers to operate facilities and protect residents where systemic tragedies, such as this, are indicated. It would require registry checks upon the hiring, and then every six months, of heal... against the health care worker registry, the DCFS registry, and the sex offender registry. It would also be sure that there is transparency so that families and loved ones of folks can review inspection reports, abuse reports and allegations, licensing reviews, and all other documentation the state has in its possession as they make decisions whether or not to put or keep a loved one in one of these facilities. Ladies and Gentlemen, this was a tragic situation. I hope that in these by passing these laws, we can prevent something like this from happening again. IARF and other organizations have brought forward some suggested changes to make this law better, and because of

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

the deadline, I'll be working with Senator Althoff to make these in the Senate. But there is one Amendment that we most certainly make. We will be calling this law, Paul's Law, in memory of Paul McCann. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 653. And on that question, Representative Bellock is recognized for a question."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is just to I want to thank the family for coming here today the Bill. and their courage in making the presentation that they did our committee last week. I want to Representative Harris for drawing the attention to us on this tragic event that happened in one our CILAs in the State of Illinois. And what I want to speak to, just briefly, is that a lot of people feel that the state facilities is the only places where we have tragic events taking place. In this case, this was a group home, a CILA, and it was a tragic event that took place, but 43 things had happened there before and two deaths. And this is why I thank Representative Harris because we must improve the situations and the oversight of CILAs in the State of Illinois. The nursing homes, we have improved greatly in the laws that we have passed in the investigations and the hotlines and we must move forward with this Bill in doing that in the State of Illinois, which is going to take a lot of addressing and reforms to go into that. And I thank Representative Harris for starting this, and I ask you to join with us in raising the awareness of the seriousness of

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

having loved ones in group homes or in state facilities and their protection. Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "Seeing no one... Representative Harris to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Representative Bellock. But mostly again, thank you Lois McCann. Thank you, Kathy Slovick. Thank you, Jeff, for bringing us Paul, and for coming here. And before I ask for an 'aye' vote, I would just like to mention some words that a nun, who taught Mrs. McCann many years ago, wrote to her in a note after this occasion. The Sister had moved to Florida, and I hope I'm getting her words correctly, Lois, when she said, Paul was a sacrificial lamb and that his passing may have prevented others from suffering the same fate. I hope this law will make those words come true. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would thank you for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Colvin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 653 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitu... Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mitchell is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Colvin: "State your point, Sir."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to introduce, and over in the gallery, at the entrance, we have a... I think all of us agree, this ... in the next month and two we'll have many contentious issues. Something that isn't contentious is the story extraordinary citizens that we have in this country. I have three young ladies from my home school district of Maroa-Forsyth. They're 13-year-old ladies. Gabrielle, and Calli. Thirteen, and they've been friends since kindergarten. In February of last year, Calli lost her mother to cancer and so this year, the young ladies all turned 13, and instead of a lieu of birthday presents, they got together and they started raising money for cancer. So, these three extraordinary young ladies have come and raised a total of \$2500 for the Come Together project. And that is cancer treatment in Macon County and it said... in lieu of any gifts for themselves, they were selfless and wanted to help others. These extraordinary young citizens of the State of Illinois, and I would like to... the Illinois House to give them a big round of applause. God love you all."
- Speaker Colvin: "Congratulations, and welcome to Springfield.

 Mr. Clerk, on page 20 of the Calendar, there appears House
 Bill 2590, offered by Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2590, a Bill for an Act concerning Corrections. Sec... Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Bost."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 2590 is a Bill that, basically, says that... and we don't have any in the state right now, but it... it would stop it from coming about in the future, if our counties would decide to go to a private control of their correctional facilities in the counties that this would stop this. There's a lot of problems that have occurred in other states, and this is just a preemptive move."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Bost has moved for the passage of House Bill 259... 2590. Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2590 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 21 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3372, offered by Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3372, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. 3372 is the result of a lot of stakeholder negotiation to deal with how we manage stormwater in our urbanized counties in Illinois. It affects those counties, but it does not include Cook. There's no affect in Cook, but in the other urbanized counties that currently have the power, either

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

have already gotten the power, or would be able to get the through referendum, to do a property tax stormwater management. It provides an alternative mechanism that is permissive. A county could switch from property taxes to a fee based system. What this does, is it would provide that the county would still be capped by the same amount of money that they would have been permitted to levy through the property tax, so the amount of total fees taken in would be capped; however, by making it a fee based system, it is more attributable to what the impact would be on the stormwater system. That is to say, properties that generate more runoff into the system would presumably pay a higher fee. So, it would not be based on property value. It keeps those fees the same and also provides protection so that counties cannot just use this anything other than specifically delineated enumerated stormwater projects. It... They cannot use it to reduplicate efforts being done by municipalities. And as I started with the... in the initial discussion, this is the result of negotiation between the realtors, home builders, county... the counties, engineers, municipalities, the The idea is to encourage good environmental groups. stormwater practices and incentivize people who are doing things to improve their property. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3372. And on that question, Representative Verschoore is recognized."

Verschoore: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Verschoore: "Representative, you said the home builders are on board. I had some home builders in my office this morning and I don't think they are on board with this."

Fortner: "They've... they've... what is true is a lot of the language in here was negotiated with the home builders. They still have some questions. When I spoke with them last night... I've already spoken to Senator Koehler, who has prefiled for the Bill in the Senate, he will continue to work with them on the newer concerns that have come up since the Amendment that had their earlier concerns addressed."

Verschoore: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "With no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3372 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Hernandez, Mell, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 73 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', and 0 'presents', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 18 there appears House Bill 1307, offered by Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1307, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Colvin: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1307 is an initiative of the

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Illinois Fire Chiefs. There's a long list of proponents including the Fire Chiefs, the Chicago Firefighters, Firefighters, Associated Illinois State Ambulance Association, State EMS, and the Fire Protection Districts. What this Bill does is address a problem... concern on when EMTs, paramedics, are required to draw blood for a DUI The EMT Practice Act specifically says that they operate under a medical supervision of a physician to do medical task. It does not include drawing blood for evidence, and they feel that doing... doing that is a violation of their Practice Act and puts them in the point liability, and possible loss of license. inconsistent that they would be doing it... licensed to do medical work. This involves then chain of evidence, court appearances, possibly drawing from a combative patient. The fire... the Police Chiefs, been in communication with them, they're... Limey said to go ahead and advance the Bill. They still are looking at some possible changes, but there's no... they haven't agreed, but they said go ahead and advance the Bill. The... we have a couple of firefighters here in the House who are also in strong support of this Bill. With that, I'll be happy to entertain any questions that you might have, but it's... the fire service is in full support. The Police Chiefs have said go ahead and advance the Bill."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1307. And on that question, Representative Bost is recognized."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Bost: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just stand in support of the Bill. Basically, this is a situation where tho... the DUI... the request from law enforcement, it can still be done, but it's not done by the EMTs. They're... they have a different task, and their task has been very clear all along, and they should not be being directed to do this at the cost of possibly not being able to respond to other things."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Reboletti is recognized." Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he does."

Reboletti: "Representative Moffitt, with respect to the opposition from the Chiefs of Police and the state's attorneys, that opposition has not been removed with any of these Amendments?"

Moffitt: "The opposition has not been removed, I don't believe. And I talked to the state's attorneys, and it's my understanding that they had taken no position on this Bill in the House, was what I was told. And that was directly to their lobbyist. The police chief said... Limey said, go ahead and advance the Bill. They will work with the Senate Sponsor to explore any of their other concerns. It may end up that there'll be trailer legislation, but they felt... they said go ahead and advance the Bill. That's directly from the police chiefs."

Reboletti: "Well, I know, Representative, you and I had a conversation with the fire chiefs and the firefighters, and I know of your concerns and I still have concerns that we still need to work out who can draw blood, when they can

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

draw blood, what the procedures will be, because when you prosecute DUIs it's very difficult to find the qual... qualified people to draw the blood to maintain the chain of custody, and then to come and testify in court. And we don't want to lose those potential cases because we don't have the right qualified people doing it in a... in a correct, evidentiary procedure. So, I know that your commitment is to work on it, but I still think, at some point, we need to resolve that issue as to who can draw the blood and... and how we're going to resolve that issue. So, thank you, Representative."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Representative. And I would just say there's probably no group in the state that sees closer, more firsthand evidence, of the problems with DUI. And I can assure you that the firefighters of Illinois want strong prosecution of violators of our DUI laws, but we probably have better ways to proceed with this. There's also new technology advancing including swabs for tests that's not to the point that could necessarily replace DUI... or blood draws, but we're moving that direction. It is possibly something that could be included in the future."

Speaker Colvin: "On this question, 'Shall House Bill 1307 pass?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McAuliffe, Poe, and Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 83 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 19

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1855, Represent... offered by Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1855, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1855 promotes commonsense gun legislation. It requires the responsible gun owner to report a lost or stolen gun within 72 hours of knowing that the gun is lost or stolen. Seven states, currently, require firearm owners to report the loss of theft of the firearm to law enforcement. Nothing in this Bill prohibits a person from legally owning a gun. This Bill states that if a gun is lost or stolen, simply report the lost or stolen gun to law enforcement within 72 hours. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman is seeking passage of House Bill 1855. And on that question, Representative Eddy is recognized."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he does."

Eddy: "Representative, what... how would you describe the practical change in... in the firearm owners loss or theft? What's going to happen differently than happens now?"

Acevedo: "It creates a new petty offense, under one year imprisonment or a \$2500 fine."

Eddy: "And... and what... what is the offense for? How does someone violate this?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Acevedo: "Well, sometimes a gun are lost or stolen. If there's not... you're required to report it to law enforcement within 72 hours, otherwise you will be fined."
- Eddy: "How do you determine when the individual... when... when's the clock start on the 72 hours?"
- Acevedo: "When you... when you have realized that the gun is lost or stolen."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, if... if my gun has been lost or if someone has stolen it and I don't realize... I don't realize that the gun is gone for a mo... two weeks, and... and I report it lost or stolen. Who... who determines whether or not I've violated that 72 hours?"
- Acevedo: "I believe it would be the State's Attorneys Office.

 And the reason why, Representative, the fact is that, say, you don't realize that a weapon... your weapon is lost... a gun is lost or stolen, okay. Someone steals it, commits a crime. Well, obviously, you haven't reported that stolen weapon."
- Eddy: "Okay. I'm... I'm just trying to... to really get my arms around how that trigger begins. Where it starts? Where... where I become liable and how that's going to be determined. And as someone who is following all the laws, I have a FOID card, I... I've followed all requisite requirements related to having a gun, when... when does 72 hours kicks in? That's... that's what I'm having trouble with here and... and how that might be applied."
- Acevedo: "I believe, Representative, the answer to your question is, after you... after... if you read the Bill, it says within 72 hours of learning of the loss or theft."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Eddy: "Okay. Well, Representative, I... I understand that what you're trying to do here is make someone responsible, or more responsible as a... as an owner, to report the loss of a My concern is... is whether or not that's going to create an offense and someone is going to have to defend their word related to this time period. And... I'm not sure, at least from my perspective, that individuals who we really are concerned about are going to pay much attention to this, or whether this is going to be an additional burden on someone who's following the law. Hopefully, we get to the point here where the crime control, and I know you've worked on Bills related to crime control, kind of becomes a focus and... and maybe some gun owners, law-abiding citizens, may not have to defend themselves against accusations related to any waiting period if... or time period when they might lose a gun. So, based on that, with great respect for you, I'll be voting against the legislation and, hopefully, working with you on... on other issues in the future to... to control crime issues. you."

Speaker Colvin: "Further questions? Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he does."

Stephens: "Thank you. Representative, what are we trying to accomplish here, really? What's the bottom line."

Acevedo: "Well, Representative, actually, I'm... I'm not trying to hurt any gun owner. What I'm trying to do is hold them responsible for reporting a lost or stolen weapon."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Stephens: "Well, let's talk about the stolen weapon. If... and I would agree with you that at some point, when... if a weapon is stolen, that maybe it's approp... appropriate to report it, but wouldn't that be a function... let's say that wherever the... the crime report is filed. Wouldn't it make more sense, you know what, if you've got a .38 that was stolen, you make a police report. Why don't we make it a function of that? And let me tell you, to the Bill, why I think that's a good idea. They... In... in my family, for instance, we... we might ... we might go hunting or we might go down, out just shooting, or going for target practice and my son might go home with... with my AR-15. My daughter might take my AK-47. Okay? Maybe she wants to go shoot it at... at a range near her home. Now, I understand some of you wonder what kind of a dysfunctional family would have an AR-15 and an AK-47. We have them for historic reasons, and they are our personal reasons, and you don't have to agree. But the ... the gun ... then I ... I might call my ... my son and I say, you know what, have you seen... where's... where's the AK-47. Where's the .38? Well, I don't know. I... we had it over in Pocahontas that day at the... at the range, and there were seven of us there, and two friends and two family members. It might be misplaced. It might... we might not know. Am I... am I required to have an inventory? I... I I... I don't think I have to have a little inventory at home about where exactly what's... what I have there. So, I... I think right-minded people who just enjoy target shooting, shooting, of the sport of temporarily not know where all their weapons are.

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

given an opportunity, if there were an investigation, of course, we could find out, exactly, where they all are. But we might, temporarily, have a weapon that we know it's in good hands, but it's unaccountable for that day. so, I... I think right-minded people can look at what appears to be very simple, straightforward, honest, law-abiding legislation, and take exception to it. Based on the fact that... the facts that I just reviewed, and the very essence of American freedom, which is, I have a constitutional right to keep and bear arms. And whether you agree with that or not, that is my right and shouldn't be infringed by law enforcement people saying, you know what, about that constitutional right of yours, we've got some Amendments to it. If you want to amend my constitutional rights, take it to the people. We have a process for that. Otherwise, leave our guns alone."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Representative, are you trying... and... and I really need to know 'cause... are you trying to get at the case where you've got a... a gun that has been used on a crime and a person has probably given them that gun and then, all of a sudden, it's registered to them. It shows up on the crime scene, and then they, when you go to them, say, well, that was stolen. Is that what you're trying to... to deal with here?"

Acevedo: "Basically, yeah. I'm not trying to infringe on the rights... a gun owner's rights. What I'm trying to do is

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

just hold them responsible as any... any responsible person should realize that it's their duty to report a stolen or a lost weapon."

"And... And I agree with you. Any responsible person Bost: should. But I believe what the law that you're trying to pass does, it... it simply doesn't... it goes after law-abiding citizens, but it gives the opportunity for a criminal to lie again. And that's... I didn't know my gun had been stolen, and... and all of a sudden, make that claim. Now, if not, then we're leaving it to the court to somebody all of a sudden to say, to possibly a law-abiding citizen, well, you didn't report it in 72 hours. When did you know it was stolen? Well, I knew it was stolen, you know, when you came to my door and have told me it's stolen. And then all of a sudden, you have a prosecutor that wants to come after them and say, no, no, you knew it before, and you didn't. That's... that's the danger I see here is... is that Okav. you're aggressively going after... I... I understand what you're trying to get at. I just don't think this does it. But I do think this then hurts law-abiding citizens because sometimes guns are lost, and guns are stolen. That happens. They're property. But I'm going to... but I'm going to tell you this, if one of my guns are stolen, you better believe I'm going to try to find out where it is and I'm going to use the police officers to try to find out where that is. As long as I find out that it's stolen. You see what I'm saying?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Acevedo: "Yeah. And Representative, you're talking about a state's attorney who's going to prosecute a law-abiding citizen, a gun owner. Okay?"

Bost: "Right."

Acevedo: "All right. They have to still have to come up with that evidence to prove that that person didn't realize that his gun was lost or stolen."

Bost: "Okay. Then... then here's my statement to you. If you're trying to get at what we first said, what... what's in this that's going to stop a criminal from lying? I mean, honest to goodness. If... if it's your concern that somebody is given, basically, a drop gun, right? And then later claims it was stolen, and that... and that happens in law enforcement, we've seen it, and he claims it's... it's stolen... If he just said, I just found out it was stolen. You haven't caught him with anything but a... you can't prove that he's lying. So, what are we really doing?"

Acevedo: "Are you talk... who... who are you talking about lying?

The citizen or the criminal?"

Bost: "The citizen. No, of the citizen that lies. I mean, I'm... that's what I'm saying is, if you're going aggressively after a criminal who has taken and given his gun to somebody else, and it shows up in a crime and then, all of a sudden he says, I... I didn't know that, that... that gun was stolen. This..."

Acevedo: "Well, that... that going to make..."

Bost: "...this doesn't do that."

Acevedo: "That's going to make it tougher on the State's Attorneys' Office to prove the charges of it."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Bost: "Then... then, why are we doing this?"

Acevedo: "We're doing this because we want to make gun owners responsible, gun owners accountable for where their guns are at."

Bost: "All right. If... if the language says that when you know it's stolen, you've got 72 hours..."

Acevedo: "Yes."

Bost: "...how do we... I... I'm just having trouble understanding that. Mr. Speaker, to... to the Bill. It... Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't... I don't think that this Bill does anything but aggressively goes after gun owners who are not doing anything wrong. I... I don't think we're going to gain ground on someone who wants to allow criminals to use their weapons and claim later that they're stolen. I think that we need to go back to the drawing board, maybe, with this piece of legislation to try to figure out how we can actually deal with that issue. Because instead, what we're doing is, we're... we're opening the door for a possibility of punishing someone who had no intention of doing anything wrong, by them losing their opportunity to carry a gun in the State of Illinois because, you know, once you lose your FOID card, but I guess you can go out of the state and carry. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... this is... this Bill needs a lot of work. I'd... I'd appreciate a 'no' vote. And with all due respect to the Sponsor, I'll be voting 'no', as well."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Reis. Out of the record. I apologize. Representative Reis is recognized."

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

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, what happens if two guns are stolen in one incident? Say someone breaks into your home and they steal both guns at the same time. Would they automatically forfeit their FOID card because two guns were stolen at the same time?"

Acevedo: "Obviously, if they don't report it within 72..."

Reis: "No. Say, they report it, but then they would cross the threshold of two guns being stolen, but they only did it in one incident."

Acevedo: "That... that has nothing to do with this legislation, Representative, as far as two guns being stolen and... It would just be one report. If I'm... if I'm a police officer and I'm making it... two guns are... I... I go to a scene, two guns are... I'm told that two guns are stolen. It's only one case file."

Reis: "Okay. Let's say what happens, happens, in your legislation, and let's say they still have three or four other guns. They will not be able to get a FOID card, right, or they'll have it revoked. So, what do they do with the other three or four guns?"

Acevedo: "Well, Representative, not necessarily automatically will their FOID card be revoked, for the fact that that... it's up to the State's Attorneys' Office to still prove a point that they knew, realized the gun was stolen. Now, Representative, if a responsible individual reports the lost or stolen weapon within 72 hours, none of this is going to take place. This wouldn't matter because you... you're following exactly by... by the law."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Reis: "No. I'm saying what if what happens, does happen. Say they failed to report two guns that were stolen, and say they didn't even know it. The serial numbers show up some other time, but they have other guns. Will they have to, then, sell those guns, or get rid of them, or have them confiscated, because you cannot have guns without a FOID card. So, I'm saying, what happens to the other guns that this person may have legally?"
- Acevedo: "Representative, in... in this country it's still considered innocent 'til proven guilty. So, no one's going to take away your FOID card right away. No one's going to take away your guns right away. It's up to the State's Attorneys Office to prove it."
- Reis: "Say the State's Attorney Office does take away the FOID card. Okay? I'm saying, what happens, happens. They failed to report. The State's Attorney reviews it. He or she decides that the FOID card should be revoked, but they still have three or four other guns. What will happen to those guns?"
- Acevedo: "They will probably be removed from the individual or...
 or they'd have to sell them."
- Reis: "That's where your Bill goes beyond what I think you're trying to do. I mean, like I said, say the two guns were stolen. The… the State's Attorney went ahead and made their ruling. They have to forfeit their FOID card. You're taking those other guns away from them because they won't have a FOID card."

Acevedo: "Was that a question, Representative?"

Reis: "Well, I guess it's a rhetorical question."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Acevedo: "Yeah."

- Reis: "Is there any provision that says that they can go ahead and keep those guns, though? But... but they won't be able to without the FOID card."
- Acevedo: "The whole point, Representative, of this legislation, is just to hold an individual accountable to know where their weapons are, and to keep them secure."
- Reis: "Okay. To the Bill. Thank you, Representative. I just think that when you really break this down, there are going to be circumstances where things happen. You're taking the FOID card away from the person, with this legislation, if what happens, happens. There may be other guns involved. In... in that respect, you're restricting the gun owner's rights to have those weapons. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Colvin: "The Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. Representative, my analysis says that this Bill… the reason for this Bill is that it arose out of a court case, People V. Carter."

Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. I can't hear."

- Speaker Colvin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, can we get some order in the chamber."
- Harris, D.: "Rep... Rep... I... I probably was not speaking loudly enough. My apologies. Representative, my analysis says that this Bill arose out of a court case, <u>People V. Carter</u>. Is that correct?"

Acevedo: "I... I don't have that on my analysis, Representative."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Harris, D.: "Okay. I would be curious, if indeed, that's the reason for the Bill. What was it in that court case that caused this... that this Bill solves the problem that was addressed in that court case? I think that's... that would be a worthy... worthy explanation. The other question I have is, in reading the Bill text, I see that there's a violation here if the person fails to report. That's... is that correct?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "So, on the first violation, the person is subject to a petty offense?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And a petty offense is punishable by what?"

Acevedo: "Under one year imprisonment or a \$2500 fine."

Harris, D.: "Is that a Class A Misdemeanor or is that a petty offense?"

Acevedo: "It will be a Class A M

isdemeanor."

Harris, D.: "So, that's for the second..."

Acevedo: "A second... Yes. Yes."

Harris, D.: "...second violation. The first violation is..."

Acevedo: "I apologize."

Harris, D.: "The first violation is... So, that could be six months probation or a \$1000 fine. Is that right?"

Acevedo: "Twenty-five hundred dollar fine."

Harris, D.: "Twenty-five hundred dollar fine. So, you know, if a person makes a mistake and loses it, doesn't report it, I mean, we're... we're imposing a fairly stiff penalty on them there. And then, of course, if there should be a sub...

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

second subsequent violation, that's even... that's even stronger. Well, I would... I appreciate your answers. I would like to get some explanation as to the court case that... that justifies the Bill. And I appreciate you taking... to giving the questions."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Colvin: "No one seeking further recognition, Representative Acevedo to close."

Acevedo: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is... this is in no way infringing on the rights for anyone to own a... a This is about holding a person accountable to be a responsible gun owner. The last speaker who spoke, talked about as far as I'm infringing on his rights for the weapons where his son and his daughter, both, take weapons to go and... and different areas. If I loan my weapon out, I expect it to be returned to me by hand. Common sense would tell you that if you secure your weapon in a certain area, and you come home and you realize your house has been burglarized, the first thing I'm going to do, I'm going to go look for that gun and if it's not there, that means it's either... it was stolen, or I lost it. And all we're asking is for 72 hours be a responsible gun owner and report it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Colvin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1855 pass?'

Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Smith. Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Speaker, could..."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Speaker Colvin: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 50 voting 'yes', 66 voting 'no'. Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, can I put this on Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Colvin: "Mr. Clerk, place the Bill on Postponed Consideration. Attention, Members, it is now 12:18, and all substantive Amendments should have be filed by now. And once again, on Thursday, April 14 at 12 noon, all technical Amendments must be filed. At this time, we would ask all Members to take their chairs, and ask for all staff to retire to the back of the chamber. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Resolution 262?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 262, offered by Representative Watson.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of United States Army Staff Sergeant Matthew W. Weikert of Jacksonville, who gave his life defending America's freedom on July 17, 2010, in the Paktika Province in Southern Afghanistan; and
 - WHEREAS, Matthew W. Weikert was born May 15, 1981 in Sioux City, Iowa; he is the son of Richard W. "Dick" and Susan B. Weikert; and
 - WHEREAS, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert was a 2000 graduate of Jacksonville High School, where he was a member of the soccer team; he was also a member of the First Presbyterian Church in Jacksonville; and
 - WHEREAS, Matthew Weikert enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in August of 2001 and served 3 tours in Iraq in only

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

4 years; he later enlisted in the United States Army, where he completed another tour in Iraq; and

WHEREAS, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert was serving in Afghanistan with the 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky at the time of his death; as a military leader, he had the courage to endure 5 deployments in support of Operation Iraqi and Enduring Freedom and considered it his personal mission to properly prepare the soldiers under his command and keep them safe from harm; and

WHEREAS, After his dismounted patrol encountered an improvised explosive device, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert was wounded, but was able to radio the coordinates of their group; helicopters were deployed to the scene, saving the life of two soldiers also wounded in the attack; and

WHEREAS, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert was the recipient of numerous decorations for his meritorious service, including the Combat Action Ribbon (Navy/Marine), the Presidential Unit Citation (Navy/Marine), the Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Korean Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Navy Reserve Sea Service with 2 Stars, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantry Badge, and the Combat Action Badge; he was also awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star; and

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- WHEREAS, United States and Illinois State flags throughout the State of Illinois flew at half-staff from July 24 to July 26, 2010; additionally, Kentucky Governor Steve Beshear ordered the flags to fly at half-staff on July 26, 2010 as a symbol of mourning and honor for the sacrifice of Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert; and
- WHEREAS, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert will be remembered for his love of country, his generous spirit, his patriotism, and his love for his family and friends; and
- WHEREAS, In his spare time, Matthew Weikert enjoyed hunting pheasant with his grandfather, playing golf with his family and friends, and spending time with his son, Jayse, which he looked forward to the most; he was also an avid St. Louis Cardinals and Dallas Cowboys fan; and
- WHEREAS, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert dedicated his life to defending America's freedom and gave the ultimate sacrifice; he will be missed by his mother and father, Susan B. (Kiel) and Richard W. "Dick" Weikert of Jacksonville; his sisters, Meghan and Melissa; his son, Jayse Schaecher Weikert; his girlfriend, Danica Schild and their daughter, Mattisyn Weikert; the mother of his son, Megan Schaecher; his paternal grandparents, Richard A. and Virginia Weikert of Sioux City, Iowa; his grandparents, Reverend Wesley and Nell Kiel of Holland, Michigan; his aunts and uncles, Cathy and Neil (deceased) Dartman, Kim Weikert-Moner and Chris Moner, Steven (Sheryl) Kiel, Sheryl (Dave) Mallehan, Scott (Cathy) Kiel; his many cousins; his fellow soldiers; and the citizens of our grateful nation; therefore, be it

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family, friends, and the rest of a grateful nation, the passing of United States Army Staff Sergeant Matthew W. Weikert; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert as a symbol of our sincere sympathy."
- Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 262. Representative Watson is recognized."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the You may have heard me use the phrases, the next generation and beacon of light, in previous speeches. Today, we pause to honor a young man whose life embodied both. We are all familiar with the sacrifices of the greatest generation. The generation that made the world safe for democracy. The generation who put the world on notice that the United States of America would forever be the lighthouse of freedom for the world. And that the men and women of its Armed Forces would prove to be its brightest beacons of light. In short, we call them the greatest generation, those who endured World War because they left a legacy of freedom, the likes of which the world has never known. Ladies and Gentlemen, I submit to you that is a legacy that is alive and well today because we are blessed by the presence of a new generation of heroes, the next greatest generation. It is the legacy that lives on because of the service and sacrifice of brave

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

souls like Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert. At a time when most of his peers entered college, Matthew Weikert entered boot camp. He traded college text books for cammies. When most people of his age spent their weekends in pursuit of various extra curricular activities, Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert spent his in the field, training his fellow Marines and soldiers. He traded weekends at the bars for weekends in Kevlar. And when most of his high school classmates were working their way up the corporate ladder, Sergeant Matthew Weikert was working his way through his fourth tour of duty in Iraq. As they checked their status for the next promotion, he was busy checking his gear. friends, we have spent the better part of a decade trying bring freedom to a part of the world that historically known very little of it. Today, more people live in freedom throughout the world than in any other time in human history. And I argue that much of that can be directly attributed to the blood, sweat and tears of the American fighting man and woman. It can be directly attributed to people like Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert. I believe in the promise of America because it is a promise of freedom, but as Matt's dad told me, freedom isn't free. It requires sacrifice. And it's a sac... sacrifice that is carried today by less than one percent of our population. These boots are symbolic of that sacrifice. These boots are symbolic of a long, green line that has had traditions in both World Wars, in Korea, in Veitnam, and in today, the Middle East. These boots are symbolic of a long, green line which continues to expand the frontiers of

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

freedom. When I hear people question America's future, I think of the men and women that I served with. When I hear people question the resolve of our younger generations, I think of Matthew Weikert, 29 years old, five tours of duty, five tours of duty. It's difficult to find the words that adequately express the honor and respect he has earned. You have to ask, where do we find such men. Men who will lay down their life for their country and for their fellow man. A man who will literally give his last dying breath to save... to make a radio call to save his friends' lives. I will tell you where we find them. We are joined in the gallery by his parents, Dick and Susan; his sisters, Meghan and Melissa; his son, Jayse; Jayse's mother, Megan; and their grandparents. I ask you to join me in giving them a round of applause in recognition of their service and sacrifice. Dick and Susan, and the rest of the family, nothing we say today can erase your pain. As Lincoln once wrote, we are aware of the supreme sacrifice that you... you have laid upon the alter of freedom, but I hope you'll find some... some comfort in knowing that this nation, this state, and this Body, will never forget Staff Sergeant Matthew Weikert. Thank you and God bless."

Speaker Colvin: "As previously stated, Representative Watson moves for the adoption of House Resolution 262. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Back to the Order of Third Reading. On the Calendar, there appears... on page 17 there appears House Bill 203, offered by

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Representative Burns. Out of the record. Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mayfield: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like the record to reflect... to correct the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'no' on House Bill 1293."
- Speaker Colvin: "The record so shall reflect it. Mr. Clerk, on page 17 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 264, offered by Representative Bradley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 264, a Bill for an Act con..."
- Speaker Colvin: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 21 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3265, offered by Representative Golar. Representative Golar, House Bill 3265. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 203, offered by Representative Burns. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 203, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Colvin: "Representative Burns."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm here to present House Bill 203, which is designed to crack down on straw purchasers. And I would like the Body to know just this past Friday, in the 26th Representative District, in broad daylight, at 4:45 p.m., three people were shot right out in front of a U.S. Post Office at the corner of 46th and Cottage Grove. One person was killed. This weekend, in Chicago, on Sunday, three children were shot at 51st and Calumet. And over the weekend, I met with some of the law enforcement officers

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

from my community. And what they made very clear was that what's fueling the gun violence in our community are straw purchasers who purchase guns legally with FOID cards and bring those guns back to our community. This Bill would help crack down on that. It does not impinge upon the constitutional rights of any Illinoisan. You may still possess guns. There are exemptions to purchase more than one gun at one time under certain circumstances, but what this Bill will help to stem is the flood of guns that come to our communities. I know that we all care about making this state a great state, a safe state, a place where people can live in peace and quiet, free from the scourge of violence and death. This Bill goes a long way to help us create that kind of state. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Colvin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 203. And on that question, Representative Reis is recognized."

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

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he does."

Reis: "Representative, you said there are exceptions to where individuals might be able to purchase more than one. Could you explain that a little further?"

Burns: "Just give me a second. The exemptions include law enforcement agencies, state and local correctional agencies and departments, the acquisition of antique firearms, a person whose handgun is stolen or is irretrievably lost and deems that that handgun must be replaced immediately. Those are the exemptions under the current Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Reis: "So, say, an individual is going to a gun show and hadn't purchased a gun for three or four years but wanted to purchase three at a gun show that was several hours away from their home. Would they be able to, in fact, purchase those guns?"
- Burns: "My understanding, Representative, is that in order to purchase more than one gun they would have to fit under the exemptions, which include antique firearms or if the handgun has been stolen or irretrievably lost."
- Reis: "Okay. So, that's... in 90 percent of the cases, that's a To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no one likes to hear about the unfortunate situations where killings happen on the street, but the fact of the matter is even if someone was able to legally purchase guns, they can purchase 12 in a year. And I would beg to dif... say that the vast, vast majority of the unfortunate situations that the Representative talked about, that happened this weekend, were done with guns that weren't purchased legally. So this Bill will do nothing to stop what's going on. Guns don't kill people, criminals kill people. And there are situations where you may want to purchase two or three guns in one month, and we shouldn't take that right away from people. We've had this Bill before. It's never been able to pass this chamber for a reason, and I would encourage a 'no' vote again today."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Stephens: "Representative, you indicated that law enforcement officials came to you after several tragic incidents in the city, or in and about the city, and they told you that... I... I want to make sure I... would you just tell us again about this..."

Burns: "Sure."

Stephens: "...source of the guns used in those crimes?"

Burns: "Sure."

Stephens: "I think you... you said something about straw purchases."

Burns: "Right."

Stephens: "I want to make sure..."

Burns: "Right."

Stephens: "...I understand."

Burns: "So... so, in my meetings with the commander for the second district of the Chicago Police Department and the Lieutenant in charge of the tactical unit for that district, I asked, you know, where... where do you think these guns are coming from? And their response was, they're coming from straw purchasers. And straw purchasers are people who have no criminal record; they have a FOID card. They are your 'law-abiding citizen' except for the fact that they buy guns in bulk and sell them in retail... at retail on the street, illegally."

Stephens: "Is that against the law?"

Burns: "It is against the law."

Stephens: "Of course it is. It already is against the law.

And many of the Members on this side of the aisle, and conservative Members, right thinking Members on your side

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

of the aisle, have spoken to the issue many times. Of course you don't want somebody selling guns to a criminal. We've made that against the law. And I would suggest, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that if that is... if the problem is that law-abiding citizens are breaking the law, let's... let's infringe their rights. You can't sell guns to ... someone who... can't sell or give them to someone who doesn't have a FOID card, someone with a known criminal record that you know is going to use the gun, the handgun or ... or weapon in the commission of a crime. That's against the law in Illinois. And it should be against the law. It is, and all we have to do is enforce it. Every time we talk about gun rights, we talk about taking gun rights away from whom? Not from the criminals. Every time we talk to the City of Chicago, it's about infringing the rights of the people who are obeying the law. We don't want anybody to run to Missouri and buy a weapon, and come back to East St. Louis, and sell it, and get away with it. Of course we're opposed to that, but we want to have the rights to go to Missouri every weekend if we wish, and buy a weapon. Why? Because we have that right, guaranteed, by the United States Constitution. And again, I say to you, if you want to change that right, change the Constitution of United States of America. I suggest that's a tough hill to climb, as it should be. Our founders understood certain freedoms had to be delineated in the Constitution and they put them in the Bill of Rights, and we don't want them infringed. want to go this Sunday to buy a weapon in Missouri, and then go next Sunday and buy one in Iowa, and then travel to

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Wisconsin and buy a weapon, I should be able to do that, Representative. You shouldn't infringe upon my rights at all. Should I ever, ever decide to find some criminal to sell or give that weapon to be... to them, put me in jail for that. But let's not create another hurdle to our own rights in our... as delineated in our own Constitution. I rise in strong opposition, and would like to be listed as a non-Sponsor of this Bill."

Speaker Colvin: "So noted. Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, you and I have had a good working relationship here and I think we respect where each other come from geographically in this state, and we would agree that there are some... some differences that we deal with based on the rural part of the State, where I'm from and... and the urban part of the state you're from."

Burns: "There's certainly cultural differences between different regions of the state."

Eddy: "And... and I respect very much your intention and what you're trying to do here for your part of the state. I... I have a question though, that always bugs me when we get to Bills like this, related to trying to control in any way, shape, or manner, or alter what I believe to be the... the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. How... do you feel that those individuals who commit crimes with guns are really going to pay any attention, whatsoever, to a law that restricts how many guns they can buy?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Burns: "What we're attempting to do here is to deal with a very specific situation, and it's one that is a key in providing access or market for guns in... in many neighborhoods, which is that people, like you and I... well, I don't have a FOID card, so I can't buy a gun. But someone who has a FOID card, is a fine, upstanding citizen, goes in, buys up a bunch of guns, and then sells them illegally. What we're trying to do is stem the flow. We're not taking away anyone's right to buy a firearm. What we're trying to have is a reasonable restriction on the number of firearms that can be purchased at any given time. And it is unfortunate that there are people who take advantage of our laws and of the ability... of their constitutional rights and use their constitutional rights to further evil things. But it's an important thing to do so that we can stem the number of that are flying... that are flooding into our communities."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I... I guess my concern is that if... if we rely on facts, if we rely on data, where we have the strictest regulations related to purchase, storage, you name the restriction, where those restrictions exist, we have the highest rates of crime. It doesn't make sense to me that any of these attempts are doing anything to fight crime."

Burns: "Well... what..."

Eddy: "Now, I don't... I don't mind the idea that we want to do things to fight crime. My concern here is if the only individuals who, at the end of the day, are affected by what we might do in public policy are law-abiding citizens

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

and those citizens who wish to break the law and use handguns illegally and for violent purposes are going to do it whether or not... this is just another law that they're going to break."

"Well, they can't break the law if they're going to buy Burns: the gun at a licensed gun dealer because a licensed gun dealer can only sell that person one gun per month, if the licensed gun dealer is doing what they're supposed to do and they're abiding by the law. But to your point, you know, Chicago is surrounded by communities where you can purchase guns in their guns stores like in a suburb of Chicago, like in Riverdale, where a number of the gun crimes that have occurred in the City of Chicago can be linked back to that very gun store. You can... I mean, and so, this effort will have a demonstrable impact in reducing the flow of guns coming into Chicago. Is it the solution to all of our problems? No. We need comprehensive solutions like... you know ... and I've voted with many people on the other side of the aisle to increase penalties for people who use guns in the commission of crimes and we need to invest in after school programs and interventions and jobs for youths, but we also have to look at the supply of guns. And if we can make it more expensive for criminals to get access to guns, then maybe they won't be able to buy them. Maybe it won't be so cheap to take someone's life on the streets of Chicago."

Eddy: "Representative, and... and I don't want to belabor this point. I think pretty... for the most part, people are where they are on this issue, philosophically. And,

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

philosophically, I just do not believe that our... or any effort that we make here to restrict the... the sale, the... the registration restrictions that we have, trigger, whatever, is going to have one iota of... of an affect on individuals who commit crimes. I believe that they will... they will have guns. They will not pay attention to these laws or these restrictions anyway, and this will make no difference whatsoever, except for the fact that it will affect people who follow the law. And they will have restrictions placed on them that aren't necessary because they are law-abiding citizens. I respect you, you know that, what you're trying to do here, but I would ask the Body to reject this and for us to continue to work together to... to really fight crime and make our mantra here crime control, not gun control. Thank you."

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Colvin: "He indicates he will."

Osterman: "So, Representative, just so I'm clear, I heard a lot about Second Amendment and Constitution. This would not prevent any Illinois resident from purchasing a gun, a handgun, a shotgun?"

Burns: "That's correct."

Osterman: "And this would not put restrictions on law enforcement being able to purchase a firearm if they need it."

Burns: "That's correct."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Osterman: "What you're simply trying to do is to say that we want to cut down on those straw purchases so someone can't walk in and buy 40 guns at one time."

Burns: "That's correct."

Osterman: "Which happens throughout our state. So, you know, today is May 13, and you could go to a gun store today, under your Bill, if it was passed and was law, buy a gun. On May 13, you could go and buy a gun. On June 13, you could go and buy a gun. So, a year from now, you would be there with 12 guns."

Burns: "That's correct."

Osterman: "And my colleagues that got up and spoke against this, similarly, would have 12 guns. Shotguns, rifles, loaded to bear."

Burns: "That's correct."

Osterman: "That seems pre... pretty realistic and reasonable. I mean, well armed, as they can be, to protect themselves. To the issue of the Constitution. Recent court rulings have not prevented states and municipalities from certain restrictions when it comes to firearms. The Second Amendment is not something that is one that states and municipalities can't come up with reasonable expectations and reasonable restrictions. Every day Chicago police officers and police officers across the State of Illinois take illegal firearms off the street. Ten thousand guns last year in Chicago alone. Ten thousand guns. Those were not purchased illegally one at a time. Those were used by straw purchasers who went out and bought 5, 10, 15 firearms and resold them at the street. One of the previous

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

speakers said, this legislation would not affect or make a I would subject to you that if one of those difference. guns that has been used in a crime, a homicide, purchased illegally through a straw purchaser, I would tell you that that affects the life of that individual and their family. There have been six police officers from Chicago cut down last year. And as the summer... the months ahead of us get warmer, many of us look at it with apprehension because we know that crime will rise and we know the people that are valiant, that are putting their lives on the line each day, are going to be in harm's way. If we can prevent some of those straw purchases that will put those guns in the wrong peoples' hands, I say that it's good public policy for our state. And if someone needs a thirteenth, or fourteenth, or fifteenth, or sixteenth, or seventeenth, or seventyfifth gun, I think they can wait until next year for that. This is commonsense legislation that affects public safety throughout our state, not just in the City of Chicago, and if we want to try to cut down on those instances of violence, I think this is a good start. And it provides much flexibility for those reasonable people that need to get a firearm the ability to do so. This is important legislation and again, Ladies and Gentlemen, as we look at the oncoming months, there will be much blood shed in our states and we have an opportunity now to try to minimize that and make it a little bit safer for the kids of our state, for the grown-ups of our state, and for law in our state, I ask enforcement that we take that opportunity and vote 'aye' today."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Colvin: "Representative Mautino in the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris, D.: "Represent... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he'll yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, thank you. This must be the gun day on the floor of the House of Representatives."

Burns: "It always is."

Harris, D.: "A couple of questions for clarification. Basically, I am a Second Amendment supporter, as you... as you know. I have a question about this... a couple questions about this Bill, though. First of all, I support you entirely in terms of what you want to do by way of cutting down on the violence that is occurring on the streets of Chicago. I support you in your current position, and I will support you in your future position. As a supporter of the Second Amendment, I'm not sure why somebody has to buy more than one, or wants to buy more than one gun a month. But be that as it may, that's their... that's their right, as it stands right now. Let me ask you, how many murders were com... were committed in the City of Chicago last year?"

Burns: "Four hundred... approximately 450."

Harris, D.: "And how many of those were committed by somebody who holds a valid FOID card?"

Burns: "I don't have that information in front of me."

Harris, D.: "It's my understanding that the answer is none.

And my point being, the folks who do things the right way,

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

aren't the folks that are committing the crimes. But let me... let me ask for some clarification..."

Burns: "Can... can I answer that... can I answer that question very quickly?"

Harris, D.: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir."

Burns: "I mean, just going back to the reason why this Bill...
why I'm introducing this Bill and having this debate and
this conversation. There are people, and there are cases
where people were law-abiding citizens, FOID cards, no
criminal records, but were feeding a secondary market. I...
I have no objection to a constitutional right to own a home
for hunt... to own a gun for hunting or to protect your home,
if that's your decision. But... but the problem is you have
people who buy in bulk and sell these guns..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Burns: "...on the streets."

Harris, D.: "Right. And the previous speaker made reference to that and it's my understanding that both at the Federal Law... or at the federal level and at the state level, straw purchases in other words, purchasing a weapon with the sole intent of giving it to someone else is currently illegal. Straw purchases are currently illegal from understanding. Let me ask you a question about... about the Bill specifically. It indicates here a person commits the offense of unlawful transfer of a firearm when he or she knowingly does any of the following. And the new language reads this, transfers or possesses with intent to transfer any firearm to a person he or she has reasonable cause to believe is under the age of 18. Now, if my son and I like

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

to go trapshooting or skeet shooting and for his 17th birthday I want to give him my favorite 12-gauge over and under, the way I read this Bill I can't do that anymore. Is that correct?"

Burns: "I'm... I'm conferring with staff right now, but the policy rationale behind this language and... currently, that's existing statute. What we did was expand it to include all firearms, not just handguns, that can be concealed, from my understanding of the analysis. But the challenge is, is that you have many of the crimes that have been committed in the city, sadly, have been committed by people under the age of 18. The guns are transferred to these juveniles and they've used them in crimes. I mean, based on my conversations with law enforcement in my district, some of the button guys on these shootings over the last weekend are not even 18."

Harris, D.: "I understand. The law says or, excuse me, the legislation in your Bill says transfers any firearm, any firearm. That means my 12-gauge over and under I cannot give to my 17-year-old son, if this Bill becomes law. Is that correct?"

Burns: "That is my understanding. To give, to transfer in, you know, to give it as to... to hand over. Now..."

Harris, D.: "Can I sell it to him?"

Burns: "No."

Harris, D.: "This says... this says transfers."

Burns: "Right."

Harris, D.: "So, I cannot make a gift, I can't sell it to him, to a 17... my 17-year-old son. We go trapshooting. It's any

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

firearm. I think we're going a little bit further here than just one gun a month, and I would ask that... I would ask that you look at that."

Burns: "Thank you for your observation."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this gets the required number of votes, one would ask for a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "Request to their... there has been a request for a verification that has been acknowledged. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, to the Bill. know that in this chamber gun issues are some of the more contentious types of issues that we... that we deal with and address. But I think sometimes what disturbs me most about when we talk about gun issues, one of the previous Sponsors... excuse me, speakers, talked about that this only creates another law that can be broken. Well, if that's kind of the mentality, then why do we have laws in the first place? Well, they're put in place to try to prevent certain things from happening. And while some of us may disagree on the reasonableness of being able to purchase one gun a month, I mean, at the very least, I think we only have two hands, so that's the most that you can shoot at any one time. But why someone needs to purchase more than one gun a month, certainly, is beyond me, but obviously, that's, I guess, what they want to do. But one thing that

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

I want to make clear, at least in the midst of this discussion, is that sometimes it appears when people talk about the differences between upstate and downstate, Chicago versus rural Illinois, that Chicago always seems to be the Mecca where only these tragedies take place. I hope for some of you that these tragedies don't take place in the areas that you represent, but God forbid if it should happen, we try to do things, not just thinking about what's taking place in Chicago and the surrounding areas, but we... we introduce these types of measures because we want to make sure that people throughout the entire State of Illinois are protected and are safe. Again, while we represent specific districts, we are all, Ladies Gentlemen, State Representatives, and we try to do things that impact the entire State of Illinois. So, I hope, that situation where the Gentleman is only even in this suggesting that we purchase one gun a... a month, that you think about that in a context of every part of the State of Illinois and that it's possible that some of these tragedies that we seem to only think happen in the City of Chicago can, indeed, happen in other parts of the state. We don't want them to, but they can, indeed, happen in other parts of the state. I certainly encourage the chamber to support ... support this measure. I think this is sensible. I think this is reasonable. He's not trying to stop anyone from being able to purchase, own, or obtain a gun through legal means. He's just simply saying, why do you need to get more than one per month? They aren't going anywhere. So, if you get one this month, obviously, the

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

other one that you want to get is going to be available to you the next month. So, there's nothing absolutely wrong with trying to purchase one gun a month. So, I do encourage the Body to support this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking recognition, Representative Burns to close."

"Thank you, Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Burns: I'd like to thank everyone who participated in the debate, and for the high level debate we had today on this I want to stress a couple of things very quickly. Number one, if folks want to take their kids out with them hunting and shooting and... and expose them to the culture that's part of their community, this Bill doesn't change that or affect it. The reason why we have the transfer language in there is that we want to make sure that we keep handguns, and shotguns, and long guns out of the hands of criminals who frequently juveniles, who are participating in gun violence crimes throughout the state. This Bill does not infringe upon a constitutional right. No gun is taken away. The ability to possess a firearm is... is intact. What we're doing is we're trying to limit the amount of guns that people can purchase at one time and because unfortunately, some people abuse constitutional right and flood our communities with these guns, purchased legally, and transfer them to people or sell them to people who are not allowed to possess guns and who will use them for criminal purposes. The gun violence is real in the City of Chicago and throughout our state. This is a... not a gun control Bill, but I do believe it's a

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

crime control Bill. And so, for those of you who want to crack down on crime and make it harder for crimes to be committed, I would encourage you to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 203. I would remind Members that Representative Bost has made a request for a verification. Please vote your own switches... switches. And all in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Dunkin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 47 voting 'yes', 68 voting... 68 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Mr. Burns."

Burns: "Take the record."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk. And the vote is 47 'yes', 68 'no',

0 voting 'present'. The Bill is declared lost.

Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege.

I'd like everybody who worked on, this December and through, on the Ed Reform Committee, the four Members on the Republican side and our four Members, if we could meet in the Speaker's chamber immediately, I'd appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Will, Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to direct your attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have in our presence some very special guests from Bolingbrook, Illinois, who are a guest of Leader Cross,

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Representative Bellock, Representative Connelly and mine. I am thrilled to introduce you to the championship Lady Raiders girls basketball team from Bolingbrook High School. The Lady Raiders are accompanied today by their head coach Tony Smith, the president of the Valley View School Board, Steve Quigley. And if I can take just a couple of minutes to tell you about the very, very, very impressive basketball team that you see in front of you. On March the 5, these women brought home a third consecutive Class 4A State Championship trophy to Bolingbrook. In the last... they have brought home seven titles in the last seven Four of them, they have been number one state championship... champions. ESPN HoopGurlz has ranked the Lady Raiders the number two team in the country. USA Today ranked the Lady Raiders the number two team in the country, recognizing all of their very, very hard work. finished their season with a record of 29 and 2. appreciate all of the Members joining me in welcoming these outstanding young women, these very talented, hardworking athletes. Please join me in recognizing their achievement, all the hard work and dedication, both on the court and off, that's brought them to this point. And I would request that we also... or I would move for the adoption of House Resolution 266 and... and again, ask the Members to join me in welcoming these outstanding... outstanding young basketball players to the State Capitol. Welcome, Lady Raiders. Congratulations on your three-peat."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Will, Representative McAsey, moves adoption of House Resolution 266. All in favor say

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you. I would add the... I would actually ask that my name be added to this Resolution..."

Speaker Mautino: "That will be done."

Mendoza: "...as a chief hyphen, and I wanted to congratulate the Lady Raiders. My name was missing up there so I feel a little bit heartbroken, but I'll have you know that while I do live in Chicago and I represent Chicago now, I am a very proud ex-Raider myself, graduated from Bolingbrook High School, was an all-State nominated Midwest soccer player, so I can relate to how hard you ladies have worked to reach the goal that you have. So, thank you for making us proud, and congratulations, once again. Go Raiders."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery behind me, we have two city councilmen from the Village of Monticello, Vince Kuetemeyer and Bill Mitze. If you guys would stand up and let's welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

Representative Osterman is seeking recognition."

Osterman: "Announcement. Ladies and Gentlemen, the shirts for tonight's softball game are at the backdoor, so please go over and grab one whether you're going to play or not. But they're at the backdoor by Lee Crawford."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Speaker Mautino: "Coach, can you give us the time to remind those... some of those Members who may not know the activities for this evening and the time."
- Osterman: "Five o'clock at Washington Park. So, get out...
 Lincoln Park."
- Speaker Mautino: "Five o'clock at Lincoln Park, and you may have noticed the trophy, which we hope to retain. Good luck to all of us. Let's see, the next Bill is House Bill 2397, Representative Eddy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2397 is a technical cleanup Bill related to a Bill we passed last year, the Care of Students with Diabetes Act. It simply makes a definition and a clarification on inservice, and I'd be happy to answer any questions. And ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 2397. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Chapa LaVia, Representative Jackson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 2397 is declared passed. Representative Fortner, House Bill 3182. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3182, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3182 is a technical change, a minor addition and clarification to the municipal aggregation Bill that's passed. It's been very successful. Over two dozen communities have referenda this spring to do municipal aggregation. This simply provides language to have the agency, whichever utility it is, provide the customer account number so they can correctly transfer that for these aggregation projects."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 3182. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost, Cavaletto, Leitch, Lilly, do you wish to be record? Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3182 is declared passed. Representative Cunningham, House Bill 1906. Out of the record. Representative Holbrook, House Bill 1368. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, take this Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. House Bill 1368, on Floor Amendment #1, Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment clears up some issues on dealing with some renewable energy resources for the Illinois Power Authority. And I'd move for its adoption."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. House Bill 224, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 224, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 224 is needed to bring Illinois law into conformacy with the Federal Law and regulation. Various State Laws, including the external review law passed by the General Assembly in 2009, give Illinois residents the right to an appeal when a health insurance denies a claim for needed treatment. A recent Federal Law expanded upon the appeals rights available under Illinois law ensuring that all individuals receive a full and fair review of a denied health insurance claim. Unless we move to incorporate the new federal standards into the Illinois law by July 1 of this year, a new Federal Law will preempt the external review established by this Body just two years ago. This Bill is based on three model laws which are adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners through a process with input from stakeholders including consumers, health care providers, health insurers, as well as insurance agents. This Bill ensures that Illinois law provides our

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

constituents with all the same appeal rights and protections to which they are entitled to under Federal Law. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 224. On that question, the Lady from Lake, Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Osmond: "Representative, are... do we currently have an external review process in place?"

Flowers: "Yes, we do."

Osmond: "And why are... are we actually doing this ahead of the schedule for the National Health care?"

Flowers: "No, we're not. What we're doing, Representative, is since we pass... Representative Harris passed his Bill, and it was signed into law last year, the Federal Government has expanded on the law, and... and it's in force right now. And we have until July to... to exercise state enforcement."

Osmond: "Well, if you say that we already have one in place, what is..."

Flowers: "But it..."

Osmond: "I'm sorry. Go ahead."

Flowers: "It does not go as far as the Federal Law goes, and we have to conform with the Federal Law, and... and especially in regards to with... external review. So, our State Law is catching up with the Federal Law."

Osmond: "And you feel that your Bill will be doing this?"

Flowers: "This language is doing what the Federal Laws required us to do."

Osmond: "Do you have any opposition to this language?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Flowers: "I'm... let... The insurance companies know that we have to do this, and I did agree to meet with Mr. Barry, but he stated that he couldn't provide the details and he didn't know anyone is Springfield to provide the details. And so, the department is going to continue to work with Mr. Barry, but in the mean time, this is something that we have to do."

Osmond: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know that in committee we've had the discussions that July 1 of 2011, I believe, that we have to have an active something along the lines of what your Bill purposes. Is that... is that fair to say?"

Flowers: "That is fair to say. You're correct."

Reboletti: "And... and I think that some of the issues is that...
some of our discussions have been if this Bill encompasses
more than what the Federal Act requires. Would that be...
some... that's where some of the opponents are coming from,
that they're saying that might be too expansive, what
you're trying to do compared to what the actual Act
covers?"

Flowers: "You... you know, Representative, you were in committee and it has been suggested that that is true, but there is no indication. No one has pointed out what the particulars are that we have gone beyond what the Federal Law is suggesting."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Reboletti: "And I... and I appreciate that. The... I don't recall any... that much testimony, if any testimony. There was...

Larry Barry did testify about it. I know they were going to try to get us some additional references, but it's been very difficult. They haven't been able to accomplish that, as of yet. So, I'm hopeful that when this Bill goes to the Senate, I know that you'll talk to the Senate Sponsor and continue to work with all the opponents to see if there's some type of agreed Bill that we may see back here but later in the year."

Flowers: "The department doors are open and my doors are always open."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, will this cost the State of Illinois anything?"

Flowers: "There... there will be some cost, but it is my understanding that the department said that the Federal Government will be the one to pick up the tab."

Franks: "So, there's no net cost to the state."

Flowers: "Right."

Franks: "And what this Bill really will do, is if a... if someone goes to their... their doctor and their doctor indicates they need a certain type of treatment, and then they... the person gets that scheduled and the... then they call the insurance

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

company for the preauthorization, and then the insurance company says no, for whatever reason it might be. This would give the consumer, the person who's sick, the ability to file an appeal to... to try to get the insurance company to change their mind to cover the treatment."

Flowers: "Internally, as well as externally, Representative, oftentimes, you know, when we purchase our insurance and the doctors say we need a particular treatment or a certain type of operation, and certain insurance require that you get the authority to do so first from the insurance company, they could say they... they could just deny it and then, you have to go through appeal process. Some people live to tell the story, and we remember the story of... of a gentleman, Mr. Strezo, who died while he was awaiting on the answer from the insurance company. So, this set forth a time limit. It set forth guidelines for an external review as well... an independent... an independent external review, not someone that the insurance company has chosen."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. I think this is a great idea, and I think it's long overdue. And I want to commend you for this because we have heard so many horror stories where people are turned down and of... and sometimes they've even retroactively canceled their insurance. I've... I've had constituents come to me where an individual had hurt a knee and walking up a stair... and in falling down a staircase, and the insurance company turned her down because she had a preexisting condition because she had something else totally unrelated. And it was just a way that they wouldn't cover something that they should've covered. And

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

I've had other instances where insurance companies have turned down procedures that they deem experimental, yet, they are used every day in other areas. This is a way, I think, to help level the playing field, to help protect our consumers. It's not going to cost the state anything. It's the right thing to do. I think a lot of people are going to be a lot healthier because of this legislation. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. wanted to commend Representative Flowers for bringing forward some very much needed improvement to the external review process that we brought forward just this last Session, this last year, I believe. There are a lot of changes in this Bill that now keep us up to date with the best practices as recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners and that also assure that, you know, each and every one of our constituents who has a complaint about bad treatment by an insurance company, by denial of claims or, you know, any other grievance, can be sure that their concerns and their questions will be answered fairly, and they don't have to worry about a selection process for an external review agent. Again, it costs the state nothing. I commend the Lady for working on this so hard because it's such a very complicated issue. And ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the Lady from Cook to close."

42nd Legislative Day

- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 224.

 All those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gabel, Holbrook, Riley, Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. This Bill receiving 56 'yes', 60 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' is declared lost. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Speaker, would you please put this on Postponed Consideration?"
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady will receive Postponed Consideration."
- Flowers: "Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "On the Calendar appears House Bill 1368, Representative Holbrook. Representative Howard, on the Calendar appears House Bill 3377. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 3377. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3377, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3377 would amend the Charitable Trust Stabilization Act. It would eliminate the option of dispersing loans from the fund and providing that the State Treasurer may either enter into contracts or transfer funds to a third party administrator. It also provides that special attention be given to entities that have operating budgets of less than one million dollars, and that are in depressed areas. It

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

gives some clarification as to the fact that the Treasurer can adopt rules regarding procedures for the fund and it also tells how the Charitable Trust Stabilization Committee must operate."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 3377. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Representative Crespo, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3377 is declared passed. Representative Jones, House Bill 212. Out of the record. Representative Lyons, House Bill 1651. Out of the record. Representative May, House Bill 1355. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1355, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Lake."
- May: "Please move that Bill back to Second for a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on Second Reading.

 Page 20 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3012,

 Representative Osmond. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3012, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Lake."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3012, as amended, is the innkeepers lien... it amends the Innkeepers Lien Act, provides that a stable keeper shall have a lien for costs

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

of unpaid boarding and related expenses for a horse. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 3012.

All those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Flowers, Soto, Crespo, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3012 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost is seeking recognition."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery with us today is a group of young women, and they're all over the chamber here, and as soon as I get my notes, I'll go right to introducing them. Can you come back to me?"

Speaker Mautino: "Sure I can. Representative Pritchard, on page 18 of the Calendar is House Bill 1353. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DeKalb."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you well know, there's been controversy with the General Assembly scholarships that we have awarded over the years. There's been several exposés in newspapers across our state, and this Bill is in partial response to that, where we amend the School Code with respect to nominees from General Assembly scholarship family members. This Bill would preclude us and it outlines who a family

42nd Legislative Day

- member is of the General Assembly Member from receiving one of the General Assembly scholarships. In the most recent reporting period for fiscal year '10, there was \$13.9 million awarded to state universities for scholarships, approximately 1487 awarded by Members on behalf of the General Assembly. I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 1353. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "I apologize, Representative Pritchard. I didn't hear the crux of what your legislation does."
- Pritchard: "So this legislation would preclude Members of the General Assembly from awarding General Assembly scholarships to members of their family, that are spelled out in the Bill."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. But I always thought that was against the law, or against the rules already. You're saying it was not?"
- Pritchard: "That's our understanding. So, we're trying to go on record with some of the opposition that has been raised about these scholarships."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. But I always thought it was already the law that we were not to do that, so maybe some of us just didn't know. So, of course, I support your legislation, if that's all it does. Thank you very much."
- Pritchard: "Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 1353. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Mathias: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify one other point in the Bill. Originally, the Bill also stated that you had to delegate your authority to... to ISAC. Is that still part of the Bill?"

Pritchard: "No. That was Amendment 1 that we stripped that provision from the Bill. So, the Bill now strictly limits the scholarships from being awarded to family members."

Mathias: "So, that part is still permissive. You can (unintelligible) that if you want to..."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Mathias: "...but it's not... you don't have to."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Mathias: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 1353. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1353 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, is seeking recognition. How..."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "...are you?"

Bost: "I've got my notes. It's wonderful now. I... I'd like to proceed with a point of personal privilege, if I might."

Speaker Mautino: "Proceed."

Bost: "Earlier, we passed House Resolution 224, and that Resolution honored the member of... it's an honor this week, with that Resolution being passed, it recognizes that this

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

is the week of the young child. And in recognition of this important week, the Illinois Association of Education of Children is honoring nine outstanding individ... individuals that are in the gallery with us today. include Barbara Bowman of Chicago, Debbie Rochester, Becky Freehill of Bloomington, Kathy Linkus of Princeton, Candace Lewis of Marion, Jeanne Mentgen of Peoria, Jill Hardwick Moore of Champaign, Jackie Swango of Charleston, and Melissa Szymczak of Plainfield. Each were nominated by their own chapters and represent shining examples of those in our communities doing good things for children. Please give them a warm welcome congratulating them on being success... or from being selected."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you for your work, and welcome to the House of Representatives. Page 21 of the Calendar is House Bill 3292, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3292, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsev."

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

House Bill 3292 is an initiative of the State's Attorneys
Association to clarify some confusion with regards to when
sentences of periodic imprisonment may accompany straight
sentences. I would ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 3292.

All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Have all voted who wish? Representative Cavaletto, Chapa LaVia, Colvin, Crespo. Representative Winters, Representative Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3292 is declared passed. House Bill 2193, Representative Mendoza. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2193, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2193 is a Bill that I've been working on regarding caustic substances based on a very horrible tragedy that occurred in the Logan Square community against a woman by the name of Esperanza Medina. She has been really championing along with a woman by the name of Karli Butler, an African-American woman, who was also the victim of an acid attack, a brutal acid attack, a few years back. And they've been championing, trying to change the law so that it would not be as easy to access the type of compounds that can cause, absolutely, horrific, life changing, possibly fatal, attacks like the ones that they've incurred. I would ask that you indulge me on passing this legislation. What it would do is that, currently, right now, you can just walk into many hardware stores, for example, and purchase a bottle of sulfuric acid with no questions asked. And these are the type of compounds that upon immediate con... contact with your skin, would not just burn you, but would actually burrow a hole through your flesh. The ramifications of an attack of this

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

nature are just absolutely horrific. There's are no other word to describe this. And what this Bill would do is that it would still allow people who have legitimate use for this product to be able to purchase it, but now, based on federal guidelines that already mandate very specific labeling on these type of products as to the danger that they cause, we have equated... we have written a Bill that mirrors the federal statute on labeling. If a product is labeled as danger and poison, with a skull and cross bones... and you probably can't tell off of this sheet, but I've shown it to many of you here... and additionally to that, has an affirmative statement that this product causes severe burns, if both of those elements are found on a label of a product, when you go to purchase that specific product, and you go to the register, you would have to then show your I.D. and, also, sign a log or a registry. This Bill has been worked on diligently with the help of some of the Representatives in this chamber, and the Retail Merchants Association, and the Chemical Association of Illinois. And we are going to make a couple minor changes in the Senate, but I think at this point, we have a really good piece of legislation here, which will hopefully limit folks from... from going to even purchase this product to begin with when they have a nefarious purpose in mind. And I believe that if they have to show their I.D. at the point of purchase, they will think twice and just not purchase the product. We need to make it more difficult for people to have access these horrific compounds when their purposes horrible in nature, and that's what we're trying to do

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

today with this legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and would... well, I guess that's it. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 2193.

And on this question, the Gentleman from Winnebago,

Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Sacia: "Representative Mendoza, I know early on the Farm Bureau, the Chemical Industry, and the Retail Merchants were in opposition. Are... are any of those agencies still opposed to the Bill?"

Mendoza: "That I am aware of, no. The Retail Merchants are still listed as opponents, but I think with the changes that we will be making in the Senate, those are off of their specific recommendations, they should be completely neutral on the legislation."

Sacia: "And... and the Farm Bureau?"

Mendoza: "The Farm Bureau is not opposed to it, this legislation."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Reboletti: "Representative, if this became law, what... when would the effective date be?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Mendoza: "The effective date will be six months from the time that we pass this legislation. That's one of the requests that IRMA has, so that they can have sufficient time to be able to work out the details of the registry with the Illinois State Police."

Reboletti: "And what would the penalties be?"

Mendoza: "The penalties will also be changed in the Senate. Right now, it's a \$1500 business fine, but it would change based on IRMA's request to be a three-tiered system. So, on a first offense, no more than a \$500, second offense, no more than a 1000, and a third offense, no more than 1500."

Reboletti: "And... and then, it's your commitment to work with the Senate Sponsor. Do you have a Senate Sponsor?"

Mendoza: "I've asked Senator Haine to Sponsor the legislation, it's my indication that he will."

Reboletti: "And... and that there might be some additional exemptions to make sure that we try to meet all the concerns of all the opponents."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...Will there being some additional exemptions?"

Mendoza: "The exemptions are... we just want to clarify what those exemptions are. So, in other words, if you're an agricultural industry, you have a very legitimate purpose for this product. And so, we want to make sure that if you're in possession of this product, there's no danger of you being charged with being in un... unlawful possession."

Reboletti: "The witnesses were..."

Mendoza: "That's one example of several different exemption...
exemptions that we will be including in the legislation."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Reboletti: "I know that the witnesses gave extremely compelling testimony. I know that you opened your office and we were able to speak with you, with the Retail Merchants, the Chemical Industry, Representative Cunningham was also present. We shared many of our concerns with you, and I know we talked about some of the language that's in the heinous battery statute, which really defines what these types of injuries would be. It's not something that would cause a rash. It's something that would... could burn right through the bone, as some of these victims experiencing. And I appreciate your... your hard work and diligence on this and your commitment to continue to work with the Senate Sponsor on the other... in the other chamber. So, thank you."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Reis: "Representative, I appreciate you working with us. I think you were as shocked as a lot of other people that we purchase large quantities of sulfuric acid, not only in concrete preparation, but also in PH uses. Could you, and I know you're going to do changes in the Senate, but could you just tell us a little bit more about the exemptions against the penalties if we have this in our... in our possession, the Class IV felony?"

Mendoza: "Yes. So, unless, say if you have possession of the product with the intent to cause a bodily harm or distress

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

to another person, you would be exempt from any issue dealing with a fine. So, I mean, for example, in your case, there's no doubt in my mind that you have a very legitimate purpose for having the product. So then, in this case, this would not apply to you because you... you don't have the intent of using it to harm someone else."

Reis: "But you have no intent of creating a registry of people that would be exempt."

Mendoza: "Excuse me. I'm sorry."

Reis: "You have no intent of setting up a registry of people that would be exempt. So each year..."

Mendoza: "No. Yeah. The registry..."

Reis: "...we would have to apply for the exemption."

Mendoza: "... you... you would still have to... anybody would have to fall under the registry."

Reis: "Right."

Mendoza: "The... the exemptions apply to the fines or the felony offense, which would be the case when the person does have it with an intent to commit, you know, a nefarious deed, they would be able to be eligible for a Class IV felony."

Reis: "Okav."

Mendoza: "But the exemptions are very clear in the Bill as to if you have a legitimate use, whether it's scientific, medicinal, you know, students, for example, or the agriculture industry or industrial, commercial use. So, we want to make sure folks like yourself and anyone else in this state that have a legitimate purpose for purchasing it, can still purchase it. The only difference would be

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

that when you purchase a product of this magnitude, you would have to show your I.D., and register in a log."

Reis: "Okay. To the Bill. Thank you, again, Representative, for working with this. I know this is very painful for the victims and their families who have been subject to this type of criminal activity. And... and we all look at each other in the committee and think, gosh, what will they think of next. And I also appreciate you working with us who do have legitimate purposes for purchasing this and look forward to working with you when it comes back from the Senate."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Moffitt: "Representative, I know this is not your first Bill.

Is there any chance this is your last Bill?"

Mendoza: "It is my last Bill, and I will say that I'm very proud that this is my last Bill because the women who this Bill is focused on are just such an inspiration. So, I... I can't be prouder to carry this as my last piece of legislation."

Moffitt: "Well, Representative, I think it's appropriate talking to the Bill because your legacy is certainly will be... serving here will be one of always trying to improve safety. You're working for the people you represent and for all the citizens of Illinois. You always reached across the center aisle and tried to address concerns. And so, you've set a tremendous example. I just want you to

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

know that I'm going to vote for your Bill, but it's been an honor and a privilege to serve with you, and all your Bills. You've been a real class act. We're better for you being here. Thank you."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Representative. It's been my honor."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 2193.

Representative, would you like to close?"

Mendoza: "I just want to say thank you. It's such a bittersweet thing. I don't want to start crying, so I'll just
ask you all to support this on behalf of these amazing
women and more importantly, to hopefully prevent this type
of tragedy from ever happening again. I don't know that
this will do that, but I think that this sends a really
strong message that we're paying attention, that this is a
really horrific type of crime that is growing in incidents,
and we need to do something to try to stop it. So, thank
you very much for your indulgence, and on behalf of
Esperanza Medina and Karli Bulter, who are two women who
have really, really inspired me and many people who have
met them, I would ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take that record. And 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2193 is declared passed. Congratulations, Representative. Representative Golar is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Golar: "Yes. Today in the gallery is a group that is from my district, Southwest Organizing Project. And they are here to rally around no budget cuts, of course, and we have two... three of the leaders, Jeff Bartow, Imelda Salazar, Rabbi Salter, and 10 organizers, along with 200 residents, along with 80 students out of that 200, and they represent Gage Park High School, Talman, Morrill School, Eberhart, Marquette, and Hancock School. And I would like for you to give them a Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. On page 18 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1651, Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1651, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1651 is a cleanup Bill on behalf of the Department of Professional Regulation. It cleans up some statutory language that became effective last July with Public Act 96-1365. Basically, cleans up a lot of things with the division of banking, including creating a dedicated thrift fund that requires all fees collected from the regulation of thrifts to be deposited into their fund, opposed to the mortgage related fund that previously contributed to; amends the Corporate Fiduciary Act to increase the amount of bond or securities pledged to the department to cover the cost of liquidation of an independent trust company. It goes from two million, from one; provides the division may enter into cooperative

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

agreements, whether state or regulatory agencies to examine institutions on the division's behalf; changes of composition of the board to make the director of banking its chair; streamlines some procedures for institutions to change their names; permits the savings association to with other approved regulatory depository merge institution; it permits the savings association to merge or sell substantially all of its assets to any other approved depository institutions. So, most of this stuff was agreed IBA's on board, completely. There's a one little part of this that the community bankers may want to work on in the Senate. If they do, we'll certainly bring it back on concurrence. But for the most part, it's agreed Bill. ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 1651. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', the House Bill 1651 is declared passed. Representative Saviano, on page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 1973. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1973, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1973 passed this chamber in the last General Assembly, and I guess they didn't get around to it in the Senate. This simply allows a professional... a licensed professional

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

in this state to expunge their disciplinary record if... if they had anything against them that was unrelated to their practice. Like if they failed to pay taxes or child support, or student loans. Unrelated to their professional practice, they would be able to take that off their record once they satisfied their obligation. I have no... this is an issue of the department, and I know of no opposition. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 1973. 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns, DeLuca, Hays, Hernandez, Mitchell, Jerry, Williams, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 83 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and House Bill 1973 is declared passed. House Bill 3593, Representative Mussman. Out of the record. Representative Osterman, House Bill 1296. Out of the record. Representative Reitz, House Bill 142. Out of the record. Representative Rita, House Bill 1634. Out of the record. House Bill 2955, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, would you place that Bill on Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie on Floor Amendment #1."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a technical Amendment to what is basically a technical Bill. It contains four or

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

five provisions. Among them, a provision to make sure that certain kinds of trusts are not paying their corporate personal property replacement taxes twice, and several other, again, fairly technical things. One item takes out of the Bill, a measure that was quite substantive. And since this is supposed to be pretty much a technical Bill, we thought we would take out a provision that would permit certain kinds of real estate trusts to carry forward losses over a 12-year period. I'd be happy to answer your technical questions."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Roth, House Bill 2046 is on Third Reading. Do you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2046, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Roth."
- Roth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with... provides that the offense of manufacturing, delivering, or possession with intent to deliver is nonprobationable in the amount of three grams of heroin. There's been a lot of heroin overdoses and deaths in my district. It's becoming a widely popular drug, and I would like to reduce it from... reduce it from three... or, excuse me, from five grams down to three."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 2046. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Crespo, Lang, Lily, Osterman, Riley, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2046 is declared passed. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Sente, House Bill 1871. Out of the record. Representative Thapedi, House Bill 171. Out of the record. Representative Turney... Turner, you have House Bill 414. Out of the record. House Bill 2972, Representative Turner. Representative Turner, 2972. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2972, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 2972 changes the Illinois Lottery Law by making the suspension of a lottery sales agency's license discretionary when the agency fails to file reports appropriately. The Bill also adds a new Section to the Department of Revenue Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, allowing the Department of Revenue to accept payments by credit card. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from McHenry is seeking recognition, Representative Franks."

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

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "Indicate that he will."

Franks: "Representative, right now, the law currently is, is that the Department of Revenue must suspend the license of any lottery sellage and who fails to file a tax return with the Department of Revenue, or owes money to the Department of Revenue. Correct?"

Turner: "Yes."

Franks: "So, what this Bill would do would not... would take away that requirement, correct?"

Turner: "It just makes it discretionary. It changes 'shall' to 'may'."

Franks: "Why would we want to do that? Why would we let someone who owes the State of Illinois tax dollars continue to hold lottery money?"

Turner: "The... the Department of Revenue spends a significant amount... significant amount of funds suspending the person's license through... through providing notice and the various procedures required to reinstate a suspended license. Under the Bill, the Department of Revenue will simply refuse to renew a license, holder's license, and that's costly. So, we would actually save... save money by being... making this discretionary."

Franks: "But isn't it different, though? Because, if they haven't paid, they would then be... under the current law, they'd be automatically suspended, where by this new law, you'd have to wait until the renewal comes up before they would not be renewed. So, they could be handling people's money for months and months, while not paying the state their taxes that they're... that they're owed."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Turner: "If it happens months before the renewal, then they'll suspend it. If it's right before, then..."

Franks: "I just don't see why we need this. I just... I'm concerned that we would be relaxing the requirements. I just don't know what the public policy is here except that it makes it easier for the Department of Revenue to do their job."

Turner: "It's a cost saving measure, actually."

Franks: "Have... have they told us how much we'd save?"

Turner: "I have not. No."

Franks: "So, we... we really don't know how much it would save."

Turner: "I'm not sure how much it would actually save, but it's
 a cost saving Bill."

"Okay. To the Bill. I appreciate your candor, and I Franks: appreciate you trying to... to help the Department of Revenue, but I think this might be a question of... of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Because what I'm very concerned about is if we don't automatically suspend the license of someone who owes the State of Illinois tax dollars, while those same people are holding money that consumers have given them for lottery purchases, I think that the opportunity for the state to get left holding the bag is increased exponentially when you don't suspend them What they ought to do if they not pay is to take away their ability to sell lottery tickets and the only way they could be reinstated is if they paid what was owed to What we're... if we change this law, we're giving them, basically, a get out of jail free card that they don't have to pay right away, and it gives much too much

42nd Legislative Day

- discretion to the Department of Revenue. I appreciate the Sponsor. I know he's well-intentioned, but I'd encourage a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 2972. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Burns, Dugan, Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 60 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 1 (sic-0) voting 'present', House Bill 2972 is declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard is seeking recognition."
- Howard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Howard: "Very happy to say that there are two groups of people who have come to see us today. One is from the Campaign for Better Health Care in my district. And the other group is the 34th District Senior Citizens Committee. Please, help me to welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

 Representative Morrison is seeking recognition."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 3372, I would like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions.

 Representative Turner on House Bill 3366. It appears on the

 Calendar, page 21. Representative Turner. Read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3366, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 3366 prohibits the disclosure of personal information of a victim or witness in open court during criminal prosecutions. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gen... the Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3366. No one seeking recognition, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Chapa LaVia, DeLuca, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'... excuse me, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3366 is declared passed. Representative Verschoore, House Bill 2842. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2842, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Rock Island."
- Verschoore: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 2842 is a work in progress between school bus manufacturers and the Citizens of the Fire Safety Institute, which is a coalition of fire professionals, educators, community activists, burn centers, doctors, fire department, and industry leaders advocating for the highest standard of fire safety. It is

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

our desire, should this Bill move forward today, to keep it in the Senate, and sit down and discuss various fire safety standards and Codes with school bus manufacturers over the summer in hopes of coming to an agreement that would further enhance fire safety standards in school bus, while keeping costs under control. The point here is to try and improve on the current fire standard, which was... were designed in the early '70s to prevent fires caused by cigarettes in cars. No one is saying that school buses aren't unsafe, all we are saying is that they could be safer and held to the same standards that we all enjoy when we're in a movie theater, or an auditorium, or a college dormitory, or an airplane, as they all have to update fire safety standards like the ones contained in this Bill. is a real problem. U.S. fire departments respond to an estimated average of 2210 bus or school bus fires per year, or 6 per day. Three civilian... is it a real problem because there was a 3 civilian deaths, 30 civilian injuries, and 24.2 million in direct property damage per year. What this Bill would do, as currently drafted, is require all school buses... all new school buses, no retro fitting of existing buses, put into service after January of 2014, to meet the fire safety standards for seats and plastic contained in eng... engine compartments through various fire safety codes, like the ASTM, Underwriters Laboratory, the National School of Transportation Specifications and Procedures by the National Congress on School Transportation, which is a voluntary school bus manufacturer standard. I would be happy to answer any questions."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 2842. And on that question, the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He says he will not."

Reitz: "Uh, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Verschoore: "No."

Speaker Mautino: "He says 'yes'."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. Rep... Representative, our analysis indicates that you were going to hold this Bill and include subject to appropriation language so it would not be an eventual unfunded mandate on schools."

Verschoore: "Well, what we talked about, like I read in the...
the introduction here, and what we'd like to do is pass it
out and move it to the Senate, and then... and add that over
in the Senate, or discuss it over the summer and come to
some type of an agreement, or else just scrap the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. I wanted to make sure we got that on the record 'cause your..."

Verschoore: "Okay."

Eddy: "...word, you're a man of your word. This needs a lot of work. And it..."

Verschoore: "Yeah."

Eddy: "...as it currently is drafted, I'm not going to vote for
 it."

Verschoore: "Okay."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Eddy: "Because I'm voting for a pretty high standard mandate for school districts because the language is still there.

I know what you... you've agreed to. You're going to try to get concurrence on this?"

Verschoore: "Right."

Eddy: "Or... or, excuse me, you're going to amend it for sure and it is going to come back here."

Verschoore: "Right. Right."

Eddy: "Okay. Okay."

Verschoore: "Yeah, they're going to work on it, like I said in the opening remark, work on it over the summer. And if they can't come to some agreement, the Bill's just going to die in the Senate."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, I... I understand what you're trying to do here. I've seen varying reports related to the cost, and any cost is substantial when it's a mandate. I know safety should trump that, and in many cases, we... we have that happen and we have to do it, but without the subject to appropriation language specifically in this and the potential, the high potential for cost, at this time, I'm going to have to oppose this. And I do... I do appreciate the fact that... that you're... you're on record as stating that this has to come back to this chamber, though."

Verschoore: "Yeah. It... it amounts to, according to the estimates that they've put together for me, Representative, is says the S... the ASTM standard would cost about 230, and the Underwriter Laboratory would be about 70, so it'd be about a total of \$300."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Eddy: "Yeah, I... I get that, but do you know how much money school districts are getting in reimbursement for last year's..."

Verschoore: "Yeah. I..."

Eddy: "...transportation?"

Verschoore: "Yeah, I know."

Eddy: "Sixty-two percent."

Verschoore: "Yeah."

Eddy: "And the Governor just introduced a budget that would cut that to 50 percent. School districts aren't even receiving the reimbursement for last year's. We received one out of four payments that... to any... have any additional cost mandate at this point would be very, very difficult. I know it's for future buses, but people will be buying buses in the future. And... and this is just a concern, a real concern for cost, and I think it's something that... it needs a lot more work. Thank you."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."

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

Verschoore: "Yeah."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, I... I just really don't understand why in the world we would pass a Bill out of here, that needs so much work and so much agreement, to the Senate when we can't get it done in the House. And then you say if... if there isn't an agreement reached, the Bill

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

will die. Well, then, why pass the Bill in the first place?"

Verschoore: "So they can..."

Mitchell, J.: "I talked to the… to the lobbyists on both sides of this Bill, and basically what they've told me is that there's already an unwritten safety standard that the major bus companies adhere to. And I asked at that time, why isn't that standard in this Bill rather than a federal standard that's even higher to reach, that's going to cost more money. And the statement was, well, my guys want that. But who are those guys? Who are the people that are actually pushing this legislation and trying to get it to fruition?"

Verschoore: "Well, I... as far as I..."

Mitchell, J.: "I know this isn't your idea, Pat, so where's it coming from?"

Verschoore: "It's... it's coming from the plastic industry, chemical industry."

Mitchell, J.: "Well, basically, it's coming from those people that... that produce those safety standards that we want to put on these buses to bring them to another level, I understand. But the problem is, is that the bus manufacturers have already stated to me that all of those costs are going to be passed on to the consumer, and the consumer in this case are school districts. Roger Eddy has just pointed out to us that transportation has been cut once. It's probably going to be cut again and at a time when revenue is going down, we're pushing the cost of the buses up. Now, I... I just can't vote for something that I'm

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

going to leave in the hands of the Senate, hoping they get things done that should've been done. I've also been told that it'll probably have to be over the summer that negotiations ha... those negotiations will go on whether this Bill's there or not. I don't know a time when we haven't had a Session where you can put a new Bill in and put the new amended language on it. And you know, I... if this were mine, I would very politely tell those Sponsors of the Bill, look, you know at this point we're so far off why don't we just pull this Bill out of the record and 'til we have some kind of an agreement between all the parties, we shouldn't even do this. It ... it's just something I don't think that should be pushed forward. And to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, think long and hard on this issue. You know, we're, basically, abdicating our authority. We're giving up on something that should have been done and saying, oh well, it can be done in the House... or in the Senate. Well, quite frankly, I, for one, don't trust the Senate to get that done. And without that, I'm afraid that maybe somebody somewhere along the line will reach at least a partial agreement and say, well, yeah, this is good enough, let's go ahead and push it. And then we're faced with a Bill that's not good, that might happen... happen to pass and wind up costing our school dis... districts even more money, when it's... it's really not needed at this time. I don't know... I don't see a whole lot of proponents of the legislation at this point. far from being done, why risk that chance? We have an unwritten rule in Elementary-Secondary Ed that we don't

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

pass Bills out of there unless they're complete, yea or nay. Here we have a Bill that... it's already incomplete that we want to move out of this chamber. I don't think it's a good idea and I recommend a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Rock Island to close."

Verschoore: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I just don't think we can put a price on safety for children and I mean, this doesn't do anymore than what we already have in movie theaters and college dormitories, and things like that. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 2842. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lyons, McCarthy, Mendoza, Mussman, Poe. Representative Poe, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 66 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 2842 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the largest city that I have in my legislative district is Freeport, and our mayor from Freeport is here today, my good friend, George Gaulrapp. He's accompanied by Bob Abboud, I believe is how you say his name, who is the mayor... mayor of Barrington Hills, and several other officials from Barrington Hills in McHenry. Would you make them feel welcome, please."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

Representative Jones, on the Calendar appears House Bill
212. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 212, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the... this Body, colleagues, I present to you House Bill 212, which is an economic development Bill. This Bill allows two communities the ability to form an intergovernment agreement for the purposes of developing... or targeting undeveloped prop... or undeveloped property in those areas. This is a good Bill. This Bill, I would like to thank my local mayors and also, Representative Bradley, the Senate Sponsor, Senator Hutchinson, for the work that we've done on this Bill. This Bill has the support of the IML, the Illinois Municipal League, and also the Southland Chamber of Commerce. There's no opposition to this Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 212. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Barickman, Coladipietro, Mussman, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 212 is declared passed. Representative Sommer, on page 20 in the Calendar is House Bill 2267. Read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Tazewell."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2267 addresses those who are convicted of multiple violations of the Vehicle Code regarding uninsured motorists. Currently, a judge can fine an individual 500 to a thousand dollars for such an offense. Because of a serious accident in my district where a teenage girl was almost killed by an uninsured motorist who was convicted for the third time and still fined just the minimum, the family has urged this legislation in coordination with the Tazewell County State's Attorney. The State Police support this Bill, which would mandate that the third offense of a person driving as an uninsured would be a thousand dollars. Also, if one of those offenses involves a bodily injury accident, then that fine is \$2500. We know that some individuals don't have the ability to pay these fines, but this is an effort to truly see some effort to see that the appropriate fine is paid for those who have those resources. I urge your passage of this legislation, and would honor your questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 2267. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Lyons, May, Mussman. Do you wish to be recorded, Representative May? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2267 is declared

42nd Legislative Day

- passed. Representative Williams, House Bill 3390. Representative Yarbrough, House Bill 1810. Mr. Clerk, would you place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. It's the intent of the Chair to go to House Bills on Second Reading, run some of these for a while, so. Representative Bellock, House Bill 2942 appears on page 12. Would you like me to call this Bill? Out of the record. Representative Coladipietro, House Bill 1960. Out of the record. Represent... on page 15 of the Calendar is House Bill 3486, Representative Reboletti. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3486, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Reboletti, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage on Floor Amendment #1."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. I would ask that we would adopt the Amendment. This would... this Amendment would take into consideration all the forms of synthetic marijuana, so we don't have to keep coming back here with new Bills every year."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Ramey, House Bill 2550 appears on Second Reading. Read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2550, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ramey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage on Floor Amendment #1."
- Ramey: "My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I have a little distraction up here. You know, I bring in my own trophy to go along with our softball trophy and things get... disappear from time to time. So, my apologies."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2550. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, House Bill 2804. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2804, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Jasper."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. It allows... would allow licensed meat processors to give away deer meat if no one comes to claim the meat, and charge a nominal fee for the processing. I ask for its adoption."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Is this your first Bill? The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Berrios, House Bill 3385. Out of the record. Burke. No. Representative Burke, Kelly. Representative Kelly, House Bill 3025. Kelly Burke. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3025, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Kelly Burke on Floor Amendment #2."
- Burke: "Mr. Chairman and Members, the Amendment was at the request of many of the groups who originally opposed. I've worked with them to take care of some of their concerns and I move that we adopt Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."
- Watson: "Representative, does... does the Amendment remove all opposition?"
- Burke: "I don't think all opposition, but the majority of it."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Watson: "And, it's... do... do you know who would be left?"

Burke: "I don't. No, they didn't slip in at... at committee, but... I... I don't know for sure."

Watson: "Okay. Thanks."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Chapa LaVia, House Bill 340. Out of the record. Representative William Davis, House Bill 1607. Out of the record. Representative DeLuca, House Bill 503. Representative Dugan, House Bill 1576. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendments 1 and 2 were both tabled. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have both been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Dugan."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Kankakee on Floor Amendment #3."

Dugan: "Speaker, I think it's #4, but let me..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady..."

Dugan: "Number 3, I believe, was adopted. I believe we're looking at Floor Amendment #4."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Floor Amendment #3?"

42nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration, but not yet adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #4 has also been approved for consideration, as offered by Representative Fortner."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4."
- Speaker Mautino: "Floor Amendment #4, Mr. Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 clarifies and defines flexibility in the issuing of preference points pursuant to the underlying Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #4. All in favor will say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. On page 10 of the Calendar is House Bill 1960, Representative Coladipietro. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1960, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law has been read a second time, previously. Amend...

 Committee Amendments 1 and 2 are both tabled. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Coladipietro, has been approved for consideration."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Coladipietro on Floor Amendment #3."
- Coladipietro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Stephens. Floor Amendment #3 provides that a party to a foreclosure action must file a motion to dismiss, or a motion to quash for purposes of challenging personal jurisdiction within 60 days of making an appearance or participating in a hearing. The Motion... the Amendment also provides the... the judge with broad discretion as to extending this time frame. I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it, and Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Page 3 of the Calendar is House Bill 503, Representative DeLuca. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 503, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. Floor Amendment #2 has been referred to a committee."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, would you take this Bill out of the record. Representative Farnham, House Bill 1534 is on Second Reading. Representative Farnham. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1534, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Farnham, has been approved for consideration."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Farnham."
- Farnham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1534, the Amendment to this does two things: training for nursing home employees for interacting with those with memory and cognitive impairments. And number two, allows family members to receive a list of employees who have had contact with the resident 30 days prior to a filed complaint. There's no opposition."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Floor Amendment #1. Excuse me. Moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Gabel, House Bill 1665. Out of the record. Representative Rose, House Bill 3636. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3636, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3129, Representative Senger. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3129, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendments 1 and 2, offered by Representative Senger, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from DuPage on Floor Amendment #1."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Senger: "Actually, I'd like to do Floor Amendment #2. I want to table Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady withdraws Floor Amendment #1, and wishes to discuss Floor Amendment #2."

Senger: "That's correct."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. Basically, this requires criminal background checks of juvenile... juvenile applicants for employment of a park district. Floor Amendment #1 included fingerprinting, and that has since been removed. There's no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Behind me, in the gallery, we have the superintendent of Monticello School District, and if we can give him a big Springfield welcome to Superintendent Vic Zimmerman."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

Representative Sacia, House Bill 1723. Out of the record.

Representative Gordon, House Bill 3469. Out of the record.

Has anyone seen Chapa LaVia? Representative Greg Harris,

House Bill 1193. Out of the record. Represen...

Representative Holbrook, House Bill 1470. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee

42nd Legislative Day

- Amendments 1 and 2 were tabled. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Holbrook, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Holbrook on Floor Amendment #3."
- Holbrook: "Thank you so much. What Floor Amendment #3 does is set July 1 of 2013 as the deadline for HFS to come out with electronic submissions for the process on long-term care facilities. Be glad to take any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1470. All in favor... excuse me. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3102,
 Representative Tryon. On page 13 of the Calendar,
 Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3102, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Tryon, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Tryon on Floor Amendment #2."
- Tryon: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment to 3102 simply provides that it's adequate legal notice if you have, for property that's being annexed, a address as well as a property tax I.D. number. And if you have that, you do not, in fact, have to print

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

the geometrics and legal description. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer them..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor will say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Nybo is seeking recognition."

Nybo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Nybo: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a group of trustees from the 41st district down here, and I'd like to recognize them if they could. Each of them is a good friend of mine, and up in the gallery, if I could ask them to stand."

Speaker Mautino: "Please rise."

Nybo: "Please rise, my friends. We've got Villa Park Trustee,
Deb Bullwinkle; Villa Park Trustee, Bob Taglia; Lombard
Trustee, Laura Fitzpatrick; Oakbrook Trustee, Mark Moy;
and... and I'm delighted to introduce someone who many of you
know, a newly elected Trustee in the Village of Lombard,
Peter Breen. Welcome to Springfield, guys."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

Page 3 of the Calendar appears House Bill 503,

Representative DeLuca. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 503, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- is tabled. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative DeLuca on Floor Amendment #2, which the committee has recommended do adopt."
- DeLuca: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the Amendment be adopted."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Lang, on page 2 of the Calendar is House Bill 30. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 30, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative treatment for serious disease causing chronic pain and de... debilitating conditions. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. We know this is a controversial issue. By prior agreement with Mr. Cross, we've agreed to adopt the Amendment on a voice vote and debate it on Third Reading. I hope you'll join me in that so we only have to debate this one time. I would like to thank Mr. Cross and Republican staff for working so closely with us to draft this really good Amendment that I'll be happy to discuss it with you on Third Reading. Move the adoption of the Amendment."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Sacia. Representative Sacia, House Bill 1723. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Place that Bill on Third Reading.

 Representative Kelly Burke is seeking recognition."
- Burke, K.: "Point... point of personal privilege, Mr. Chair... Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Burke, K.: "I have in the gallery some visitors from my district. I have Joan Knox, who is an alderman in the City of Palos Hills, and Maureen Kelly. In addition to being an alderman in Palos Hills, Joan and Maureen are both staff members at St. Xavier University, the oldest Catholic college in Chicago and a proud resident of my district. Please welcome them."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

 Representative Phelps, House Bill 3237. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3237, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Kelly Burke,
 House Bill 3342. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3342, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendments 1 and 2 were both tabled. Floor Amendment #3 and Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #3."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These Amendments were technical Amendments just to clean up some language within the Bill and put things in their proper place within the statute."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #5."

Burke, K.: "Floor Amendment 5 was..."

- Speaker Mautino: "Excuse me. Floor Amendment #4, Sir.

 Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #5."
- Burke, K.: "Floor Amendment 5 was some additional, technical changes to the Bill..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption..."

Burke, K.: "...and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Mautino: "...of Floor Amendment #5. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the

42nd Legislative Day

- 'yeses' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Morthland,
 House Bill 3522. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3522, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is adopted to the Bill. However, notes have been requested and not yet received on this Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "We'll leave that Bill on Second Reading.

 House Bill 1569, Representative Bellock. Out of the record. Representative DeLuca, House Bill 1309. Out of the record. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege.

 I would like to introduce in the west gallery, Alderman Ann
 Thompson from the City of Rockford down here lobbying on
 behalf of the city along with Patrick Hayes, their legal
 director. Welcome to Springfield. Get the work done."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

 Representative Moffitt, House Bill 1362. Read the Bill.

 Take this Bill out of the record. Representative

 Jefferson, House Bill 3118. Out of the record.

 Representative Ramey, House Bill 2820. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2820, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled on the Bill. Committee Amendment #2 has been adopted. No Motions filed."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Rose, House Bill 2953. Out of the record. Representative Holbrook, House Bill... Representative Tryon, House Bill 3103. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3103, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Tryon, also on page 14 of the Calendar is House Bill 3252, on Second Reading. Out of the record. House Bill 1368 appears on the Calendar, Representative Holbrook. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from St. Clair."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. 1368, as amended, just requires a couple more extensive... a detailed reports on procurement of renewables for the IPA."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 1368. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Harris, Burns, Fortner, Pihos, Senger, Sosnowski, and Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1368 is declared passed. Representative Kay, House Bill 2607. The Gentleman from Madison. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Would you place this Bill on Second Reading? Representative Kay on Floor Amendment #2."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move this on to Third."

Speaker Mautino: "I believe you need to explain..."

Kay: "Oh, it's on..."

Speaker Mautino: "...the Amendment #2."

Kay: "Yes, I will."

Speaker Mautino: "It was recommended by committee."

Kay: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "You just have to put it on."

Kay: "This Amendment is Floor Amendment #2. It becomes the Bill and amends the Workers' Compensation Act to provide that accidental injuries incurred while an employee is engaged in commission of a forcible felony, aggravated driving under the influence of alcohol or other drugs, or reckless homicide, for which the employee is convicted, does not arise out of or in the course of employment, if the conduct caused an accident resulting in the death or severe injury of another person. And I ask that this be adopted."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2601. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed... excuse me. House Bill 2607. The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. House Bill 2607... Excuse me. Representative Mathias, House Bill 3283. Representative Mathias. Read the Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3283, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3283, as amended, basically increases the penalty in relation to child pornography and provides that if the child pornography is done by filming, or video taping, or creating a moving image, or possession of such pornography, that the penalty is a... one class higher than if it's done with still photography. The reason is those who commit this crime are more likely, if it's a moving type picture, to commit a serious crime against children than still pictures. And so the... the penalty is enhanced. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 3283. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Greg Harris. Representative Sandra Cole. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3283 is declared passed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair. Sox are ahead 3 to 1 in the sixth. Leader Currie on House Bill 2955. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Third Reading."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2955, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, and Members of the This is a very technical Bill that represents two years of work by our State Department of Revenue and the Taxpayers Federation of Illinois. It corrects ordinary technical errors in the statute. It make changes of, my view or not, particularly substantive, but as an example, under the current law the... the money that one receives from a partnership for, basically, salary would be something that would be subject to automatic sunsets. Well, the sunsets are in the statute to say that if there's a tax credit, or a tax deduction, we ought to review periodically and make sure it still makes sense. never intended that that would apply to the decision that something is accounted as salary that is not a... a tax credit, nor is it a tax deduction. Other changes include making sure that certain kinds of trusts are not subject to double taxation on the corporate personal property replacement tax side. I'd be happy to answer your questions. As I say, it's a very technical Bill and I think it has been thoroughly vetted, both by the department and the Taxpayers Federation, as well as our staffs. I'm available to answer your question, and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, could... could you... you described this as technical in nature. Could... could you describe how this

42nd Legislative Day

- Bill will affect the process, the overall revenue process, budgeting process?"
- Currie: "Actually, it's mostly cleanup. So, for example, it takes out language that is outdated. It connects to... our statute to some changes in the Federal Law. It really is making sure that we're not having a conflicting language in the statute, making sure that we are clear about how insurance companies treat tax-exempt bond interest, making sure that someone, as I said earlier, who is paid a salary through a partnership doesn't count as a tax credit that would be subject to a five-year sunset provision. So, we're trying to eliminate double taxation of certain kinds of trusts in the corporate personal property tax. Really, throughout the statutes, the effort here is to make sure that we have greater clarity and that we fix some things that should not have happened in the first place."
- Eddy: "Would... would you describe the language related to reinsurers as maybe a little more than technical change?"
- Currie: "Do... could you give me a reference to the page and the line item?"
- Eddy: "Yeah, if you give me just a second. There's... there's a specific subgroup of insurance companies called reinsurers, and this affects the calculation on how... how they file their income."
- Currie: "And would... could you give me a page and... and line number?"
- Eddy: "Yeah. Yeah. Give us a second, we'll... page 143, I believe, we've... we're referring to, and we're looking for the line. Yeah... basically, here's... here's what our

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

analysis outlines. It governs the way a specific subgroup of insurance companies called reinsure..."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "...reinsurers..."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "...calculate and file their income, so..."

Currie: "Right. So... so, the change is this. A couple of years ago, it used to be that reinsurance premiums could be sourced according to one of three methods, and every year the taxpayer could change his or her mind. Then... then, we said that you could only do... we would mandate the use of a single method and there was no opportunity to change. Apparently, there was a lot of confusion and it became very impractical for many taxpayers. So, what we do here, in this Bill, is to reinstate those earlier three choices, but we require the taxpayer to choose one and then to stick with it. So, this is different from the old law, but it does correct what was see... what has seemed to be very problematic with respect to the taxpayers in the current law."

Eddy: "So, based on that change, and... and, again, this is the only one I think that we... we categorize as maybe a little more than technical, that has... you're saying it's... it's return... or requiring them to choose which method that they're going to use."

Currie: "What we're doing is reinstating the three opportunities, the three methodologies, but unlike the old law that in 2008 we changed, we now say choose one and stick with it."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Eddy: "Okay. And... and it's for all subsequent tax years you stay with that."

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the explanations."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Brown,
Representative Tracy. Tracy, did you seek recognition?
Your light was on. No further discussion, Representative
Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. A highly technical Bill, I would appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2955 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.
Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 82 Members voting 'yes', 34 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Frank Mautino, on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, on page 22 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3441. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3441, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Frank Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This Bill is at the request of the CHIP board. Representative Leitch and I are the Legislative Members on there. They're asking the ability to extend

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

their contract for their current third party administrator or go to bid. They want to have that option. Reason being, the contracts are let in five-year increments. With the status of the new health care system, we don't know what CHIP status will be within the next two years. So, they're asking this flexibility to do a contract extension. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3441 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Dave Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, you also have House Bill 3449. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3449, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Frank Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This is an initiative of Comptroller Judy Baar Topinka, and this... this Bill encourages and moves towards a heavier usage of the direct deposit program. Currently, about 90 percent of the state employees, or better, are direct depositing their money. This also would ask the vendors to go to the direct deposits program. The figured savings on this is about a million dollars. Currently, it cost us about \$18.33 for every check that we

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

do process in paper form. And this is the Comptroller's idea to reduce that, save some money, and utilize existing technologies. There is a fee that's in... included over the... the first 30 checks. There's no charge for... for checks on paper. If that option is selected, there's a \$2.50 fee. The concerns of IRMA have been taken care of, and that exempted from the \$5 provision under the Prompt Payment Act. Happy to answer any questions. Appreciate an 'aye' vote. And I thank the Comptroller's Office for working with us and with all the groups who were concerned."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in strong support of this Bill. This is a very, very good idea. I had a Bill very similar to this last year. Quite frankly, I think anyone doing business with the State of Illinois, those that are receiving checks of any kind, should go to direct deposit. These are the kind of savings we can look at in the State of Illinois that cost everybody nothing yet saves the State of Illinois money at a time when we desperately need it and, quite frankly, there's a safety factor involved here. More checks are lost from people carrying them around than we ever have lost through the electronic trans... transfer process. So, many, many reasons why this is a really good Bill and it should fly out of here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 3449 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Sacia. Jim Sacia, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, on... No, you... 3283 passed Sid, correct? We did that Bill. Representative Senger, we have on the Order of Third Readings, on page 21 of the Calendar, House Bill 3156. Darlene Senger. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3156, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3156 basically changes the… let me pull it up here… the part of the code that pertains to ambulatory surgical centers. And in 1990, what… there was a law that put together a new breed of abortion clinics called pregnancy termination centers. What this House Bill is doing is basically saying the centers need to go on to the standard of a ambulatory surgical center. Right now, in the state, there are 142 ambulatory… registered licensed ambulatory surgical centers; they're throughout the state. And why they're there today and not in 1990, today we have a much broader use for outpatient and one day surgery centers, and these centers can be used… what we're looking at… the number of

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

centers we're looking right now at number in nine, total, that are pregnancy termination centers. So, those are the nine facilities that I'm looking to adjust, and then there's some other unlicensed substandard facilities to adjust, but compared to the 140... 142 centers that are in use, this is a small number. I've also agreed to work with the Medical Society and the Hospital Association to refine the Bill in the Senate to make sure that medical abortion, which is the abortion pill, is not part of this. And we've buttoned down very specifically that we're talking about the pregnancy termination specialty centers. So, I appreciate your support for this Bill."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, these ambulatory service centers, are there currently any guidelines at the state or federal level that they have to meet?"
- Senger: "There are different state standards and levels and they do have additional inspections."
- Davis, M.: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."
- Senger: "Yeah. There are... actually, they do have a higher level of standards for facility, building facility, and they are inspected on a regular yearly basis. Now, I'm not to say that some of the Planned Parenthood facilities and some of the, basically, abortion centers, they are already in compliance. There's a facility in... in Chicago doing the

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

research on Michigan Avenue that looks like it's... it's a newer facility, so they have the wider halls; they have the recovery rooms; they have the facil... but, there's some smaller facilities in Downers Grove and Hinsdale and... spattered throughout Chicago and the suburbs, lower in Rockford, that are the smaller standards."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a piece of legislation that is requiring higher standards for the building for an abortion than for a colonoscopy. colonoscopies are given at freestanding health centers, and there are those who feel that abortions should be permitted at freestanding health centers. Now, originally, I had signed on to be a Sponsor of this Bill, but after being lobbied by a number of organizations who felt that this legislation was an attempt to deny some women the opportunity from getting abortions. As I explained to those who were lobbying for the Bill, I do not want to come between a woman, her doctor, and her decisions. Her... a woman, her body, her doctor, and their decision, I don't want to be the one that comes between them on that issue. I think there's something else in this Bill that you might not have mentioned yet. Is this the one that they also have to sign for an amniocentesis? This is not this Bill? Okay. Is this going to create a tax increase?"

Senger: "What... this does not create a tax increase, but what this is asking to do is... is the centers... the facilities, right now, that aren't up to an ambulatory surgical standard, which is a standard where, you know, you can get emergency equipment and (indiscernible) the rest."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Davis, M.: "But who would... who would pay it?"

Senger: "The facilities, themselves. Now, one thing I want to make clear, there's a Anchor health care services. They have five different facilities in the suburbs. One of their facilities is in standard. So..."

Davis, M.: "But I..."

Senger: "...doctors can go there and use it."

Davis, M.: "...I have to be concerned with this facility, let's say, way in rural Illinois, and it's the only one there, and they have no way to get to the one that you're speaking Real far rural Illinois, and there's one freestanding center and it is not a great building like a hospital. We wish that it could be, but it is not. So, for us to say that these people have to stop giving this service and that women cannot use that facility, we're denying them the opportunity... I shouldn't say opportunity... we're denying them the right to do something that they choose to do. Do we want them to do that? No, we do not. We would prefer that women not abort their little babies. We prefer that they don't, but sometimes there's illness, sometimes there's incest, sometimes there's rape. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I loudly proclaim that this should be a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. We have several speakers on this. I'll put the time limit on this at four minutes, and we'll give extra time if needed, but we'll try to limit the time on this thing to four minutes. Representative Nekritz, you're recognized."

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

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, wasn't legislation similar to this the subject of a lawsuit about 20 years ago in <a href="Ragsdale V.Turnock?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Nekritz: "And what was the... what was the... do you know the results in that case?"

Senger: "Yeah. Basically, the case had to do with a building, particularly in Rockford, and... and it was ruled in favor of Rockford... in the Rockford facility."

Nekritz: "Yeah, and I'm having trouble hearing, but I... I think..."

Senger: "It was..."

Nekritz: "...that the result was that the Federal Courts held that... that legislation that was very similar to this was a violation of the Constitution, and... and so, the... the legislation was thrown out. As a result of that, I believe that there were some negotiations that resulted in the depart... the Illinois Department of Public Health regulating providers of abortion services. There are... are you familiar with those regulations?"

Senger: "Yes. Yeah, I'm familiar with the regulations."

Nekritz: "And those regulations have been in place for 20 years now?"

Senger: "What... Yeah. What is going on... and I'm going to go back and answer another statement about pregnancy termination centers. This was a new breed of clinics, basically, put in place after the Ragsdale outcome, and they are located right now in Hinsdale, Glen Ellyn, Downers

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Grove, Des Plains, Des Plains, Chicago, Peoria, Rockford, and Lin... Lincolnwood. They are not in small, downstate facilities right now. What has changed since 1990 is that some of these centers are up to standard right now, as a surgical center. Some of the... some of the names that I just listed have affiliates that have a surgical center."

Nekritz: "But... but there..."

Senger: "And we have..."

Nekritz: "...is there any reason to believe..."

Senger: "...140 surgical centers."

Nekritz: "...that any of those... that any of those providers that you just mentioned are not meeting the Department of Public Health standards?"

Senger: "I have a... a research done here where someone went and checked the health standards going back in, to one case, 1995 and there were violations. On top of that, many of the centers have not been inspected. The worse..."

Nekritz: "So... so the..."

Senger: "...abuse, they haven't been inspected since 1995."

Nekritz: "But... but Representative, is there... is there... are... do you have any statistics that indicate that women's health are being affected by that?"

Senger: "I have..."

Nekritz: "I mean, I understand that there might be violations, but... but there's nothing to indicate from the Department of Public Health, in fact, they're... they're opposed to your legislation, because they don't think that this impact... that this is intended, really, to improve the health and safety of... of women."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Senger: "There... there is... there is violations in there, but you're correct. They don't have any specific saying, you know..."

Nekritz: "Right. So..."

Senger: "...specific violation."

Nekritz: "...so, the fact that they might have been... I'm sure that those... I... I don't know, but I could imagine that those violations have been corrected. But there's nothing to indicate that those... that those regulations, as they've existed for the last 20 years, are not working to protect women's health when it comes to the abortion providers."

Senger: "And, not... not to disregard your point 'cause, basically, there is one case where the violations haven't ... I can't say they're not corrected, but there hasn't been an inspection since to show the corrections. What... basically, what we're doing here is not saying that, you know, that Ragsdale settlement, at the time, made sense. But what we're saying now is particularly in regards to the facility you're in, for emergency access to defibrillators, recovery room numbers, you know, the rest that are part of the ambulatory centers, women should have equal opportunity to be in a safe building. The new Planned Parenthood in Aurora, which I visited, they were proud to have me come in 'cause they are in compliance with the standards. should women in Aurora have a better facility than the women in Downers Grove?"

Nekritz: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. In 19... the early 1990s, legislation very, very similar to this was declared unconstitutional by the Illinois Federal Courts. Since

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

that time, we've been under a regulatory scheme by the Illinois Department of Public Health. It has been working just fine to protect the health and safety of women. This is simply designed to put these clinics out of... that those that don't already comply with this, out of business, and restrict abortion services, as one of my colleagues said, in those areas in which they... they are limited already. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. This is not about protecting women."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm... I'm just curious. There are a number of organizations on... on my analysis who are opposed to your legislation: the National Organization for Women, the Planned Parenthood of Illinois, ACLU, Illinois Choice Action Team, McHenry County Citizens for... for Choice, League of Women Voters, Chicago Abortion Fund. I'm just curious, why are they opposed to this legislation?"

Senger: "You know, I'll answer... part of... part of what is going on here for it, particularly with the ACLU, which I've been trying to reach out and work with them, they... we haven't had a real conversation. Looking at the state again and the facilities that are there, particularly, the new, you know, the... the category called pregnancy termination specialty centers, and how in today's environment with the fact that they have all these centers available and the doctors can use them, why not have a woman in the safe

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

center. We... I... I can say, we haven't sat down and had a real conversation."

Dunkin: "So, Representative, I'm... I'm curious, I mean, these are some of the leading women... or women's organization in our state that a lot of Members here on both sides of the aisle respect, and you could... you couldn't come up with some type of understanding or clarification or compromise that made sense where it wouldn't be so... seem so lopsided in terms of opposition?"

Senger: "There is... there's not just opposition, there's proponents on this too. And again, what I'm trying to... I'm not trying to create a real hardship here to put the centers under..."

Dunkin: "Can you speak clearly into the mic? I can barely hear you. Sorry."

Senger: "I can. I've not... the intent here is not to put a hardship on those doing a procedure, isn't going to put them out of business. The intent here is to basically say if you have a facility and you've got affiliate building, and the building that is in code with the ambulatory center, use that building. But the other thing I'm saying, if there's a... you can, today, through a board approval, use a lot of the outpatient facilities for the center. And the facilities that we're looking at are the nine; Hinsdale, Glen Ellyn, Downers Grove, Des Plaines, Des Plaines, Chicago, Peoria..."

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, you know..."

Senger: "...Rockford and Glenwood."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Dunkin: "...I'm... I'm watching the clock. These... these organizations, I'm sure you would agree, have a vested interest and concern for women throughout this country, as well as in the state. Wouldn't you agree?"

Senger: "Yes."

Dunkin: "So, why would they be so adamantly opposite of your legislation? Because I look at these organizations as being very, very pro, in support of women in today's time and not sort of in an antiquated way. Why is it that there was not an adequate compromise or some level of understanding that addresses this major issue?"

Senger: "You know, again, I'm willing... there are... there are some faults in the Bill right now that may address some of the issues, and I'd like to make it more clear that this does not pertain to medical abortions, which is our..."

Dunkin: "Can you pull it out of the record until you at least come up with a compromise with these progressive organizations?"

Senger: "I, basically... I was promised I could work with this in a Senate Amendment."

Dunkin: "Okay. Well, so, can you pull... pull it out of the record until you can come up with a compromise because this is a stark..."

Senger: "No."

Dunkin: "...contrast to this legislation, and it doesn't appear as if you are interested in coming up with some resolution."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Senger: "I've been working on this for a while. We've been working together and no, I will not pull it out of the record."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time's expired. Do you need one more minute to conclude your thoughts?"

"To the Bill. Representative, I am... have the upmost respect for what... where you're coming from and you as a This is pretty significant here in this Legislator. chamber, in this state, and I think we need to tread very carefully what we legislate here, in this Body, when it comes to citizens, adult citizens, making choices of where and how they are choosing to take their life... excuse me, their approach towards their own bodies. And I... I think a number of organizations that adamantly oppose this legislation are organizations that all of us have the upmost regard for, and they need to be considered, as well. I think most of us work sometimes years for compromise and doing the right thing for the citizens here in the state. I'm going to vote 'no' because there is no understanding with some of these premier progressive organizations. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Jakobsson: "Representative, who wrote this Bill?"

Senger: "It was brought to me by a lobbyist with the Federation for life."

Jakobsson: "A lobbyist. Was it written by the Thomas Moore Society?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Senger: "It was a Bill written by the Thomas Moore Society.

Actually, the Bill was a combination, including some of my input. The Amendment includes the part that says three years. You don't have to do… you don't have to be in compliance for three years unless you're doing a permit."

Jakobsson: "Well, if... you know, I had an understanding, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the Thomas Moore Society had a part... had a role to play in this. And, you know, they've never supported any measure that enhances access to reproductive health care, and we're talking about all kinds of health care. So, do you think that they're trying to shut down, and are you trying to shut down all kinds of reproductive health care?"

"This is absolutely... no matter what the Thomas Moore Senger: Society is saying, this is... this is my Bill and that is not my intent, at all. As I had said, I made... I actually made visits to some of the facilities. I made a visit to Aurora Planned Parenthood, which is a new building. It's not licensed, but they were very proud to show me the facility, and I'm not... actually, I'm surprised the pro-lifers are... are not against the fact that I think that facility is a safe facility and I'm not saying that a woman shouldn't be there. I also made a visit to the Downers Grove facility, which is a very different building from the Planned Parenthood. When you walk in the door, you've got a small door which you immediately have to do a 45 angled turn to So, this is a Bill that I've worked on to basically highlight and to educate the differences between buildings that are doing surgery and... these are

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

surgeries, and we were talking about the downstate facilities. I mean, given how far they are from hospitals, you would want to have the ability to get emergency equipment in real quick if something went wrong."

Jakobsson: "Well, doesn't Illinois already have an extensive regulatory system for surgical procedures, including surgical abortion?"

Senger: "This is not... has nothing to do with the procedures.

It has to do with the facility, the build... the physical building itself; recovery rooms with a door; basically, a... a room for consulting; and it has to do with the physical building itself."

Jakobsson: "Well, of course, the building of... is where the surgeries take place. So, we are talking about them. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "...Bill. Go ahead, Representative."

Jakobsson: "I'm just going to be very quick to the Bill. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "I knew she would and... and of course, I... I have no questions for the Gentle Lady. I have observed that the last four speakers were quite firm in their opposition of the Gentle Lady's legislation. Fact, one Gentleman said that it was just amazing to him that there were so many opponents and that she should pull the Bill out of the record. Well, apparently, our analyses are greatly different because I show five proponents: Concerned

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Christian Americans, Illinois Federation for Right to Life, Illinois Citizens for Life, Students for Life in Illinois, and the Thomas Moore Society and three opponents: Planned Parenthood, ACLU, and the League of Women Voters. And that was the moment that I... I turned my light on because I think the Lady has a good piece of legislation, and to insinuate that the Thomas Moore Society is the driving force behind it, I... I think it's very, very unfair. And... and a Gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that he strongly supports women's groups. Well, I certainly do as I strongly support women groups, but I also support the unborn. And I think we're we're losing sight of the fact here that this is an issue that deals with the safety of the life of a woman and the life of the unborn. applaud the Gentle Lady for bringing this legislation forward. To ask her to pull it out of the record until more people support it, just absolutely unacceptable. has a good piece of legislation. She has worked hard on this issue and on other issues that pertain to the unborn. I applaud her efforts and I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think that after reading the analysis of this, this issue was really... came back from a long time ago with an article from the Chicago Sun Times and the Better Government Association referring to some women who had died in abortion clinics and they felt that clinics needed to be investigated and that they needed to have more regulations

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

on them. So, I think this issue is more about regulation and the adequacy of the regulations across all ambulatory surgical centers in Illinois. And I think for protection of women, whether you agree with abortion or not, I don't think that that really applies here. I think that all of our ambulatory surgical centers should not have any disparity in the regulations, but should be the same. I don't know if there are any other surgical centers that they changed some of the regulations, depending upon what they are, I've asked several people on the floor and they don't know that. But I think that this Bill is something that is addressing the issues of just the same regulations pertaining to all ASTCs across the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, have you visited pregnancy termination centers that are not being affected by these rules?"

Senger: "I visited the Planned Parenthood in Aurora."

Reis: "And what did you find there?"

Senger: "They were proud to have me come in 'cause they were in compliance with the ambulatory code. It was... basically, the walk-in; they halls are white; they do have the recovery rooms; they... they have a place in there for consulting. You know, it's just a whole... it's a... it's a facility that looks like a place you'd go in today to get a colonoscopy."

Reis: "So, they wouldn't be affected by this legislation?"

Senger: "They would not be."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Reis: "So, everything's just fine there."

Senger: "That's right."

Reis: "Whether or not you agree with abortions, they're in compliance with the rules that this would require for everyone, and life goes on. Right?"

Senger: "Right."

Reis: "Are there other states that have requirements on all pregnancy termination centers like you're trying to implement now?"

Senger: "Yes. That I do not know. I don't know."

Reis: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. There was some... a lot of controversy as to why this was assigned to this particular committee. Don't know why it was appointed to that committee, but it did. And people came in that day and say that women aren't livestock. Well, you know what, we should treat them better livestock because veterinarian clinics have higher standards than abortion clinics... some of the abortion clinics do. should treat women with respect that go into this, and whether or not we agree with abortion or not, I'd love to That isn't what this Bill does. All have that debate. this Bill says is that all clinics should be held to a higher standard, the same standards that we would a surgical center; risk of infection, the risk of sexually transmitted diseases, HIV. All those things should be make sure that women who do go in and have this procedure done with a surgical process, are not going to be at risk for these things to happen. This Bill merely says that these centers should be run in the same way. I don't know why

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

we're… we're having this discussion. This is not going to limit the right for a woman to terminate a pregnancy. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had four people speak in favor of the Bill, four people speak in response to the Bill. We put this on the timer for extended Debate from the floor. I'll ask that Representative Currie be the final speaker, and then Representative Senger to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. First, I would like to request a verification should this Bill get the required number of votes. If this Bill were about patient safety, then I don't understand why it doesn't apply to dentist, podiatrists, people who do Lasik eye surgery, people who do varicose vein removal, people who do liposuction, who do other kinds of procedures not dissimilar to early stage abortions, a terminations; knee surgeries, as well. If that were the issue, that would not be the Bill before us. Right now, in Illinois, we have evidence based regulation of health care facilities. There is no question that since the Ragsdale decision, that evidence based system says that early termination can be performed without having to be performed in a hospital. This Bill is not about late term abortions, it's not about complicated surgical procedures. It's about a straightforward procedure that has been legally done in these facilities since the Ragsdale decision. recently about a child who died after treatment in a dental office that did not meet ATSCs requirements. So, why a dental office is not included in this Bill? If this Bill

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

were about patient safety, it would not be targeted, and only one procedure in which it is not medically necessary to provide a full scale hospital. The cost of... of bringing these clinics up to the standards defined in House Bill 3156 would be somewhere between one... one million and two The Aurora clinic, although it has been million dollars. said, is in compliance with ATSC standards, is not. the cost of bringing it up to that standard would be at least a million dollars. The point of this Bill is to close the clinics. The point of this Bill is to make legal abortion, early abortion, in Illinois, unavailable inaccessible. Should this Bill become law, it is my guess, not only will these services no longer be available, but you will find women who have no other options, turning to the dangerous back alley abortions that were common in this state and in this country before Roe V. Wade. This is an underhanded effort to shut down abortion. It has nothing to do with patient safety. I urge your strong 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Senger to close."

Senger: "Yes. I just... a couple comments. If something was a surgery that had to be in an ambulatory surgical center, those... those procedures would be under the code to do that. What... basically what is going on here is, this is something, again, it's the safety of the woman in the building, in her building, to get emergency care when needed. Reading through... and this is one of the centers that actually is not in compliance. If you read through the first trimester of what you have to do to prepare for the surgery, it says plan to spend three to five hours at

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

the clinic; make sure you have a prearranged ride from the... from the clinic; do not wear jewelry, including earrings, bracelets, rings, et cetera; all body piercing must be removed. If you are going to sleep for the surgery, which they will put you under if you request and this is first trimester, not second, and some are doing second trimester, you may have no piercings in your mouth or nose. Do not bring any valuables in a large amount; and please do not bring children into the clinic. So, we're... what this clinic is calling is they're saying preparing for your surgery, and that's the first trimester."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation.

Representative Barbara Flynn Currie's asked for a verification on this, so please push your own switches. We had Extended Debate on this, and the questions is, 'Should House Bill 3156 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford, Hatcher, like to be record? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 57 'yeas', 51 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. Representative Senger."

Senger: "I ask for postponed consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative DeLuca. Representative DeLuca, on the Order of Third Reading, you have House Bill 1310. Out of the record. Representative Rosenthal, on the Order of Third Reading, on page 19 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1914. Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record. Representative Jakobsson, on the

42nd Legislative Day

- Order of Third Reading, on page 19 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2066. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, status on that Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2066 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I believe you have a Amendment in Rules. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk? There's an Amendment that's been approved in Rules. Would you like to take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for it's adoption?"
- Jakobsson: "Yes, please. That's why I rose."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading, and what's the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative on the Floor Amendment, Floor Amendment #3."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment to this is something that we worked on with the Department of Employment Security just to make sure that we're in compliance with them, and IDES requested the Amendment. The AOIC has agreed to supply the list to county boards. And it just makes it subject to federal regulations. That's what this third Amendment does in agreement with working with the Illinois Department of Employment Security."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor to its adoption signify by saying 'yes';

42nd Legislative Day

- those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Reading, Representative Morthland, on page 16 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3522. You have an Amendment. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3522 has been read a second time, previously. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill, as well as Floor Amendment #2. There is a request, a correctional note request, for House Amendment... on House Amendment #1 still on the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Representative DeLuca, on the Order of Second Reading,

 House Bill 1309. Out of the record. Representative Chuck

 Jefferson, on the Order of Second Reading, you have House

 Bill 3118. Out of the record. Chapin Rose, on the Order

 of Second Reading, on page 13 of the Calendar, you have

 House Bill 2953. 2953. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2953, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Representative Mike Tryon, on the Order of Second Reading,
 you have two Bills on page 13 of the Calendar. You have
 House Bill 3103. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3103, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

42nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Representative Tryon, you have House Bill 3252. 3252 on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3252, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Patti Bellock, on the Order of Second Reading, on page 8 of the Calendar, Representative, you have House Bill 1569. 1569, Representative Bellock. Out of the record. Representative Lisa Hernandez, you have, on the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 1241. 1241, Representative Hernandez. Read the Bill. Hold the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Leave it on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Hernandez, do you wish to have that Bill run a second time? Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 1241?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1241 has been read a second time, previously, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Tryon, you have House Bill 308. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 308, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Tryon, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon on Floor Amendment #1.

 Mike Tryon, there's a Amendment you'd like to explain?

 Amendment #1 on House Bill 308."

42nd Legislative Day

- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is an... an agreed Amendment between the operating engineers and the pipe fitters. I'd like to thank Representative Verschoore for all of his efforts on working on this, and it... it essentially sets up a licensing board as part of the well water code for geothermal closed... closed loop wells. And be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 308 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 224?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 224 is on the Order of Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "House Bill 22... 224 was on Postponed Consideration by Representative Mary Flowers and had a full debate. Representative Mary Flowers on House Bill 224."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've had the debate on 224, and the only thing this Bill does is bring Illinois law into conformity for consumers in regards to... with Federal Law. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "All right. This... the debate has been thoroughly done on this thing, but we'll recognize Representative Osmond."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to clarify one thing before we do the vote. Representative, you stated before that there was... or I questioned you before about the opposition from the industry, and I know that we have a deadline of July 1st to get this in place. And what I'm asking now, I'll be happy to support this issue, if you could just... I know that you tried to work with the industry, and I would hope that you would be, again, amenable to you and the Sponsor for the Senate also working with the industry to try to get any of their questions resolved so that when it does come into place it's in the right position."

Flowers: "Absolutely, Representative. That's what I said in my closing remark. I'll be more than happy to continue to work with the industry."

Osmond: "Thank you very much."

Flowers: "And thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Watson, last question, then...

then to the vote. Representative Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, just a... a statement. My conversation with the department is... is that their goal is, one, is we have a deadline that we have to meet, but their goal is to do this and not, as much as possible, not expand beyond the federal requirements. Is that your..."

Flowers: "That is the intent."

Watson: "...intent? Great. Thanks... thanks, Rep."

Flowers: "Thank you."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flowers, do you wish to close?" Flowers: "Apprec... I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 224 pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote
'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady,
Brauer. Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
Bill, there are 71 Members voting 'yes', 45 Members voting
'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lou Lang on
the Order of Second Reading, on page 13 of the Calendar,
Lou, you have House Bill 3107. Out of the record.
Representative Hammond, for what purpose do you seek... do
you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Hammond: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to any and all of my colleagues, not just on this side of the aisle, but also on the other side of the aisle. I'd like to request your help, if I may. I'm looking for a Senate Sponsor for House Bill 3178. If any of you can help me with that, I would greatly appreciate it. It's also known as my roadkill Bill. Thank you. Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis, you have House Bill 1284. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1284, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance, is on the order of Second Readings. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. Floor Amendment #3, offered by

42nd Legislative Day

- Represen... Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis on Floor Amendment #3."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 clarifies a great deal of the supervising entity, and the fact that the person or whoever wants to be the insurer, they have 90 days after the effective date in order to become a part of this vendor solution for electronic devices. And I just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Moffitt, on the Order of Second Reading, on page 7 of the Calendar, Don, you have House Bill 1362. Out of the record. Representative Dave Winters, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a point of personal privilege. My seatmate, Representative Joe Sosnowski, who is never in his seat, is his 34 birthday today. Wouldn't it be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, if we could allow the freshman to go out and get ready on his birthday to break a leg in the softball game. But again, Representative Joe Sosnowski on his birthday. Congratulations."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Happy birthday, Joe, many happy, healthy more.

 Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 94?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 94 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 And what's the status on the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3, both offered by Representative Ford, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford, you have Floor Amendment #2 and #3. Do you want to proceed with Floor Amendment #2?"
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Move to adopt Floor Amendment #2. And I'm open for any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters and Representative Hammond, you still have your lights on. I don't think you want to address the… you wish to address the Amendment, Representative? We're… we're on the Order of a Bill here so, I'll get back to you, Norine. That's a promise. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment 2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford on Floor Amendment #3."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I move to adopt Amendment #3. And I will take any questions at this time."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments or Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 94 is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I move for the passage of House Bill 94. There's been some changes to the Bill to make this Bill, I believe, a little fairer to the people of Illinois. And I'm very happy that I was able to work with the Republican side to make these changes so that everyone in Illinois benefits from good legislation. I move for passage of House Bill 94."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I think the goal here is... is to establish a different method for counting... counting individuals who are housed in the Department of Correction facilities to their prior... their residence prior to their incarceration. Is that... that basically what you're

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

attempting to do? You don't want to count them where they are, you want to count them where they were."

Ford: "Sometimes."

Eddy: "Pardon me?"

Ford: "Sometimes. Only in the most fair circumstance."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we need a little more quiet on the House Floor. Ladies and Gentlemen, shhhh.

Thank you very much. Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this includes all Department of Correction facilities, local and county jails that have those convicted of misdemeanors, but not those being held, who are still kind of waiting for trial or... or disposition, and the Department of Juvenile Justice, as well, those youth convicted of criminal felons. It includes all of those individuals?"

Ford: "It does includes everyone that this Bill talks about, yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Does... does the Bill apply to all the inmates in one of the qualifying facilities, or just those that qualify?"

Ford: "Just those that qualify."

Eddy: "So, does it apply to all the inmates in the county jail, since the county jail is a facility..."

Ford: "No. State facilities."

Eddy: "...that houses convicted of... those convicted of crimes?"

Ford: "No. Just state... state and federal."

Eddy: "Are you sure?"

Ford: "I mean, if you know..."

Eddy: "Have you checked the language..."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "...something different, than I..."

Eddy: "...of this?"

Ford: "...I could..."

Eddy: "Pardon me?"

Ford: "I'm... If you know something that I don't know and your analysis tells you different, then, if you're correcting me, then I... I stand to be corrected here."

Eddy: "Well, the Bill provides that the governmental entity who completed the census has to provide the name, age, gender and race, of the last address in which the person resided before the person's current incarceration. So, wouldn't that include those incarcerated at a county jail?"

Ford: "No. County jail, they're not sentenced yet. They're...
they're waiting to be sentenced most of the time. So, once
they are sentenced to prison, this is when this Bill would
take effect, once they're sentenced to a state prison."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, Representative, who... who reports the address?"

Ford: "Secretary of State will report it."

Eddy: "Well, but who..."

Ford: "Or the warden would report it to the Secretary of State.

Secretary of State will report it to... in the census."

Eddy: "Well, the individual that's incarcerated though, don't...
aren't they self-reporting the address?"

Ford: "When they're... Yes. When they enter the prison, an address is given."

Eddy: "So, when they fill out this paperwork and they state that they reside in a local jail or they report something... who checks that? How... how do..."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "Good. That's a good point."

Eddy: "...you verify..."

Ford: "And that's a part of the… in the change. If a person claims that they are… that they have no last known address, one of the Leaders on this side of the aisle, Representative Lou Lang, suggested that we make sure that we correct that. That if a person has no last known address, if that person is… last known address is the prison, then we're going to use that address for that individual. So, that's covered. It's just the one…"

Eddy: "But... but they still self-report."

Ford: "Self-report, right."

Eddy: "They self-report."

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "And... and what's the verification process of their selfreporting?"

Ford: "Well, I'm not... I can't answer that. I mean, we have to talk to the warden..."

Eddy: "So, there's no way to verify that they're actually at the residence that they report, that they're claiming to be at, prior to their incarceration."

Ford: "Well, I think that we could count on our state departments to make sure that they report accurate information. If... if you say that the information that they give to the state department is inaccurate, then we should really look at how the state records information."

Eddy: "So, what you're saying is there's a potential here for the Department of Corrections to have to verify for each individual claiming an address, whether or not they had

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

that address, not only upon incarceration, but the way the Bill reads, also upon release."

Ford: "No. I mean, the only time that you would have to do that is if there's a question. I mean, right now, everyone that enters a prison, they will have an address on record, and that's a fact."

Eddy: "Representative, in your opinion, how long should an inmate be in a facility before they don't, I guess in the manner of the word, reside or live, at the last known address anymore? How long?"

Ford: "Eight years."

Eddy: "Eight years."

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "So, in other words, the individual has to be an inmate in a facility for eight years."

Ford: "But the Bill says four."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the Bill says four and you mean it to be eight, so..."

Ford: "No."

Eddy: "...is that what you said."

Ford: "It's four now."

Eddy: "The Bill says four."

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "Well, the Bill says there's... if they have less than four years remaining on their sentence."

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "My question was how long do they have to be in a facility before they don't reside, under the terms of your

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Bill, before they don't reside or live at their last known address?"

Ford: "The last known address, is that what you're asking?

Well, the law says, as we talked about in this debate
earlier, that will always be their known address. A prison
can never be an individual's address, but..."

Eddy: "Well, the..."

Ford: "...the last known address is never the prison address."

Eddy: "How does that work if you're serving life in prison then?"

Ford: "That's why the Bill says if you have four years less... or if you have more than four year remaining on your sentence, then we're going to count you at that prison. So, that covers that. I... I worked with your side to make sure that wasn't an issue anymore because it would be unfair if we had a person that is sentenced to life being counted at their last known address and they were going to be in the prison for the rest of their life."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I would characterize it as unfair counting someone where they are not, and that's what this Bill does. This allows some person to be counted in a census where they don't live. They don't live there..."

Ford: "Well, you know..."

Eddy: "...and they may never live there..."

Ford: "...and I don't think they live in a prison."

Eddy: "...again. There's nothing..."

Ford: "They just stay there."

Eddy: "...that says that they're ever going to physically live at that address again just because..."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "Where... where would you say you..."

Eddy: "...it was their last known address."

Ford: "I think they just spend a night there. I mean, would you say you live in Springfield, or would you say you live in your district?"

Eddy: "Representative, I'm not counted in Springfield on the census."

Ford: "Right. Because..."

"But this is not a prison. Now, if you want to Eddy: characterize it that way, that's your business, but I never looked at it that way. I think this is a place for public service. There's a big difference between this... I mean, we have long hours here, but I think we can come and go. don't think that's a pretty... a very good analogy. Representative, I don't want to... I really think with the crux of this... because there are issues related to the Department of Corrections that house the interstate compact inmates. Their last address is from another state. There... there's people whose last address is out of the country. How you going to count those people? The Bill doesn't account for that. The Bill provides that each federal facility in the state that incarcerates persons convicted of a crim... criminal offense should also provide the same information to the Secretary of State. Right?"

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "How does that happen in the system that we have for the Department of Corrections? Some..."

Ford: "Well, you... you know, I think we'll deal with one thing at a time. You know, I know you're in education and you

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

know there are a lot of departments in education. You deal with math, you deal with English, you deal with reading. So, right now, we're just going to deal with the prisoners. They need some special attention. I really appreciate you fighting for them..."

Eddy: "What about federal?"

Ford: "...but I want them."

Eddy: "What about federal prisons?"

Ford: "It... it covers them. It's for state and federal."

Eddy: "Well..."

Ford: "This is the..."

Eddy: "This... this is the Illinois Department of Corrections.

Where's the language in here that covers the... the federal prison in Greenville, and Marion, and Chicago, and..."

Ford: "Can you ask the question again?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

Ford: "All right."

Eddy: "I don't see the language in here that deals with the federal prisons."

Ford: "Yeah. You're right. It's not there."

Eddy: "So... so, it's not in here."

Ford: "Right."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... as always, I... I understand and... and I do... I do recognize what the Representative's trying to do. He's representing what he believes to be a fair change, but the... the census is supposed to count people where they reside, where they live, and that's for purposes

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

that we all know, provide services, and that count is that snap..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I'll give you another minute."

Eddy: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. That count is that snap... snapshot moment in time. This Bill just simply does not meet what the goal of the census requires. I urge a... a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I want to make sure I... I understand what this Bill, as amended, would do. And let me kind of walk through what I think I've heard, and you can please correct me in the record. So, it sounds like what we're asking the... the Department of Corrections to do is at sometime between when the census data is released and May 1, to inquire of those prisoners who are anticipated to be released within the next four years, about this information, about the prior address. Is that correct?"

Ford: "I... I need you to ask that again."

Fortner: "I... I'd be happy to."

Ford: "Yeah."

Fortner: "The… as I understand it that… what this is asking is that sometime between when the census data is released and May 1st, the… so, during that two-month period, the Department of Corrections would identify what members of its prison population who are going to be scheduled for release within four years, and they would inquire prior address. Is that what I'm understanding from this Bill?"

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "That's correct."

Fortner: "And then, sometime between May 1st and August 1st, the Secretary of State would be required to release the adjusted census block totals to reflect those changes of address. Is that correct?"

Ford: "And right now it's 30 days. And I got to tell you, Representative, Professor, that we have 20 years to get this right, but I think that we should really look at passing this measure and continuing to work on it because we have 20... 10 years to get it right. So..."

Fortner: "Well, I think redistricting is an important enough measure that it tends, my experience both in my brief tenure here and watching the goings on..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time expired. We'll give you another minute."

Fortner: "Thank you. That this... this process often gets too much overlook during the decade until you get to just a couple years before or the... the year of the redistricting and then it tends to go quiet. And I appreciate your thought that we have this time, but my experience is that we often do not, as a Body, focus on that. And I... I think that if we're going to do this, it... it behooves us to really get it right, and getting that time line right, making sure it's going to mesh. What I see here, I'm not sure is even going to mesh with what we, as a Legislature, would need to be able to do in a timely fashion. So, I think this is still not a Bill that is ready, that I would be able to trust for how to work in 2020. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I was going to ask a question, but I think you answered it, but I want to clarify it. When will your Bill take effect?"

Ford: "In 10 years, for the next census reporting period, 20..."

Reis: "We're working on a Bill that won't really effect anything until the 2020..."

Ford: "Well, the professor said we need to move early on things and we wait too long. And so, I think that this is a good thing that we start now..."

Reis: "Oh."

Ford: "...because it take time to get things done, the professor said. You don't mind do you?"

Reis: "I... I know the wheels of government sometimes turn slow. Representative, come on. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, these are set up... census numbers are set up the way they are because important grants, and things like that, that come back to communities are based on census numbers. The local counties that these facilities are located in are going to... bearing the brunt of these added services, whether it's education, law enforcement, whatever. Those grant moneys should be coming into those counties so that they can pay for those services. To reverse this and send the money elsewhere, would really put rural counties, where most of these facilities are located at, at a real disadvantage. I urge a strong 'no' vote."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Speaker Lyons: "We have three speakers left, Stephens, Dunkin, Reboletti, and then Ford to close. Representative Ron Stephens."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Stephens: "Just briefly, Representative. We've debated this Bill ad nauseam, but could you tell the Body the address that you wish to have established as their census counting address, if I can call it that, their count in the census. Is there a guarantee that they won't be released to that address?"

Ford: "I... I don't speak to guarantees."

Stephens: "I'm sorry."

Ford: "I can't guarantee anything."

Stephens: "Well, Representative, we... can we guarantee that they will be counted in the census..."

Ford: "No."

Ford: "...at that address?"

Ford: "You... no."

Stephens: "What's the purpose of your Bill, again?"

Ford: "Because right now, if you know, some of these people are not counted at the prison address because the cities or the villages have a choice of not counting them. So, if you're concerned..."

Stephens: "No. No, no, no."

Ford: "...about them being counted..."

Stephens: "The city or village does not count people..."

Ford: "But... but..."

Stephens: "...the U.S. Census Bureau does."

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Ford: "No. They... they can report their population..."

Stephens: "Excuse me."

Ford: "...and if they don't report the population of the prison..."

Stephens: "The city of... the city does not run the prison, okay?"

Ford: "I didn't say they did.

Stephens: "The village doesn't."

Ford: "I didn't say they did."

Stephens: "They have nothing to do..."

Ford: "I didn't say they did."

Stephens: "...with the cen..."

Ford: "I didn't say they did. I didn't say they did."

Stephens: "You said that they that they reported the count.

What count would they have? They don't have access to..."

Ford: "They have access to the number of people in the prison in their... in their county. Is that correct?"

Stephens: "No. That is just not true."

Ford: "It is correct."

Stephens: "It is not true."

Ford: "Yes, it is."

Stephens: "Well, okay. Mr. Speaker..."

Ford: "And he's wrong."

Stephens: "...I'll... before I proceed, I want to, if this Bill gets the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification of the 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "So noted."

Stephens: "The… so, we're going to establish an address for that person, but we're not going to release them to that…

Representative."

42nd Legislative Day

- Ford: "Sir, I'm glad you got the light back on. Can we pull this Bill from the record?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

 Representative Morthland, on the Order of Second Reading, I
 believe you have House Bill 3522. Out of the record.

 Representative Hammond, I promised we'd get back to you on
 the point of personal privilege. Still looking for a
 Sponsor? Any luck, Representative?"
- Hammond: "Not yet, Mr. Speaker, but thank you. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."
- Hammond: "I would like to welcome, in the gallery, a group of gentlemen, firefighters from my district. They are part of the R.S.P.&E. Fire Protection District, and I appreciate that they... everything they do to keep us safe in our district. Thank you, gentlemen."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, enjoy your day, gentlemen. You're back. Representative Morthland, on the Order of Second Reading, you have House Bill 3522. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3522, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation has been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted to the Bill. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Attention, Members. Again, everybody, regarding Amendments for Bills. If you were looking to get a substantive Amendment on your Bill, you blew it, 'cause the deadline was at noon today. You have about 18 hours... if you want to get a technical Amendment on

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

your Bill, you've got until Thursday, April 14 at the hour of noon. Last call for technical Amendments. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 267, offered by Representative Kelly Burke. House Resolution 268, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 269, offered by Representative Fortner. House Resolution 272, offered by Representative May. And House Resolution 274, offered by Representative Dunkin."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Motion on the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Acevedo moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have committees, and there's about 11 committees scheduled today for... tomorrow, tomorrow morning. Mr. Clerk, on these... committee schedule for tomorrow morning."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Tomorrow morning committee meetings are at 8 a.m. The Appropriation Human Services is in Room 122B. Elementary & Secondary Education is in Room 114 at 8 a.m. At 8:30 a.m. is the Executive Committee in Room 118. At 9 a.m. Environmental Health will meet in Room D-1. Transportation: Regulation, and Roads & Bridges will meet in Room 413. Counties & Townships in Room 115 at 9 a.m. Business & Occupational License in Room C-1 at 9 a.m., and Public Utilities meets at 9:00 a.m. in Room 118. At 9:30 a.m., Housing meets in Room D-1, Personnel & Pensions in

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

Room C-1, and Judiciary-Civil Law, Jud. 1, in Room 4... 413, Stratton."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack McGuire. Representative McGuire, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of guests that I'd like to introduce. They're from the Elwood Fire District, which is near Joliet, in my district. And I believe... I hope they're up there. We have the Elwood Fire District Chief, Bill Offerman, and I have a trustee from the fire board, Norman Fanning, and a trustee by the name of Colleen Prieboy, who happens to be my secretary in my Joliet office. And they have a special guest from Russia. The young lady... I didn't say Ireland, from Russia, a young lady named Kate. If you all could stand... the people that I have introduced, would you please stand up. Oh, there they are."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, folks. Glad to have you in Springfield. Ladies and Gentlemen, I take a leave from the podium. If you want to retain this beautiful trophy in the House, there is a softball game tonight at Lincoln Park, which is north on 5th. Root on our fine fighters of 16-inch softball from the of Representatives, and bring home the trophy, men and ladies. And now, seeing no further business to be Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til the hour of 11 a.m. on Thursday, April 14. allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, all those in favor for adjournment signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

The House stand adjourned 'til the hour of April... 11:00 on Thursday, April 14. Have a great night, everybody. Go House. Bring back the trophy."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 3759, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3760, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3761, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3762, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. Bill 3763, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3764, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3765, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3766, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. House Bill 3767, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning redistricting. And House Bill 3768, offered Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Introduction of ... and reading of Senate redistricting. Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 1235, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1236, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1270, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning finances. There being no

42nd Legislative Day

4/13/2011

further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."