50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We'll be led in prayer today by Reverend Jeremy Cagle who is with Southern View Chapel in Springfield, Illinois. Reverend Cagle is the guest of Representative Raymond Poe. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all your cell phones and pagers, and everyone is asked to please rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Cagle."

"Heavenly Father, I... I praise You for Reverend Cagle: privilege and opportunity You've given Representatives today to discuss the affairs of the state. I pray that You would remind them that the state and the national and local government is ultimately governed by You. You are the God who rules over every government in every state. You are Lord over Heaven and Earth. You are the King of Kings. And for every decision that they make this afternoon and in every day of their lives, Lord, I pray that You would remind them that they ultimately answer to You. That's not just because they're leaders of the state, it's because they're human beings. Every person on this planet will have to answer to You for their life because You are the sovereign master of the universe and You are holy. You are morally pure and no one can come to You who is not as pure as You are, no one can please You who is not as holy as You are. Which puts us in a tough spot because we're not holy, we have sinned. But not only are You a God of holiness, You're also a God of love.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

You're a God who loves sinners and You chose mercy and grace and compassion to those who have done wrong in Your eyes. And 2000 years ago You came to this earth in the form of a man, the Lord Jesus Christ, to live a perfect, holy life and to be crucified so that Your anger towards sin might be poured out on Him and that He might rise from the dead to defeat death and sin so that we might have Him. through Lord, Ι salvation pray for Representatives today. I ask that You give them wisdom and strength to make good choices for our state; we have a lot of important things to discuss. And please, Father, give them the ability to do that to the best of their skills, but also give them the realization that their sin can be forgiven at the Cross of Christ and only at the Cross. We pray this in Jesus' name, Amen."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beaubien, Representative Mulligan we're glad you're back with your family. If you'd jointly lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Mulligan & Beaubien et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have no excused Democrats to report today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Michael Bost, the GOP?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All Republicans are present and ready to do the work of the people."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. We have 118 Members responding to the Call of the Chair, we have a quorum present. We're prepared to do the will and the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Clerk Mahoney: Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 04, 2011: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1806, Senate Bill 2037, Senate Bill 2145; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2236. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor reports following committee action taken on May 04, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2987; do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1147, Senate Bill 1952 and Senate Bill 2123. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy reports the following committee action taken on May 04, 2011: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1821 and Senate Bill 2288; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 270. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 04, 2011: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1967, Senate Bill 2042; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 120. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Disability Services reports the following committee action taken on May 04, 2011: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 273. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce reports the following

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

committee action taken on May 04, 2011: recommends be House Joint Resolution adopted as amended is Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Criminal Law reports the following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 64, Senate Bill 151, Senate Bill 1554, Senate Bill 1699, Senate Bill 1949, Senate Bill 2004, Senate Bill 2267; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2040; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative McAuliffe, Chairperson from Veterans Affairs reports Committee on the following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: recommends adopted is House Resolution 280. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 92; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1584. Representative Lilly, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Healthcare Disparities reports the following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1948 and Senate Bill 2193. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1972, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment is #5; Short Debate Senate Bill 1278. do pass Representative Barbara Flynn Currie Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action: approved for floor consideration is Floor Amendment #4 to

50th Legislative Day

- House Bill 2934. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 321 and House Resolution 325."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May for the purpose of an announcement. Shhh."
- May: "Yes, thank you, Speaker. Listen, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to call your attention that we are less than one week away. Mark your calendar, mark your calendar. May 11 at the Hilton, 5:30. The biennial Capitol Capers. Rehearsal, if you're in the show, May 9, 7 p.m. at the Hewlett Building; dress rehearsal May 10, 5:30 p.m. at the Hilton. We... our captains are busy giving out the assignments, practicing their songs. It's going to be great. If you haven't bought your ticket yet, see us now because the tickets are going fast. And in case you haven't heard, the theme is the Wizard of Oz. So, start thinking about who's the Wizard and see you there."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis, I believe you want to present House Resolution 304. Mr. Clerk."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill... House Resolution 304, is as follows;
 - WHEREAS, Illinois State Representative Monique Davis and the Members of the Illinois House of Representatives recognize that Mother's Day is celebrated nationally on Sunday, May 8, 2011; and
 - WHEREAS, Every mother wants her child to succeed; and
 - WHEREAS, A child's parents are the foremost authority in the needs of the child; and

50th Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, Every day, mothers and grandmothers stand up for the rights and justice of their children and advocate for their needs; and
- WHEREAS, Many of these parents and grandparents come to Springfield to advocate on behalf of legislation that supports their children's rights; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we designate May 5, 2011 as 'Moms on a Mission Day' in the State of Illinois... in the State of Illinois to honor mothers, grandmothers, and their families who stand up for children's rights; and be it further
 - RESOLVED, That we welcome the mothers and grandmothers present at the Illinois State Capitol today May 5, 2011 to join us in our efforts. I ask you to politely welcome the moms on a mission who are in the gallery over to your left."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, moms. We are proud to have you in Springfield and happy Mother's Day from all of us. Representative Soto."
- Soto: "I will be translating what Representative Davis... on the House Resolution.
 - En español, hoy reconocimos en esta resolución que estamos aquí y reconocimos que el día de las madres es domingo mayo ocho, veinte once, y
 - EN TANTO QUE cada madre quiero lo mejor para sus niños y
 - TANTO QUE cada... cada todo de los padres están la mas destacada autoridad en las necesidades de los ninos,

50th Legislative Day

- EN TANTO QUE, las madres y las abuelas separan a los derechos de sus hijos, y abogado para sus necesidades; y
- EN TANTO QUE, muchos de estos padres y abuelos vienen aquí a Springfield al capital para recomendar a favor de legislación que apoya las derechas de sus niños, por eso ESTA RESUELTO, por LA CASA DE REPRESENTANTES DE LA NOVENTA SÉPTIMA ASAMBLEA GENERAL DEL ESTADO DE ILLINOIS,
- Que designamos el 5 mayo 2011 como, 'El día de las madres están en un misión,' en es estado de Illinois... en el estado de Illinois, para tener honor del madres, abuelas, y sus familias quien defender las derechas de los niños, y haber ido mas lejos,
- ESTA RESUELTO, que nos bienvenidos las madres y abuelas que hoy en el día 5 mayo 2011 están aquí en la capital del estado Illinois, preguntamos que a unirnos en nuestros esfuerzos. Le pregunto a cortésmente para bienvenida las madres que tienen un misión que están en la galería a su izquierda.
- Bienvenido a tu capital, las madres, estamos orgullosos de tenerte en Springfield, y feliz dia de las madres de todos nosotros."
- Speaker Lyons: "We've heard the English and the Spanish version of House Resolution 304. All in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, by unanimous consent, House Resolution 304 is adopted. Thank you, Representative Davis. Thank you, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, Representative Lang on the Order of Third-Reading House Bills, on page 4

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

of the Calendar, has House Bill 30. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 30, an Act concerning alternative treatment for serious disease causing chronic pain and debilitating conditions. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook on House Bill 30, Representative Lou Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Lang: The importance of this Bill is not lost on anybody in this chamber. We've spent a good deal of time talking about the original Bill which barely failed, spent a good deal of time talking about the changes to the Bill. Before we proceed, I do want to publicly thank Leader Tom Cross and Mr. O'Shea and Mr. Persico from his staff for working tirelessly with me to try to craft a piece of legislation that would be a model piece of legislation for this country. And I believe we've done that. I also want to thank Mr. Mapes, Mr. Isaac who's standing here with me, for a good deal of cooperation in making significant changes to a Bill that last year, admittedly came close to passage, but was not as tight as this Bill. And I do believe that even those among you who will not vote for this today would acknowledge that this is a much better Bill. Tribune and other newspapers around the State of Illinois have said that in their endorsements of the Bill. So today we have a Bill that's titled the compassionate use of medical cannabis. The compassionate use of medical cannabis to help people who need a product to live a quality life, the person that can't get out of bed because they're too

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

doped up on morphine or OxyContin, the person that can't take care of their kids because of that, the person that can't work because of that, the person that needs a little help from us. The help that a doctor would like to provide, but is not allowed to provide under the statutes of the State of Illinois. So, this is a Bill that many more than 60 of you would tell me privately that you hope I pass, many more than 60 of you have told me you hope the Bill will pass, but not all of you that told me the Bill would pass are prepared to vote for it today. And I am asking you to take your heels out of the sand you've dug them into and So, listen, iust listen. despite newspaper endorsements of this Bill and despite polls in Illinois that show 70 percent of Illinoisans believe that we ought to be able to provide relief and a better quality of life to the people that live in the State of Illinois who need this help, some of you are unwilling to even vote your own conscience and your own convictions and I ask you to give that some thought. The Members of this House, even those that will vote 'no', are aware that this Bill is not about drugs; it's not about marijuana; it's about health care. It's about health care for Jim Champion who's in the gallery today, a disabled vet who many of you have met. He has been down here for months, years visiting with you, talking to him about his MS, talking to you about what he needs to live a better life, talking to you about the fact that he just takes one or two puffs and his hands open up and his legs uncross and he's able to have a much better quality of his life. It's about Mike Graham who has been

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

here many times, a man who has had heart attacks and strokes and two spinal fusions and has come to visit many of you to tell you that he would not be alive today if not for the relief that this product has given him. And there are so many others who are just seeking a better quality of life. Some are... some have fatal diseases. The 75-year-old woman, who's a colon cancer patient who is terminal, who may want a cookie with marijuana in it or a brownie or get one puff of a cigarette to provide relief so she can enjoy the remaining years she has on this planet. Today the drugs that people are taking sometimes don't work, they render them unable to do anything. And they're just simply looking for an alternative. This Bill is substantially different from the Bill that was defeated barely some months ago. Many of you have not yet even read the new Bill. Some of you have said to me, I can't vote for a Bill that allows someone to grow their own. That is out of the Bill. Here's what the Bill does. It says that if your doctor believes you need to be able to use this product for relief of your symptoms the doctor can give you a piece of paper, along with your medical records, displaying that you have had a bona fide relationship with this doctor and that the doctor has tried other alternatives which don't work to provide the quality of life to you that you need. You can take these documents to the Department of Public Health who may or may not agree that you are eligible and qualified to get a license, If you get a license you have to purchase this product from one of 59 dispensaries throughout the state. We picked 59 so there'd be only one in each Senate

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

District. And we require that these dispensaries be notfor-profit. We didn't want to make Illinois a marijuana profit center. We just want to find places where people can product they need. These not-for-profit organizations have to have everyone who works there and everyone who is an owner go through a criminal background check. Each dispensary must have computer equipment with a database that can be accessed by law enforcement. No one can buy more than a specified amount within a given period of time, and no one can own or stockpile more than that specific amount at any given time so that nobody will be persuaded or even think about stockpiling it and selling it illegally. And by the way, there are very strong penalties for the illegal sale of medical cannabis under this Bill. The Bill also states that employers may have any rules they wish regarding the use of this product at the workplace or even prohibit it entirely. This is why the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is neutral on the Bill. Employers may make any rules they wish, landlords may make any rules they wish. If a landlord doesn't want somebody with this product on their premises, they can't be there. They can't use the product. Finally, maybe not finally... next, this Bill has a 3-year sunset. This Bill doesn't ask you to for all time allow anyone who wants medical cannabis to have it. It doesn't say we're going to do this for the next 100 years. It says, these are sick people, some who are dying, some who are in desperate pain. Let's try, for 3 years, what 16 other states have tried, but many of those other states have botched it. Let's give people 3 years, under a highly

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

regulated system, to be able to get a product they need to improve their lives. The issue of law enforcement will come up. Let me tell you that the Federation of Police are neutral, the State Police are neutral and yet the Illinois Chiefs of Police are opposed, but does anyone expect them not to be opposed. Police are never for making something legal that was illegal. And so, I don't think that argument flies. The only argument that flies is that every one of us has people in our district who need this product. I'm asking you to consider this. Those of you who have told me you'll think about it, please do. One more comment and then take questions. As always happens on controversial Bills, many of you have said to me I'll be there if you need me, I'll be #58, I'll be #59, I'll be #60, but if you do that, we will never get there. If you have pledged to me your help, press that green button right away and the Speaker will give you a few seconds to jump off the Bill later if that's what you think you need to do, but don't be the 60th vote, be the 1st vote, please. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill and I'll take questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to ask a few questions and then I'll make some statements to the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "First of all, I want to applaud you, Representative, for the movement that you have made to make this Bill better. And I also want to say, I know there is a certain

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

group in the State of Illinois that does want this to pass. Where I am coming from and a lot of other people in the State of Illinois are looking to how this law will impact the… the majority of the people in the State of Illinois. I want to start off by asking you the question, is marijuana still an illegal substance in the United States Government?"

Lang: "The answer is, yes, but I don't think because the Federal Government has failed to research something that provides relief to people, such as the people in the gallery, we should hide our heads in the sand and ignore the facts."

Bellock: "Well, I guess I would come back at that, Representative, is that when we all swear to uphold the Constitution of the State of Illinois and the Constitution of the Federal Government we're upholding the laws that are on the books. So, if we want to change those laws, then we change them, but right now marijuana is outlawed by the Federal Government. Isn't that correct?"

Lang: "That is correct except that the United States Justice

Department has announced that they are not going to pursue
those laws in states where marijuana has been legalized for
this purpose."

Bellock: "That is absolute... okay. Right now, I was just handed a document that the Governor of the State of Washington who was about to sign their medical marijuana Bill stopped that because the U.S. Attorneys informed the Governor that the U.S. Government was going to pursue action against the state employees that enforce the Medical Marijuana Act.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

is just in the paper today from the State of Washington. As I said, the last time we debated this Bill, the Federal Government in the last 6 months, since the amount of figures have come out about teenage usage in the states that have passed medical marijuana have come out. The President Obama has gone back higher the drugs are that was under the Bush administration, she is totally opposed to medical marijuana Acts and the President has come out in the same fashion. Just in the last 8 months there has been a complete turnaround. And I want to just give you the statistics right now. In our schools right now throughout the United States, according to public health records 1 out of every 11 eighth graders in the United States used marijuana last week. One out of every 5 twelfth grade children in the United States, that's 1 out of 5, used marijuana last week. And you can't say that that is not an increase in the State of..."

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

Bellock: "Thank you. I'm going to go back over... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. All of the law enforcement except the State Police and the FOP, all other law enforcement in the State of Illinois is opposed to this Bill. All of the medical groups in the State of Illinois have concerns over the Bill and not one medical group has come out pushing it. The Glaucoma Society is opposed to it. The MS Society, of which they were all down here a couple of weeks ago I asked them all because we know there are people that want that, they were not for the Bill because they still had concerns. The

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

American Cancer Society, the Alzheimer's Society, all of them have severe concerns over the Bill. To talk about the enforcement of this Bill, I have sat in 24 hours meetings this week on Human Service Approp. Public Health does not have people to even do hospital and nursing home inspections and now we're going to put the enforcement, we're going to make them the police to enforce medical marijuana Acts? I don't see how in this State Legislature that we can endorse a Bill that supersedes the Federal Law in the United States. The FDA has ruled that this is not a medicine; this is an illegal substance. If we want to change this, we can go to the Federal Government, have it rescheduled. But right now this is illegal as I've told you today the State of Washington whose Governor was about to sign the Bill has said she cannot protect her state employees from being prosecuted federally by their U.S. Attorneys for... for endorsing and doing a program that allows an illegal substance. I ask you today to please vote 'no' on this Bill because this Bill supersedes the Federal Laws of the United States of America. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill's on Standard Debate. I'd appreciate if you'd indulge that Chair. We get three speakers for it; three speakers against it. It's been debated in the past. It would be much appreciated. Representative Sacia, 3 minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Lang who is a very well-respected Member of this Body and

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

certainly I'm among the many that hold him in the highest esteem. Never have I been in support of this Bill, never have I said, Representative Lang, if you're close I'll be with you. I am adamantly opposed to the Bill and I base that on 30 years in law enforcement. When I initially became involved in law enforcement, I... I don't think I had a strong opinion one way or another. As I have matured in life and I have seen some of the unbelievable situations which were initially caused by marijuana usage, I have grown increasingly concerned. I can't begin to tell you how this particular Bill does concern me. And let me just start if I could, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you look up by my desk I'm holding up the equivalency of 2.5 ounces of marijuana which would create... it's a look alike, okay. Two and a half ounces of marijuana will create 10 to 13 joints a day. Ladies and Gentlemen, every 14 days a person can create this much marijuana. Representative Bellock passionately and correctly about the letter to the Governor of the State of Washington. I hold that letter in my hand, it is signed by the United States Attorney for the eastern district of Washington. And the letter does, in fact, state and I will quote, 'In addition, state employees who conducted activities mandated by the Washington legislative proposals would not be immune from liability under the Controlled Substance Act.' Ladies and Gentlemen, Federal Government is adamantly opposed to this type of legislation. This being passed off to you as a Bill that is for the benefit of those who are extremely sick is an..."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

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

Sacia: "...it's an absolute unacceptable proposal. Ladies and Gentlemen, giving someone this much marijuana and believing it will not create problems is absolutely unacceptable. We are dealing with a situation here with a type, a controlled 1 substance. It is completely illegal. Put it in a pill form, regulate it by the FDA, I will support your Bill. This Bill is totally unacceptable. It is a situation that will not be rectified passing it off as medical marijuana. Representative Lang referred to 16 other states, most of them have very serious problems. The great State of Montana, big sky country is starting to refer to itself as big high country because they cannot control the runaway problem with medical marijuana. This Bill is an absolute abomination, Ladies and Gentlemen. I strongly oppose... I strongly oppose the Bill and urge you to do so as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz, 3 minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor vields."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Lang, there's a lot of noise in this chamber and I have been running around and I really would like the Body to know, I... you did say earlier that this Bill is... has been changed dramatically, and for those of us who have concerns or had concerns, this is a pilot that we have to... that sunsets in 3 years. Is that correct?"

Lang: "I'm sorry. Did you ask me if the... what the changes are in the Bill?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Feigenholtz: "I did. I'd like to hear that, but I also would like to talk about the 3-year pilot, but go ahead."

Lang: "Well, let's... let's start with that. So, we made this a 3-year pilot so that those on the House Floor who were concerned about what could happen or concerned about any negative fallout from this Bill could be convinced that in 3 years we are going to have to, if we want to continue this, start all over, draft a Bill and pass a Bill. So, clearly if it's not working, if... if we're having the problems that some other states are having, we... we won't vote to renew this program."

Feigenholtz: "So, it is going to be left up to the Body to make a decision on whether or not there's been abuses in the program and we can revisit this in 3 years. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That is completely correct."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I... when I first ran for State Representative one of the first things that I encountered were... was a man in my district who was dying of cancer and one of his major concerns was our profound inability to be good stewards of... of pain management and allowing for what the Representative is proposing in this Bill. I know that many of you have had visits from your constituents about this Bill who are living with all kinds of health issues for which this would help dramatically. And I ask you to pause for a moment and think about them and think about the relief this would bring to them. And if in the end, this Bill is abused that we will have an opportunity to come back and remediate. And

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

I encourage a 'yes' vote. And Mr. Speaker, I also would like to put this on Extended Debate and also I would request a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "Verification's been noted, Representative.

Representative Morthland, 3 minutes."

Morthland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do have a verification of the vote already requested. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Morthland: "I rise in support of the Sponsor and in strong opposition to this Bill. I support many aspects of what he's done, even the state's rights aspect of this Bill and I agree with him that he had tightened it up and it will be the tightest medical marijuana Bill in the nation if it is passed. However, the genesis of this Bill not in its intent. His intent's pure. And I... I've already told him that privately; I admire him for the work. His intent is pure, but the genesis of this Bill legislatively is a flawed piece of West Coast marijuana legislation. They have all failed, they have all caused harm. I will quote for you the director of the Metropolitan Enforcement Group last year when Iowa was trying to do this. He said, in the previous 7 weeks, the State of Illinois had interdicted in Henry County alone 500 pounds of medical marijuana grown in California and Oregon destined for state sale in the State of Illinois and the east. And in each case, the defendant was a medical marijuana patient. He has tightened it, but at this point it is a Rube Goldberg contraption and no one, I say no one knows what will happen if we turn it on. I've been getting e-mails about this, we get those from time to

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

time, automatically generated by policy groups. Not one support group for a sick person has contacted me. No, they have all come from the marijuana policy project. marijuana policy project's mission statement is to increase support for nonpunitive, noncoercive marijuana policies, identify and activate supporters for noncoercive, non-marijuana of marijuana policies to reduce state laws, eliminate penalties for medical and nonmedical marijuana use. These people believe you are saddling up their Trojan horse or at the very least, you are putting irreplaceable chink into the armor of the law. This will put marijuana into the hands of the wrong people. I have a daughter with epilepsy and, Sir, she does not marijuana. But if a doctor of osteopathy or a medical doctor disagrees with me, she will receive it and that is not right. She has been on strong drugs for many years and to my knowledge she has never been approached to sell her prescriptions nor has anyone tried to steal them from her, but that will happen if this goes through. She will be approached. Do not put my daughter in that place. And third, there is a traditional path. I... I agree with you that Marinol is insufficient. However, I ask you to consider what about Sativex? It is in third phase medical trials here in the United States, it has been legal in Canada for 5 years. It is legal in Great Britain, beloved Czech Republic. There are options. If we allow users of marijuana to control..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your 3 minutes are up. We'll give you another minute to finish your thoughts."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Morthland: "Thank you very much. If we give users of marijuana the ability to direct this, we will end up with more substance abuse and more crime. However, if we leave our medicines in the hands of scientists and physicians we will have true science and good medicine. I respect you, Sir, but I urge opposition to this Bill. Thank you very much, Members of the House."

Speaker Lyons: "We've had three people speak in opposition, two in support. The Chair recognizes Leader Tom Cross."

"Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know it was my turn. I... I want to make it very clear that I am speaking individually. I realize as an individual Rep from my own district that a number of people on my side of the aisle do not support this Bill and I respect that. And I likewise know they respect my position. But this is an issue that I have not always embraced. I am a former prosecutor for those of you who don't know this. I was a prosecutor for 9 years in Kendall County. I have probably voted 99.99 percent of the time with law enforcement in my time here in the General Assembly. I've sponsored Bill after Bill that gets tougher on crime, drug cases, et cetera. I have spent a lot of time with law enforcement and I've supported them and they have supported me. And I realize where they are on this Bill and I realize where others are on this Bill. But I, with the utmost respect, totally disagree with where they are on this Bill and this did not come easily for me. I struggled with whether or not I should support this Bill. And I realize the arguments against it from both law enforcement and from the substance abuse side and from

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

others, I'm not unaware of those issues and those concerns and I speak about that from some personal history, not my own, but from people I know close to me. But as I started listening to people and talking to people around this state on the issue of medical marijuana it became apparent to me that, in my opinion, it was the right thing and the compassionate thing to consider and to ultimately support. I talked to people struggling with diseases and illnesses. And I want to applaud Representative Lang from... from where he was 6 months ago to where he is with this Bill today, it is a dramatically different piece of legislation. Some would have argued 6 months ago that it was very vague and broad, if you look at it today and you look at illnesses listed that you would... that would make you eligible for medical marijuana from cancer to Crohn's to MS to Lupus to ALS, you realize that they are very specific illnesses that are very, very horrific in many cases. And as I then talked to people in the medical community, physicians, oncologists, nurses, nurses assistants, they would tell me that there were only, in these instances, medical marijuana was the only thing... the only thing that provided relief to people with these illnesses, the only thing. And I.. I started asking myself, why can't we in this year, in this state find relief for people going through their darkest days with all these... I think 19 to illnesses that Representative Lang has listed? We can't say to them, we can make your life a little better? Whether you're in hospice or whether you're not in hospice or whether you're about to die or you hopefully aren't going

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

to die 'cause you're struggling with an early stage of an illness. Shouldn't we be able to provide for them the most... the best relief and the best available source to do that? Why would we say no to that? Why would we say no to that? So, Representative Lang said, I'm going to make this as strict and as tough a Bill as I can. I'm going to make sure the workplace doesn't change; if you're drug free, you stay drug free. If you are concerned about the chronic pain argument, it's... you don't have to worry about it in this Bill. If you're worried about California 'cause they have 21 dispen... 2100 dispensaries, we have 59. He has done his best to limit the availability and make sure there is less potential for abuse. One of the other things that struck me about this Bill is and this issue is, I had a couple of situations where I talked to... they didn't specifically tell me, but some friends of friends had some loved ones struggling with some of these illnesses. And they went to find marijuana for their loved one. They went to find medical marijuana or marijuana for their loved one and they got it. And it made life a little better at that moment for that person. And I... as someone said to me, why should those individuals have risked their professional careers? They could have been arrested for possession. Why should they have risked their professional careers because they were trying to make life better for somebody they cared about and somebody they loved? I don't think that's what we want to do. I don't think that's the way we should operate. And I don't think that's the way we should treat people struggling with these various diseases and illnesses. If

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

you have not looked at this Bill and you have not looked at the 19 illnesses on there and the people that would be eligible for medical marijuana, I would strongly encourage you to look at that before you vote on this Bill. The people that will be eligible are, I would submit to you, not in any position or condition or have any interest in abusing the use of medical marijuana. These are about as bad as they get when it comes to illnesses. So again, I respect all of the folks in this chamber that don't support this. I clearly respect and... and appreciate where many of the Members of my caucus are, but for the reasons I've highlighted I'm going to support this Bill. And as I've said, it didn't come easily, but Representative Lang has gone a long way in making this Bill better and I think the folks in this state that are struggling with the diseases and the illnesses that we've talked about deserve an opportunity to have a comfortable and a physical life and time that's best... that can be better than it is for them right now. And I would... I for those reasons will be voting 'yes'. Thank you, Representative Lang."

Speaker Lyons: "We've had three people speak in favor and three speak in response. Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen for a robust debate which we had last time a similar Bill was on the floor. I appreciate the comments of the Minority Leader. I don't think I can say it any better than Mr. Cross did. He worked very closely with me to craft this legislation. And as we crafted the legislation we listened to the debate, the previous debate. We heard your comments.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

You didn't want the grow your own in, we took it out. You wanted law enforcement to be able to access what people were buying, we put it in. You wanted strict limits on driving, we put them in. You wanted to make sure that landlords and employers could have any rules at apartment building or the workplace that they wanted, we put that in the Bill. We kept the 3-year pilot program in the Bill. We put strict limits on how much you can buy and how much you can keep at any one time. We did all those things because we listened to you and we listened to the debate. What we did not change is the core of the Bill. What is the core? The core of this Bill is helping sick people feel better. If it were simple to go to the Federal Government and get them to just make marijuana legal, that would have been done already. We wouldn't need to have this Bill. And to say that the Federal Government should decide for us what we should do on a case where 16 other states are doing it, I think is not a good logical argument. The comments that eighth graders get a hold of marijuana, let me tell you, eighth graders who get it are going to get it whether we pass this Bill or not. Every one of us either has or has had kids in college, we were in college. We know you can get this product if you want to get it. The question is, are we going to make Jim Champion a criminal? He's going to continue to get the product, but should we make him a criminal or should we allow him to have some dignity with his MS? A disabled veteran who wants to get his legs uncrossed, who wants to be able to unfold his hands so he can play a couple of games on his cell phone

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

and live out a quality of life that's good for him. Is there any reason we shouldn't allow Jim Champion that privilege? So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm asking you, I'm cajoling you, I'm pleading with you to consider that this is a 3-year pilot program to give sick people in our state a better way of living and if we're not here to do that, then we ought to consider why we're here in the first place. Those of you who've told me you would consider voting for this Bill, please do not watch the board. Please don't be the 58th vote or we'll never get there. We can pass this Bill if good, right thinking people will consider their position in the next 30 seconds after hearing this debate and after searching their heart. If you do the right thing, this could happen. Be the 1st green vote on that board. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request for a verification... two requests for verification, so push your own switch. The question is, 'Should House Bill 30 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? Representative Colvin. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill, there are 53 'yeas', 61 'nays' and 4 'present'. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Request Postpone Consideration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put that Bill on the Order of Postpone Consideration. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the

50th Legislative Day

- following committee action taken on May 05, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 148."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Second Readings, there's House Bill 2934. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2934 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 4 have been approved for floor consideration. Floor Amendment #5 has been referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz, there's Amendments pending. What's your pleasure on Amendment #1?"
- Feigenholtz: "I believe I... there are four Amendments on this, correct?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, the status on that Bill and the Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Five Amendments have been filed. Floor Amendment #1 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 5 are still in the Rules Committee."
- Feigenholtz: "I believe we wanted to put #4 on."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record.

 Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, under Postponed

 Consideration, is House Bill 2987. What's the status on
 that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "There's a Floor Amendment #1 that was approved for consideration today."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading,
 Mr. Clerk. And Representative Verschoore on Floor Amendment
 #1 to House Bill 2987. Representative Pat Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the... what the Amendment does is adds to... adds to the PL agreement that there will be a... records kept and for every three months on the amount of... of minority of women that would be working on these projects. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Amendment #1... Floor Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Representative Ford, are you seeking recognition on the Amendment? Okay. We'll get back to you in a moment. Seeing no one has any further questions on Floor Amendment #1, all those in favor 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 Motions."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act concerning finance."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pat Verschoore on House Bill 2987."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have debated this Bill before. What this does is codify a law that we already have in place whereby the... would be project labor agreements on projects that the department heads would deem that would make them... get them done under a timely manner and most of the time under... under budget and on time. And I would be glad to answer any questions on that."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, you just said in your remarks that this codifies already what we have in law. The reason we have it in law is because of an Executive Order, is that not correct? It's not anything that was done through the Legislature."

Verschoore: "It's done by Executive Order now. All this would do is take it away from the Executive Order and then give it to department heads that deem this would be a... a project. It's not all projects; it would be project labor agreements. The ones that they deem... that deem worthy of these that would be used."

"Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Reis: House, there has been a lot of discussion about project labor agreements over the last 8 years when Rod Blagojevich took office and through Executive Order required that all projects funded by state tax dollars would have to be... would have to use project labor agreements when it's... which in essence says, any contractor that bids on this his labor must be union. Eighty-four percent of the contractors in this state are nonunion. We're fleecing the taxpayers by doing away with competition; it's discriminatory to the nonunion contractors. They understand prevailing wage, they understand apprenticeships, they understand requirements and things like that. They may not agree with them, but they understand them. All they want is an opportunity to bid on state projects and this would codify

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

in State Law something that maybe a Republican organi... administration might want to do away with or a future Democrat Governor. There is... it's bad enough that we have this in law right now through Executive Order where there was no debate, no hearings, no chance for people to come in and testify, but to place it in... in State Law now is the wrong message to send. We hear all the time, even from your side of the aisle now, jobs, jobs, jobs. Well, what about the jobs for the nonunion contractors that are paying taxes, their employees are paying taxes, the projects that they're working on are... are creating economic activity in their local communities and they can't even bid on this. This is the wrong message to send. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, would you briefly give the Body a little bit of knowledge about what a project labor agreement is and what that requirement will cause. It's in effect now, it is by Executive Order, but what affect did that Executive Order have on projects?"

Verschoore: "Well, when they deem... when they deem a project they want to use a project labor agreement on it, it would be put in the bid specifications that there would be the prevailing wage or the union wage would be paid on that. And to get back to the previous speaker's thing, right in the Bill is says it permits the selection of the lowest qualified respectful bidder without regard to union or

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

nonunion status. So, they can bid it. It's not that they cannot bid it."

Eddy: "Well, but the project labor agreement has to be negotiated..."

Verschoore: "Right."

Eddy: "...and the unions are involved in the negotiation."

Verschoore: "Right."

Eddy: "So, the affect of most project labor agreement executions are union wages."

Verschoore: "Yes."

Eddy: "I mean, it... it basically increases construction..."

Verschoore: "Wages and benefits."

Eddy: "...costs. It increases construction costs..."

Verschoore: "No."

Eddy: "...by eliminating competition?"

Verschoore: "It does not eliminate... it makes a level playing field because they have to pay the prevailing wage plus the prevailing benefits. So, they have to pay that anyhow so it does not raise the cost of a project."

Eddy: "Well, why was there... why was there an Executive Order then if they had to do this anyway?"

Verschoore: "They used the… I think the reason they used it,
Representative Eddy, was because of in larger projects they
wanted to make sure they got them done on time and on
budget."

Eddy: "Representative, the reason the Executive Order came was to eliminate competition and guarantee that union wages would be paid on all public works projects through public labor agreements. It's kind of a back door way of making

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

sure that those wages are going to be... going to be paid. And if that's what we're voting on, we just need to let people know that's... that's what we're doing. We are going to guarantee on projects that they're not going to be that competition, that there are going to be required public labor agreements, project labor agreements by statute now and not by Executive Order. So, if someone is against that type of increase in cost potential and loss of competition, they'll be in favor of this because they want to support union wages."

Verschoore: "If they have to pay them anyhow, Representative Eddy. We have prevailing wage, they have to pay prevailing wage and prevailing benefits. So, it doesn't make any difference whether they bid them or not."

Eddy: "Representative, right now under this Executive Order, the Executive Order has created that situation for those projects. These... there are... this is an extension of that and project labor agreements will add costs by reducing competition available to... to complete those projects. Ladies and Gentlemen, just very quickly to the Bill. We... we have seen over the years in Illinois various pieces of legislation and now Executive Orders that have... that have driven the... the cost of projects to a point that they're much more expensive and the people of the state, the taxpayers of the state are paying an additional premium because of legislation like this. I would urge a 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, if this receives the required number of votes, I would ask for a verification."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "So noted, Representative Eddy. Representative Tom Holbrook."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Holbrook: "Question, Representative Verschoore. Sometimes utility companies must relocate their facilities as a result of public works projects, does this Bill also require public retire… excuse me, does this Bill require utility companies to establish project labor agreements?"

Verschoore: "No."

Holbrook: "Thank you."

Verschoore: "This Bill covers projects that are directly contracted by the State of Illinois; therefore, the Bill does not cover utility relocation facilities that are done by utility expenses."

Holbrook: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burns."

Burns: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Burns: "Just for the information of the Body, I'd like to thank the Sponsor of this legislation and the proponents of the Bill for working with several of us in the Black Caucus on language regarding goals for apprenticeship hours to be performed by minorities and women and for goals for total hours on project labor agreement projects to be performed by underrepresentative... underrepresented minorities and females. This language is very important to make sure that on project labor agreements there is a workforce that looks like the rest of the State of Illinois. There is a strong

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

reporting requirement on the actual number of hours performed by minorities and women. And I'd like to thank the Sponsor for including this language and I plan to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Verschoore, I read in our analysis that the goal... the goal for apprentices is 5 percent of the hours to go to minorities and 5 percent to females. Would that be correct?"

Verschoore: "I think you're correct there. I don't... I don't have that right in front of me."

Sacia: "I'm reminded of a year ago... year ago this past summer, there was a goal and it came out from the Secretary of IDOT and there was a goal at the time to have 10 percent minority hires for road construction, and in my district numerous and Ι repeat numerous trade organizations, numerous contractors applied for position... or applied for bids through the Illinois Department of Transportation and not one... not one nonunion organization was granted even though they complied with the requirements. And what troubled me so about that, Representative Verschoore, was the then Secretary of IDOT said, well, the goal is to have 10 or 12 percent, whatever the number was, minority hires and that would be complied with by the nonunion people in my district who could not and I repeat, could not get a bid from the Illinois Department of Transportation. Now, I'm just using IDOT one example. The point as

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Representative, we have these project labor agreements... we have these agreements where we state the goal is and then if we are а state contractor under the current administration we do not allow or we allow them to bid, we certainly allow nonunion contractors to bid, Representative Reis so eloquently stated, the very significant number of contractors in the State of Illinois are nonunion. Why are they not given the opportunity when they do comply with the requirements of the project labor agreement? That... if you could give me an answer to that, I... I would be deeply appreciative and shut up and sit down."

Verschoore: "Well, Representative, I... I read this Section 20 under paragraph 3 and it says right here, when it's been determined that a project labor agreement is appropriate for a particular project... a works project, the State Department may award that to instrumentally awarded bidders. And it all says... and it says there's... any qualified bidder is permitted to bid on this whether union or nonunion. So, I don't know why they didn't get to bid on it. But... and I don't know where they come up with the percentages."

Sacia: "No, no, no... they bid. They were allowed to bid, Representative and they had the low bid. In several situations they had the low bid, but they weren't a union contractor. And believe me, Representative Verschoore, you and I are great friends and you know I don't question you, but I really question the administration and the authorization to allow agency heads to award contracts to nonunion project labor full agreement organizations that

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

bid on these projects. I have grave concerns about it and that... that's my concern here. If it should pass and it should become law, will those opportunities be afforded to nonunion... nonunion contractors?"

Verschoore: "Well, Representative, I don't know where you saw in the Bill, I was... maybe it's in here, but I was thumbing through it as you were... you were talking. And I don't see anywhere where there's percentages... a number of percentages in here."

Sacia: "I'll read it to you. This is in Floor Amendment #1 and I'll read it directly to you, Representative. The goal for apprenticeship hours are 5 percent of the hours to go to minorities, 5 percent to females. There are no requirement for persons with disabilities and state construction contracts. That is paragraph 1. It's under D for minorities and females as defined under the Business Enterprise for Minorities."

Verschoore: "I see that, but I don't see the percentages there.

I'm sorry, maybe I'm blind but I don't see those."

Sacia: "Okay. It's in the other Act, it's not in this Bill. But it is part of the Act, right? It... it's the Act that you reference in your Bill, Representative. It's the Act that you re... that you reference in your Bill."

Verschoore: "That's where the definition of minorities come from..."

Sacia: "I've been told, Representative."

Verschoore: "In your... in your Amendment."

Sacia: "Thank you, Pat."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jefferson and then Representative Verschoore to close."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Jefferson: "Representative, we had this discussion yesterday in committee..."

Verschoore: "Uh huh."

Jefferson: "...and I'm going to support your Bill. From what I understand with this Bill, it's going to strengthen the ability to bring in minorities, females to be included in this job. Is that correct?"

Verschoore: "That's correct."

Jefferson: "I'm getting sick and tired of... of passing these projects in my community, \$100 million projects, minorities, maybe a handful of females, whatever. It's time for us to be included. With our unemployment at its highest in the African-American districts, the female districts, the Hispanic districts, it's time for us to be included in the process. And I get sick and tired of driving by these projects as they're being put in place and not have the inclusion that we need. It's not showing diversity that our state shows and we need to be included in the process. So, I'm going to support this Bill, but I'm going to make sure I follow it through to the Senate Sponsor and that language is included, and maybe even made to be stronger than it is so that we can be included in the process because we... we support our communities too and we need to work to feed our families. And if we aren't included in the process, that means we aren't working. So, I commend you for this piece

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

of legislation. Just make sure it's doing what we want it to do. Thank you."

Verschoore: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "I announced that Representative Jefferson was the last speaker. Representative Pat Verschoore to close."

Verschoore: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and thank you Representative Jefferson. We will work on this in the Senate, I give you my word on that. And we will work on this and get the language in there, it'll be satisfactory to that... that affect. And again; I want to tell everybody, this does not raise the price of construction in the State of Illinois. We are... the state... everybody that bids on a job in the State of Illinois right now is subject to prevailing wage, which means they pay the prevailing wage and the prevailing benefits. So, if they have to pay that, it shouldn't make any... the job any higher. So, I just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request for a verification by Representative Eddy. So, please, Members, vote your own switch. The question is, 'Should House Bill 2987 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? Arroyo, Flowers, May. Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 69 'yeas', 49 'nays'. Representative Eddy, do you wish to pursue your verification? He does not. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, thank you for your patience. I know

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

you have a point of personal privilege, appreciate your indulgence."

- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like for the Members of this House to recognize a great man. We all say it takes a village to raise a child and I think that the man that I want to recognize is... he's from my area, from my district. His name is Larry Williams and he's been very instrumental in my life. He's right in the gallery there. He's with the SFAA Pack, but I think he's a great man and I think we should all give Larry Williams a round of applause. Thank you. Thank you, Larry Williams."
- Speaker Lyons: "Larry, welcome to your Capitol. Proud to have you here in Springfield. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of House Bills-Second Order, on page 4 of the Calendar, is House Bill 2934. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2934 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "So, Representative Feigenholtz, we have Floor Amendment #1. What is your pleasure with Floor Amendment #1?"
- Feigenholtz: "Take... I'd like that Amendment, I believe, tabled."
- Speaker Lyons: "Choose to withdraw that Amendment?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

- Speaker Lyons: "We'll withdraw Amendment #1. Anything further,
 Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4 has been approved for consideration."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #4."
- Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2934 is a committee effort of the House Appropriations-Human Services Committee. What it does is it allows us to take advantage of the enhanced match that the State of Illinois will be getting until June 30 by transferring some money to the Federal Government and getting 90 million extra back, which we sorely need to pay our bills. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, question on the Amendment?"

Eddy: "I'm sorry. We'll do it on Third."

Speaker Lyons: "Want to let it go on Third Reading, Representative?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you. No one seeking further discussion on Floor Amendment #4, 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 #4 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2934, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on House Bill 2934."
- Feigenholtz: "Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2934 is an effort for us to recoup some extra federal dollars, which we of course need desperately so that we can meet the

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

health care needs of the people in this state and do what we've been hoping and trying and promising, which is pay our bills. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just for clarification purposes, the...
the... the idea here is to use money that is available that
are... that is in a fund... or two funds, flow that through to
the Federal Government, receive an enhanced match from the
Federal Government and then put that money directly back
into that fund?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Eddy: "So, the money is not going to be a long-term loan from the fund; it's just going to revolve in and out basically. When we receive the money back, that money gets replaced and that's guaranteed in the text of the Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "With interest."

Eddy: "With interest. Very good. Now, for other clarification purposes this Amendment clarifies that the road fund is not used as part of this transfer of money, is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I think it's something that we ought to do, something that makes good sense and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Harris."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "She awaits your question, Sir."

Harris, D.: "I don't have my analysis. Which funds are being used?"

Feigenholtz: "GOBRI and the Water Revolving Fund, but only for one month."

Harris, D.: "And I say, again, the first one?"

Feigenholtz: "GOBRI."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill will put 100 million more dollars-ish into the coffers so that we can try and dig ourselves out and pay our bills. Our committee has been working night and day to see something like this happen. So, we would all appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2934 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? Dugan. Pat Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Norine Hammond, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Ma'am?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Hammond: "Mr. Speaker, I would... if you would direct your attention to the gallery in the middle right there is a

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- group of students from Western Illinois University and accompanying them is Dr. Garry Johnson. They are all first-year graduate students in Western Illinois University's very successful College Student Personnel program. I'd like to welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, Western Illinois.

 Proud to have you down here. Representative Lisa Dugan on a

 Motion."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 65, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 94 failed."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady's made a Motion to reconsider House Bill 94. Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We object to the Lady's Motion and I request 'no' votes."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman's made a Motion for 'no' votes. Representative Dugan moves the Motion for 'yes' votes. So, the question is, 'Shall the Motion pass?' All those in favor of the Motion to reconsider 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? Representative Burns, Davis, Dunkin. Will Davis, Dunkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 59 Members vote 'yes', 59 Members voted 'no'. The Motion fails. Representative Jim Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Sacia: "We're joined today in the gallery from several folks back in my district from TCCS eighth grade. We have chaperones: Chris Reckinger, Christy Heun, Bill Klatt and students: Kayla Heun, Dominique Holland, Seth Klatt, Rachel Ramage, Ryan Ramage and Keegan Reckinger. They're down here visiting the Capitol today and I wish you'd make them feel welcome to our Capitol. If they'd stand, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, enjoy your day. Good to see you down here. Representative Ford, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir? LaShawn."
- Ford: "Something happened that would... with House Bill 94. Can we do that again? I... I need to... we need to because something happened with the switches. So, I don't know because I'm not the parliamentarian. What should I do now? I have a lot of people that's interested in voting for that Bill and that did not reflect it."
- Speaker Lyons: "Staff will take that request under consideration and discuss it with you."

Ford: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the bottom of page 4, under House Bills-Third Reading, Representative Dan Beiser, you have House Bill 1041. Representative Beiser. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1041 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1041 defines federal construction projects. And basically what we're doing is bringing the prevailing wage into the Davis Bacon Act compliance uniform throughout the state. Currently the CDB does use the Prevailing Wage Act when there is some federal and local and state projects involved. Other agencies within the state do not and we're attempting to create a uniform standard here with this Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Are there any questions? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I think I understand what this does and it basically states that if an individual works over 8 hours a day rather than the limitation of 40 hours per week that they're going to have to be paid overtime?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Eddy: "So..."

Beiser: "That's the difference Davis Bacon and prevailing wage."

Eddy: "Yeah. So right now though, it... it's possible for an individual because of weather conditions for example to work 12-hour days, but work three 12-hour days in a row or some combination where they stay under 40 hours in a week, and they're not being overtime paid?"

Beiser: "Yes. The ability to schedule your workers is not hampered by this."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Eddy: "Well, it... it can be hampered by this if there happen to be weather conditions that result in trying to get a project done while there happens to be dry weather, and somebody wants to work 12 hours a day for three days, not go over 40 hours a week, as is often the case. I mean, right now, with the weather conditions we have if you want to try to get a project done within a bid constraint timeline what you end up doing is increasing the cost, not working over 40 hours a week, by paying overtime after 8 hours. Would that not be the effect of this Bill?"

Beiser: "Again, Roger, if you're at the... you're at the very end of a construction project that has a time sensitive dead line, I would grant that that would be the case where you would have to work probably in a shortened week. If you only had 2 days out of the week to work, yes, there would be an instance where you would have to pay overtime in that instance. However, in a normal workweek, depending on if it's 40 hours a week, there is no overtime. If there's 48 hours a week depending on whether you use Davis Bacon or Prevailing Wage there would only be 8 hours if they schedule them appropriately. Sixty hour workweek, same thing. Twenty hours of overtime between Davis Bacon and Illinois Prevailing Wage if you've scheduled appropriately. So, I don't believe we're tying the hands of contractors unless, again, you're at the very end of a time sensitive contract. It will..."

Eddy: "So, what... why is this necessary? I... I don't understand why it's necessary because you're talking about the same number of hours, but you're talking about affecting

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

anything over an 8-hour day with an increased cost. The concern... has IDOT weighed in on this?"

Beiser: "They... no, they have not contacted me about it. And why is because we're bringing uniformity where you got CDB doing it and you have other agencies may or may not be doing it."

Eddy: "Well, the... the prevailing wage increase would be substantial for... a federal construction project, for example, that's taking place in Sangamon County that is paid a certain amount. If they're going to try to finish up, they have rain coming in they have to do a project or they have other constraints that have been on the project, it could very easily, if they work a 10-hour day one day in order to take advantage of good weather, it could cost them more money."

Beiser: "I... I will give you that if it's at the tail end of a... of a shortened workweek with a time... with a deadline looming, yes, but otherwise if it's an normal workweek where the contractor has a... the ability to schedule their workers according to their wishes, I don't think it would."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I... I... I would just say at this point in this state with what we see as far as weather conditions and the need to be able to finish projects that's a very, very difficult loophole to work around. And if you're going to work someone 40 hours a week and... and pay them a regular wage, prevailing wage, rather than an overtime wage that's going to save the taxpayers of the state money, the project's going to get done and we're not going to go over cost. And I'm not sure why this is

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

necessary when people are working 40 hours a week whether it's over 3 or 4 days or whether it's over 5 days. We're increasing costs for project during a time that our state can't afford all of the projects that we have out there. I... I just... I don't see any reason for it. Representative, I understand what you're trying to do here for uniformity, but to tie the hands of contractors this is... this is obviously opposed by the construction industry because they need that flexibility. All... all of the... the groups in this state that do business and have to work under the constraints that they have to work on don't want this to pass. I would urge a 'no' vote on this legislation. We are in no position to have increased costs for this type of a... of a new or a change in policy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Verschoore."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Verschoore: "Representative, I understand that the weatherization payroll costs for Illinois Community Action Agencies have severally be impacted their availability to install weatherization items for low-income families, citizens across Illinois. Would you be willing to work with the Senate Sponsor to exempt Community Action Agency Weatherization Programs from your Bill?"

Beiser: "Thank you, Representative Verschoore. Yeah, it was not my intention to disrupt this weatherization program for low-income citizens. Therefore, I... I would be willing to work with the Senate Sponsor for this Bill to exempt the

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Illinois Communities Action Agencies from these provisions of the House Bill 1041."

Verschoore: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser to close."

"Yeah. I... I would suggest, again, that this is a way Beiser: to... to bring uniformity to our... the way when we award state, local contracts to bring the state... all the agencies doing the correct thing and doing it through the prevailing wage which we've adopted in the State of Illinois. I will allude to an Economic Policy Institute study that says that construction costs in states with prevailing wage laws versus states that do not have them, the costs were lower in states with prevailing wage laws than those without. I would also cite that same study that said states with prevailing wage laws had higher productivity than those without. And I also would suggest and for the safety of our men and women on the job, it shows that for those that have prevailing wage laws that they're... the construction fatality rates are 25 percent lower in these states that have prevailing wage laws. For all these reasons, I would ask that you have an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Question is, 'Should House Bill 1041 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? Beaubien, Brauer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 65 Members voting 'yes', 52 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

declared passed. Representative Acevedo for the purpose of an announcement."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Ed."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier this afternoon we had a ceremony outside honoring fallen police officers. I got to tell you, I encourage all of you to come next year because it's... it's such a touching ceremony to honor those who have paid the ultimate price, men and women. But there was a sister of a Riverdale police officer that told a very compelling story as she described, she introduces as her fallen brother and she talked about how we will never feel the pain. No, we can never feel the pain and I hope no one ever has to feel their pain again. But we always have to remember that no matter what, whether you're wearing a uniform, men and women, you're still part of our family. Every one of them, every family member of a police officer are part of our family and we will never forget those families who... family members have paid the ultimate price. We owe them a gratitude of thanks and we want to wish them the best and we want them to know that we are here for them. And up... up here in the gallery, we have former president of FOP and other police officials up in the gallery. Thank you for all you and do and to the brave men and women of the police department. And Speaker, at this time, if we can have a moment of silence for all the fallen police officers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "May they rest in peace. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 4, under House Bills-Second Reading, is House Bill 2107. What's the status on that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2107, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was tabled in committee. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading, and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

 Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House
 Bill 148?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 148 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Put that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. What's the status on the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "On House Bill 148, Floor Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps on Floor Amendment #2."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What I'd like to do is, Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. I'd like to adopt 2 and 3 if I could and debate the Bill on the floor."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman makes a Motion to adopt... we'll do it in two separate Motions, Representative. All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps makes a Motion to adopt 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. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 148, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Saline, Representative Brandon Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Phelps: House. I don't think this Bill needs any introduction. House Bill 148, the Family Protection Act for concealed carry. We all know this is an emotional issue and right now once this passes everybody thinks that this is going to turn into the wild west and everybody's going to get a gun and on... so on and so on. Folks, 49 other states have some type of permit to carry process. And how can they be wrong? It has not been the wild west there. And we can go out and act like it's Halloween every day and try to spook everybody, but you cannot contest that everywhere that this been allowed to be law crime has has gone considerably. I want to thank all the groups that was willing to sit down with us. We worked with every group that wanted to, to make this probably one of the best Bills

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

we've ever had on the concealed carry. So, with that, I know there's going to be a lot of questions, but a lot of people are going to say take guns off the streets. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's guns on the streets right now, but it's guns that the bad guys have and law-abiding gun owners, law-abiding citizens have no protection, and we are at the criminal's mercy. What in the world is wrong with us to be able to defend ourselves and our families? Just in that split second if there was a confrontation. I think there's a lot of people that's going to vote on this that may vote 'no' that knows this is the right thing to do. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. We'll put the timer on the Motion of 3 minutes and if you need an extra minute, we'll certainly let you extend your point. So, Representative Stephens, you're the first person to speak to the issue."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Stephens: "Representative, you met with state... people from around the state law enforcement groups, colleges, business groups. Is that right?"

Phelps: "Absolutely. Everybody that wanted to meet, there was only two groups that did not want to meet. And we asked them repeatedly to sit down and negotiate this... this out."

Stephens: "And those... and those two groups were whom?"

Phelps: "Cook County and the City of Chicago."

Stephens: "Oh, that speaks volumes. The... so, when people came to you, you tried to accommodate them. Is that right?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Phelps: "Yes. And I think we accommodated everybody. You know, it's hard to accommodate everybody, but yes, about... probably 95 percent."
- Stephens: "And the opponents, they were the same people who had a... who support a handgun ban. Is that right?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

- Stephens: "There was a gentleman in Chicago who... by the name of McDonald... Otis McDonald. Are you familiar with him?"
- Phelps: "I absolutely met him many times."
- Stephens: "He came down and testified on your Bill. He's... isn't he the one who filed the suit that wound up in the Supreme Court?"
- Phelps: "Just to... absolutely. He actually sued the City of Chicago so he could keep a handgun in his house for his protection of himself and his family."
- Stephens: "Ironically, the mayor was opposed to him having a handgun in the house. Isn't that right?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Today the <u>Sun Times</u> is reporting that the outgoing mayor, Richard Daley, wants a 24-hour, three person Chicago police officer protection security unit. Not only for him, but for his wife. Why? Because he doesn't feel safe. It's... that's what he wants. He wants to be protected by guns. Unbelievably, the same mayor that stood in opposition to Otis McDonald, a 77-year-old African American from the City of Chicago, former president of his union. That same mayor wants to spend \$200 thousand of taxpayer money... oh and there are two cars involved in that too... but he attempted to deprive Otis

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

McDonald of merely keeping a handgun in his home. He wasn't worthy of being able to defend himself. And now he wants to spend our money for security detail so that he… because he doesn't think it's safe to be in public. Let me tell you about another woman. Her name is Mary Shepard and she has my… she… I have her permission to talk about her today and to show you a photo of her. Mary is 71 years old. She has a permit to carry in Florida and Utah and so that gives her permission to carry in 30 states… 30 states but not Illinois where she now calls home. Well, unfortunately because she was… although she was trained to protect herself, had gone through five classes on self protection, she couldn't have a handgun in Chicago. A parolee, a convict, standing 6 foot…"

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

Stephens: "...6 foot 2, 245 pound came into her workplace and tried to beat her to death. Mary Shepard, that's what she looked like. This guy wasn't satisfied with this. Could you step... Do you mind having a seat? Thank you. He... they weren't satisfied. He went and tried to beat to death another 80-year-old woman in the same workplace. Ladies and Gentlemen, if not for Shepard and if not for Otis McDonald, that's why you need to be for this Bill. Just for these two people alone. Think of all the harm that has been done because people can't protect themselves. I rise in strong support of the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley for 3 minutes." Bradley: "Sponsor yield?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bradley: "Representative Phelps, we've known each other a long time and do you know of any piece of legislation that there is more widespread support for in southern Illinois than this?"

Phelps: "Never. In the 9 years I've been here, Representative Bradley, and I think you can attest to that, no."

Bradley: "And you have taken extreme precautions to make sure that the safety of the people of the State of Illinois is increased by these measures?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Bradley: "And you have made a significant negotiations and significant efforts to try to deal with criticisms, legitimate criticisms at times, illegitimate criticisms at times, regarding the opponents to this Bill?"

Phelps: "Everybody that had an issue, we worked it out with them."

Bradley: "I've known you my whole life and I'm proud of what you're doing here and I commend you for what you're doing and what you're doing for the people of the State of Illinois and the people of the region that we represent. I want to say thank you on behalf of the people of the 117th District for what you're doing here today, Brandon."

Phelps: "Thank you, John."

Bradley: "To the Bill. Significant piece of legislation, not only for the people of southern Illinois but for the people of the entire State of Illinois. With this piece of legislation we can get in line with the 48 other states and 49 to come with regards to how we handle gun laws in the

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

State of Illinois. We have evidence throughout the country that when we pass these laws that the crime rates go down, that people's lives and home are protected. We have the opportunity to allow law-abiding citizens to protect their families, their friends, their homes, their communities. It's a significant piece of legislation; it's not reckless. It's not indifferent to the concerns of the people of the State of Illinois. It's not something that's extreme or an outlier. This state's current policy is an extreme; it's an outlier. It's beyond the realm of the rest of the states of the United States of America. The time has come. The time has come for concealed carry in Illinois. The time has come for concealed carry. Today is the day. Today is the day that the House of Representatives makes a stand and say we're standing up for the second Amendment. We're standing up for the entire Constitution. We're standing up for the people for the State of Illinois. We're standing up for the United States Constitution. We're going to pass concealed carry and we're going to give the people of the State of Illinois the same right that the rest of the people of the United States of America have and the other 48 states that have this. Please help us in passing concealed carry and giving the rights of the second Amendment to the people of the State of Illinois once and for all."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. With all due respect and I have the utmost respect for Representative Phillips... Phelps, Bradley and Stephens who have just spoken. But Illinois residents

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

will be allowed to carry concealed handguns in public including: public including... sidewalks, parks playgrounds, public transportation, beaches, shopping malls, restaurants, office building, workplaces, et cetera. As a Chicago police officer with experience protecting public safety on our streets, I have firsthand knowledge of how dangerous it'll be to allow people to carry loaded handguns. Despite what the NRA and gun advocates might say, there is no compelling evidence to show that more guns make people safer. In fact, most of the evidence nationwide and in our state shows just the opposite. There are more guns... where there are more guns, there is more injuries, there's more death and there is more gun violence. More guns doesn't... does not mean less violence. As we honor our fallen law enforcement officers today, please don't forget 11 police officers have been shot and killed across the... across the county by concealed carry permit holders. Make no mistake about it, this Bill will not make the work of our police officers... it will make the work for our police officers much harder. Right now, if a police officer sees a person with a gun on the street they know immediately that that gun is illegal, but if this Bill becomes law, anyone will be carrying a gun on the street and rather than moving swiftly to protect themselves and us the officer who spots the gun will have to delay. That delay will make a big difference and that difference can be fatal to that officer. The consequences are enormous. Is the person with the gun someone who intends to cause harm or death or is the person a law-abiding citizen who happens to be carrying

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

a gun? At that point, the best course of action for police officer is no longer clear. Carrying a concealed handgun won't make us safer and will not scare off anyone intent on committing the crime. Just this past summer, Chicago police officer Michael Bailey, a 30-year veteran of the department with top notch credentials, was in full uniform... in full uniform when he was shot and killed in front of his home. Let me repeat that, he was in full uniform with a silver revolver on the side out in the open for the world to see. Mentally disabled people who will also have a much easier time getting their hands on guns. We have already heard stories about how our background checks in Illinois is not equipped to screen out every mentally ill person who should not have a gun. But to make matters worse, mentally ill persons will have greater opportunity to wrestle guns from people on the street who are exercising their so-called right to carry. Let us remember the case of Chicago police officer, Thor Soderberg 11-year veteran of the department, who's job was to train police officers in the use of guns. Officer Soderberg..."

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

Acevedo: "...standing at a truck by his vehicle in the parking lot of a local police facility when a mentally ill person approached him, wrestled his gun from the holster and used it to shoot him. This officer was in top shape; he was a veteran of the Operation Desert Storm and a tri-athlete. A similar incident occurred. Police officer Richard Francis, a 27-year veteran of the force, he was in uniform when he was attacked by a mentally ill woman who wanted his gun.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

She managed to get it away. Again, as a police officer, I can tell you firsthand experience more guns on our street is no answer. We lost 5 Chicago police officers last year to gun violence. Five brave officers who trained and experienced and armed. More opportunities for gun use by these people who shouldn't have them is not the answer. Fewer guns means less violence, less injury and less death. It's as simple as that. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ed Sullivan. Three minutes, Ed."
Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Sullivan: "Representative, I have a few questions that we want to get into the record and we want the… the Body to know.

 How... how much would the permit fees in this... for this carry license?"
- Phelps: "A hundred dollars for a new permit, 25 of that goes to the sheriff on their end and 75 goes to the State Police."
- Sullivan: "And the State Police have estimated how many people do they think will enter into this program?"
- Phelps: "Just a projection, a guestimate of what they came up with as many as 100 thousand people the first part of next year and another 325 thousand after that."
- Sullivan: "And they have estimated that will be about approximately how much in revenue?"
- Phelps: "Forty million dollars in two and a half years."
- Sullivan: "So, when they talk about handling the... the caseload, that'll be enough for computers, for extra personnel to take care of not only this aspect of the law, but also FOID card-type issues and also mental health issues?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Phelps: "Yes. More than enough."

Sullivan: "And where does this money go?"

Phelps: "It goes into a special fund created by the State Police to administer this Act and I think 25 million or 40 million makes the Act not just revenue neutral, but a revenue generator. And at this point in time in our budget we need every dime we can get."

"Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, a lot Sullivan: of times we debate issues in regard to guns and we always talk about the mental health issues and we don't want people with mental health disease or mental health issues to be able to get guns. This Bill will generate enough money so we can now fix the problems that some people think are there. We have enough money to take care of the FOID applications, to process things better, to have more staff to handle the caseload. Many of you know that I.m. that I'm a hunter, that I am generally in favor of the Second Amendment. I'm also from a... a suburban Legislator. And so, I have not, in my 9 years down here, signed on for concealed carry. I've not always... I've not always been a Legislator that thought this was... was something that should... should be law, but we have worked very hard on this. We have taken the concerns of all the people that chose to be part of the process. One of the concerns and one that was very valuable to me is why I think I'm here. I'm here to try and help protect my citizens. And one of the aspects of this Bill that is... is very important is the fact that my Chiefs of Police have said they need this to help protect society. And so that has changed my opinion of

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

this Bill and I have come on board as a strong supporter, because how would I deny... why would I deny my Chiefs of Police a tool that they think is going to help them protect the people that I'm here to protect? So, with that I... I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis. Three minutes, Monique."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative, are you aware of how many policemen were lost in Chicago because of concealed weapons?"

Phelps: "Not to the degree that you do, but this is the first time, Representative Davis, that I've had so many law enforcement groups support this Bill."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I, too, know Mr. McDonald who was mentioned earlier. Mr. McDonald lives in my district. And when this Bill came forward, House Bill 148, I felt truly conflicted until I realized that Chicago lost the lives of 5 police officers in a very short period of time, young men who had dedicated their lives to protecting others. Because someone was carrying a concealed weapon, these men lost their lives. We know that officers are trained professionals, but when a person is walking around with a weapon that's hidden one does not know what to expect. Because of what we already know about gang activity, gang wars, it puts a lot of innocent people in jeopardy when we say that it's okay to carry a concealed weapon. You know, I know some people that would shoot a weapon at the slightest provocation. They won't be

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

concerned with the results of what they do. It'll just be a moment of terror for individuals who perhaps don't know that this person is under duress or feeling guilty about something or someone. Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker and my good friend, the Sponsor of this Bill who I have great respect for as you know, love and respect, Representative. I, too, like the John Wayne movies. I like those movies about the wild west where people... everybody's carrying a weapon and everybody's shooting at each other. We don't live in those days anymore. We're supposed to be a civilized society. And I question... I question the continued massive distribution and manufacturing of weapons for a civilized society. America is no longer the wild, wild west. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

Osterman: "To pass this legislation, would this Bill receive a Supermajority of 71 votes?"

Speaker Lyons: "Harry, we'll get back to you. Let the parliamentarian get back to you."

Osterman: "If so, I'd like to verify that. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "And I was told that, yes, this will require 71 votes."

Osterman: "I'd like a verification if it does pass. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "A verification... Sponsor yields."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Osterman: "A couple of questions, Representative Phelps. The way you portray the negotiations everybody's in agreement with law enforcement. I think that you and I both know that that's not true. The City of Chicago and the Chicago Police Department, the Cook County Sheriff's Office and many others... stand in opposition to this including the State Police of the State of Illinois, whose task it is to administer this program as well. As well as the School Management Alliance, who's got concerns about some of the exemptions for schools and how that would be carried out. I do have a few questions, though, and that is that in here there are a number of exemptions enumerated for government buildings and certain parts of airports. The question I have is, would the General Assembly be one of those? Why aren't we including things like parks and others?"

Phelps: "Well, Representative, we did. And first off, aren't...
aren't you supposed to leave... aren't you leaving? I mean,
didn't everybody think that. No, I'm kidding. Hey, I know
it's not a kidding matter right now. We... we... we did
amusement parks. We did we think... I think and some of the
attorneys that I've talked to said that that falls under
government bodies. So... and to be honest with you about the
Chicago Police, I cannot begin to tell you how many
personal phone calls and e-mails I've received from rank
and file Chicago policemen that know this is going to help
them because they cannot be there in... if there's a
confrontation or a crime, they can't be there that quick."

Osterman: "Okay. There are a whole swath of places that if this passes people are going to be able to carry a loaded

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

firearm: Navy Pier, events, parks, all over the place. And if the intention is for safety, why are we protected here and yet people around the state are not going to be protected? This goes way too far, Representative. And I think that law enforcement, while some of the leadership of these organizations stand in support, as Representative Acevedo had stated the rank and file around our state are very concerned about this legislation. I want to talk about the process, too, with State Police. State Police currently has a backlog with FOID and what we're also adding to this is a separate database for licensees. Under testimony from a committee that we had, the individual in charge of the FOID system stated that..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your 3 minutes expired. We'll give you another minute. Harry. Go ahead, Harry, another minute."

Osterman: "...John Coffey (sic-Coffman), who's in charge of the FOID system for the state indicated he stays up late at night concerns about the current system and the fact that people with mental illness are not being screened properly and there's a chance that someone could get that. Those are his words. Adding this on to that system that's broken, money can't solve that. If this Bill passes, in 180 days it's supposed to take effect. We are going to add problems to a broken system and we're also going to add problems of potential tragedy like we suffered in northern Illinois and other parts of our state by adding to a broken system. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the way the Bill is drafted, the way we administer our FOID program, we are

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

adding gas to the fire of a broken problem and money's not going to solve it right now. It takes time to get it right. State Police believes that. Our campus presidents, who we charge with protecting the children of our state universities around our state, stand in opposition to this Bill because of the tragedies that could be on campuses. And from a letter that came to us, they talk about overlapping the challenges of young people learning and weapons and the potential tragedies we have. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this comes down to a fundamental issue that we have to all, 118 Members, decide. And that is arming our state and having people walking around with loaded firearms, will that make us more safe or less safe? And I, for one, my constituents strongly believe that this will add to injury, to death, to more memorials like we had today outside of our Capitol, for more families losing their innocent children by adding more guns on the street. All of you know where I stand on this and have for many years, but I want to add some words into this chamber from people that are not here. Mary K. Mace, who's the mother of Ryanne Mace who was killed in Northern, Illinois, says, gets offended when she has people say that if my daughter only had a gun. It's crazy to me that we would have everyone walking around with a concealed weapon. And Jennifer London, who's the wife of Officer Thor Soderberg, a trained officer who taught people how... officers how to carry a firearm, said, If you have a concealed gun, you have to be ready to take someone's life. It's something I think is wrong and I stand against it. I ask all of us

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

today to think about the safety of our state and stand with the victims of violence and law enforcement and reject this measure today."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Bost, 3 minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we prepare for this talk and we put those words so that we can ask these questions back and forth. And I'm amazed as I've watched the debates that have occurred over the years and that's one thing I was going to bring up, but I'm not that in... I've watched you... a person that might be on the other side of this issue in one point in a debate a few months ago on Bill 'that these background check... these background checks work' and now that same person just said that they don't. You can't have it both ways. They do. The State of Illinois has some very strict laws on... on the mental rules on how to do background checks. But Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been involved with the debate on this issue for 17 years. I watched Terry Deering, the late Terry Deering, almost run down and argue with the Speaker in a very heated moment when we tried to move this Bill similar to this in 1997. Ladies and Gentlemen, the... the... the crimes that are occurring right now in Chicago you have already banned weapons. The people that are doing these are doing it illegally. They're illegal. I don't know how else I can express that. The... the statement awhile ago, and let me tell you that I respect police officers, many of you know that I was a firefighter myself. We respect the police officers, but to say that the police officer that had a wrestling match with a person that was mentally ill and

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

then took his gun, that wouldn't change and this won't change that. What this says is, is that we the citizens of the State of Illinois would have the opportunity to carry, by going through a procedure and getting the legal permit as 48 states and soon 49 other states have, that we can carry a handgun to protect ourselves, our family, friends. And think about this, maybe even that police officer if something goes awry. A person years ago from the... from the University of Chicago gave us the statistics of where it is that... and what happens to crime rates when these Bills are passed. Crime rates go down, except for two areas. Vending machine break-in where the vending machines left unattended and automobile theft where automobiles are left unattended. Now, why is that? That's because criminals are cowards. Criminals... and I'm going to..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your three minutes expired.

We'll give you another minute to finish your thoughts."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Criminals are cowards. And criminals will stay away where they believe that there's a danger that someone can have even, not an upper hand, but just an even hand. And the City of Chicago is one of the only major cities in the United States that a person doesn't have that ability to protect themselves or that the criminals don't have in the back of their mind that that person might be carrying. Doesn't mean they are, they might. That's why you get a reduction in crime. Ladies and Gentlemen, we... we've had this debate for years. It's gone back and forth. I'm asking, I'm pleading, for your citizens

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

this is the right vote. For the Constitution of the United States, this is the right vote. Give the opportunity for your citizens to protect themselves, let's pass concealed carry, let's move it over to the Senate. And let's move online with the rest of the states in the nation. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Beiser, 3 minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Beiser: "Representative Phelps, I know in the 7 years I've been here I've been a proponent of this type of legislation and following your lead and others leads like Representative Bradley and those, Representative Bost, but I know you've spoke in the past and this Bill gives the ability to have a concealed carry permit. But I think you feel strongly that it's a right that's already there and we're just basically validating that. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Absolutely. We... it says in the Constitution. We have two Supreme Court cases in our favor, Representative Beiser and we are not allowing the rights to our law-abiding gun owners."

Beiser: "Another point, and many of the people that oppose this type of legislation talk about 'what if' scenarios and... and I have the utmost respect for all of the people that... that don't share our views. Are you aware of... of... of any instance in a state that has concealed carry where someone might have cut somebody off in a parking lot or brushed somebody on the sidewalk and a legally concealed carry permit person committed a crime?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Phelps: "I... I do not."

Beiser: "And that's just my point, I don't think those... I think that's... tends to be an overreaction. To the Bill. The implication that everyone will have a concealed carry permit and there will be guns almost 100 percent throughout the State of Illinois is just not accurate. Not everyone will take application for concealed carry permit, we know that. Those that do will be law-abiding citizens, will be vetted as to their criminal background if they have one and they won't get one. They'll be vetted as far as their physiological standing. And they will be going through strict training. And they will get a permit should they qualify for all the standards set forth in this Bill. And to imply otherwise that everyone would have a gun and that gun violence would go up, I think is doing a disservice to those men and women that choose... that would choose to take out a permit and go through this intense training. And for those that suggest, again, that this would increase violence or that it would fear... their safety would be put in harm's way, I would just ask this question. When you've traveled to other states in this country that... all 48 other states and I've asked myself this question, the minute you cross that border, did you fear for your safety? And I would venture a guess that almost everyone to the men and women in this Body would have to honestly say, when I boarded that plane and crossed that border or when I got in my car and crossed that border I did not fear for my safety. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia, 3 minutes, Representative."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Sacia: "Thank you. Representative, I... I'm going to ask some questions for legislative intent and I know some have been answered already, but did you work with law enforcement on the Bill?"
- Phelps: "Yes, we did Representative Sacia, numerous times.

 Negotiated with the Chiefs of Police, Illinois Sheriffs'

 Association, Chicago Sergeants."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Representative. I... it's such a privilege and an honor to stand on the floor when there is so much bipartisan support for a Bill. So, it's fair to say that the Illinois Chiefs are supporting the Bill?"
- Phelps: "Absolutely. With the negotiations that we made, everyone of their concerns that we brought to light."
- Sacia: "What about the Illinois Sheriffs' Association?"
- Phelps: "One hundred and one sheriffs out of 102 support this Bill, Representative."
- Sacia: "And the State Police went from neutral to opposed after you made changes to make the Bill better. Is that correct?"
- Phelps: "Absolutely. And we believe that their bosses had a lot to do with that."
- Sacia: "I think that's well said, Representative. And the Chicago Police brass are opposed to the Bill?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Phelps: "I think they always will. Yes, because of what the mayor has said and... but I cannot tell you how many, again, rank and file Chicago police are hoping this passes today."

Sacia: "And... and would it not be fair to say, Representative, that the Chicago Police Lieutenants Association and the Chicago Police Sergeants' Association are in support of the Bill and that the Fraternal Order of Police is neutral on the Bill?"

Phelps: "Absolutely. For the first time, the FOP is not opposing this measure."

Sacia: "And... and the PBPA, they support your Bill?"

Phelps: "They do."

"To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. Yesterday... or day Sacia: before yesterday in committee, Representative Moffitt debated with Deputy Chief or Deputy Superintendent Peterson from the Chicago Police Department who boasted and he said... the greatest respect for the man, a 39-year veteran, and Representative Moffitt talked with him about response time. And the Deputy Chief stated that it would be absolutely unacceptable to have a time frame of say 6-8 minutes to respond to a felony in progress. And Representative Moffitt very eloquently shared with the gentleman in Illinois, certainly in two of the five counties represent, early in the morning we only have one State Trooper or Deputy Sheriff on duty and there's going to be easily a 30-minute response time and accordingly you may well, if we had a responsible citizen with a firearm, we may well be in a situation to be most helpful. Ladies and Gentlemen, many of you in here know I spent 30 years in law

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

enforcement, investigated many heinous crimes and the one thing that happened throughout that 30-year tenure is I became more and more convinced that law-abiding citizens should have the right to carry. I so hope Representative Cavaletto tells his heart wrenching story on this Body... to this Body today. Representative Reboletti shared with me earlier in the day, he visited with his family in Phoenix and he was sitting in a crowded... a crowded movie theatre and he was thinking, in this state anyone of these folks could be carrying a gun. And he felt completely safe. Just like you would in Chicago or Rockford or Freeport or Cairo, if it comes above water or anywhere else. A... a gently Lady from Chicago commented about police killed in the line of duty in Chicago and I... I... I ache with her over that, but not one of them... not one of them was legally carrying a weapon. They were punks, they were improperly carry firearms. Ladies people that and Gentlemen, if there was ever a time..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia, your time has expired.

Please conclude your remarks."

Sacia: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence. If there as ever a Bill whose time has reached maturity, the soup has been made, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Sponsor has worked overtime trying to eradicate any problems. The red herring that's out there is we're going to return to the old west. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is an opportunity to give those of us who legally... the legal opportunity to carry a firearm. And as was so well said earlier by one of the Representatives, it

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

doesn't mean everybody's going to carry. I'm one of the few in this Body that can legally carry, I choose not to. I carried one enough, but I applaud this legislation. We have to give our law-abiding citizens the right to protect themselves and to be vigilant and on the forefront and to the \$40 million that this will generate over the next two and a half years for the Illinois State Police, help us pass this Bill, a very important Bill. And thank you so much, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, three minutes, Roger."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, as alluded to earlier that the Management Alliance had some issues with the Bill and I want to clear that up just a little bit. I... I think that it can be better characterized as some concerns that can be cleaned up with a trailer Bill or just legislative intent. And I think it deals with the Section in the Bill that quotes, elementary and secondary schools and then the ability of the elementary and secondary school authorities to allow for conceal and carry. Now, in the Bill your intent for authorities would be that the school board through policy and procedures would be the authorizing body?"

Phelps: "Yes. Correct, Representative Eddy. And I appreciate you bringing this us because the Management Alliance is not against this Bill. Because they know what you and I are doing right now with legislative intent and we're going to make it better for them exactly the way they want it."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Eddy: "Okay. And I... I think that clears up the concern that... that basically they brought up. And with that, I don't know of any other concerns. They... they did talk a little bit about district controlled buildings where there might be administration buildings and that type of thing, but... but again, the intent is to allow the school board, not a... not a school authority that... that could be defined by any other purpose to make that decision and by a board Resolution and specific policy to make those rules."

Phelps: "Their own decision, yes. Absolutely."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you, Representative. Now, the other...

let me ask you a question. I'm looking at the eligibility

for a concealed carry firearm license in the Bill. They

have to have a FOID card, right?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "They can't have been a patient in a mental institution within the last 5 years?"

Phelps: "Right."

Eddy: "No convictions for a felony or violent misdemeanors or any misdemeanor involving drugs within 10 years?"

Phelps: "In Illinois or any state, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Any state. They don't chronically or habitually use alcohol or... or have any DUI convictions or any other drug dependency problems..."

Phelps: "Correct."

Eddy: "...and they have to complete a firearms education course."

Phelps: "Yes."

Eddy: "Now, it seems to me that if you vote against this you're voting against the right for people who are going through

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

much more of a background check and licensure procedure to carry a gun than most of the thugs and the... and the gang members who carry in Chicago who are committing the murders that have been referred to earlier."

Phelps: "And they're going to continue to carry and we're going to be more at their mercy every day."

Eddy: "We're not talking about allowing criminals to carry guns, we're talking about setting up a very specific process whereby law-abiding citizens who meet very strict requirements and training will have their Second Amendment right verified."

Phelps: "To protect ourselves and our families, correct."

Eddy: "Forty eight other states carry or allow this. They recognize that Second Amendment right and they set up a similar type of a system to make sure that the safety of the individuals that carry..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your 3 minutes have expired.

We'll give you another minute."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... is of upmost concern."

Phelps: "And... and Representative Eddy let me say this, and I want to hold this up for everybody 'cause I know everybody wants to talk about mental health. Under this Bill, this gentleman right here with this propaganda would not be able to get a concealed carry permit in the State of Illinois Because he had known run ins with local sheriffs and the sheriffs are the ones who are going to decide who gets a permit or not."

Eddy: "Representative, the data supports... I want to make one other comment. It's... it's ironic to me that individuals

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

that are aldermen in the City of Chicago have the right to conceal and carry. Isn't that true?"

Phelps: "One of the only few people in Cook County and the City of Chicago is the aldermen can carry."

Eddy: "So, it's okay for them to be protected. It's okay for them to conceal and carry walking down the streets of Chicago, but it's not okay for an average citizen in Illinois to be able to protect themselves?"

Phelps: "Not their own constituents that they represent, exactly."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's even this up.

Let's let the law-abiding citizens of this state have the same privilege and constitutional right to exercise that we give elected officials in the City of Chicago where they don't allow those citizens that right."

Phelps: "Thank you, Representative Eddy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ann Williams, 3 minutes."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So far we've been discussing the merits of the concealed legislation, but I think there's a fundamental question we need to answer before we even get to that discussion, no one's really asked it. And the question is, Is Illinois today to safely implement this prepared Representative Osterman held a hearing about two weeks ago to answer this question and the answer was a resounding no. And that is not me saying that, that is the Illinois State Police. The Illinois State Police basically informed us on the record that the FOID database is fundamentally flawed and lacks the requisite reliability, speed and flexibility

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

to be effective. Let me share some quotes with you for the many of you that were unable to be at that hearing. These are direct quotes from the State Police, which related to the reliability of the system that we currently use to process applicants for FOID cards and the same system that would be used to process the huge number of applicants that would presumably apply for a permit if this legislation were to pass. The State Police called the gaps in mental health reporting, 'a ticking time bomb.' The State Police has said that gaps in mental health reporting present a significant public safety issue. They 'individuals prohibited from purchasing a firearm Illinois due to mental health or other conditions could readily obtain a firearm' and that 'a replacement of the FOID card system was drastically needed.' When you hear quotes like being a ticking time bomb, in need of drastic change, that really has to give you pause as to whether we are ready to implement this system in Illinois. A 2009 State Police sponsored report estimated that it would take 24 months to update the current reporting system and that's just to be able to handle the current applicants. If House Bill 148 is passed the State Police estimates that 325 thousand people, approximately, would apply for concealed carry permits. There's no way, they indicated to us, the system would be able to safely handle that number of applicants. While I... and to the merits of the Bill, while I respect the Sponsor and the many proponents, I simply disagree that more guns do make us safer. I know a lot of law enforcement officers that have shared that with me as

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

well. Let's think for a second about what we're really talking about. We keep calling it concealed carry, like it's a purse or something, but the reality is we're talking about the concealed carry of loaded guns. That means carrying loaded guns... carrying loaded guns on trains, public transportation facilities..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your 3 minutes have expired.

We'll give you a minute to finish your thoughts."

Williams: "...CTA stops, public restrooms, many government buildings, restaurants, playgrounds, malls, hospitals, grocery stores, the Starbucks, beaches, gyms. Again, loaded concealed guns. Pharmacies, parking lots, cafes, banks, gas station, roller rinks, arcades, bowling alleys. Most public places. My favorite, the most troubling to me and to many of my constituents, street fairs. If you ever come up to the 11th District this summer most every weekend you can find yourself at a street fair where hundreds of people are enjoying time together with their families, children and enjoying alcoholic beverages as well at times. If this Bill were to pass, they would be able to carry concealed loaded guns in these places. I don't understand how this Bill makes us safer. I've talked to survivors of Virginia Tech; they have worked against this Bill. They are confident that it would not make us safer and having concealed car... loaded weapons would not have made... would have avoided the tragedy at Virginia Tech. Concealed carry was in place during the tragedy in Arizona. It didn't make the tragedy not occur. It doesn't make sense how more guns make us safer. We haven't answered the fundamental questions that we are

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

prepared to handle the influx of applicants and I would therefore urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Marlow Colvin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, I... I sincerely would like to congratulate the Sponsor of this Bill. As a lawmaker and a public policy maker, it is encouraging to see someone put so much hard work and effort into something they so strongly believe in. And for that you can't help but to be impressed from where he's gone in January to this day here on the 5th of May in 2011. But what gives me pause this afternoon is the last 10 Sessions here in Springfield where I have sat and literally kind of watched a play unfold year after year after year and literally all of us who have been here for at least one year could give testimony to the actors in this play. Every year advocates from the City of Chicago, Cook County and like Springfield and places come to work with Representatives Acevedo and Burns and Osterman and my former seatmate who made this issue commonsense gun control initiatives in their attempt to pass those Bills every year only to be rebuffed by arguments dealing with the doctrine of one size fits all. And it is ironic that here today that while we consider a Bill that in effect is a policy that all without creates а one size fits ever really acknowledging the real dichotomy or differences of the communities we come from. Chicago, I would bear to guess, is a lot different from the places Representative Phelps and Beiser and Bradley and Unes and others who are Sponsors of this Bill. It's no secret that Chicago has struggled

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

with gun violence for many years. And all of us come here with, at least I like to think, with a real notion to do something about it. I think the first place you have to look is how guns are distributed, how they are kept safe, if they get lost that they would be reported to the police, that maybe we limit how many guns people can buy in a month. All of these have been parts of legislative proposals where we were told that they didn't fit where I come from. Well, I can tell you how a proliferation of guns of this level, of this magnitude does not pass that one size fits all doctrine that we often talk about here in Springfield as it relates to policy that impacts every man, woman and child in the State of Illinois. This clearly is a public safety issue. Can you imagine on our city's lakefront on July 3rd, where more than a million people gather for a fireworks celebration and imagine this Bill being policy of the State of Illinois. And a modest number of people, just maybe 10 percent of those people have..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your 3 minutes expired. Please conclude your remarks."

Colvin: "...where, just maybe 10 percent of those people had guns. More than 100 thousand people on Chicago's lakefront at a time of celebration carrying a loaded handgun. Now, I know the Bill provides that if you're intoxicated that you don't... you don't take your gun with you, but nobody just leaves home in their automobile and gets caught drunk driving with the intention of getting drunk while they're driving their car. But if you go down to the fireworks show, where my family and I have been for many years,

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

there's an awful lot of intoxication on that lakefront. Talk about powder keq. Chicago is far different from the rest of the state. One size fits all does not fit this doctrine. Now, I... there was a lot of talk about police officer organizations endorsing this Bill. Well, I have letters in my office right now from the Chicago Police Department, from its superintendent, from our mayor and our mayor-elect, our County Board President and our state's attorney all opposed to this. These are the people who are charged with the responsibility of dealing with all of the public policies and the fallout by so much gun violence. Should their ... should their names, should their words, should their letters, should their remarks fall on deaf ears to say, no, this is still going to be good for Chicago, to give everyone the right to own a handgun. I think not. I think not. I don't think they should be ignored anymore than those people who feel like this is good policy. I've listened to your arguments and I respectfully disagree with them. We talked about the train..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, Representative, please one more minute and that's it."

Colvin: "So in closing, as we talked about training and the 200 hours I believe is in this Bill that will give you the ability to shoot straight, well police officers have to go through training, too, but that training which lasts for months deal with more than not just being able to use the power of deadly force, but also deals with situations that may lead up to it and how you defuse it. By giving everyone

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

guns and allowing some modest amount of training is not going to deal with the crime problem or the gun problem and the gun violence problem that we face in Chicago. We'll continue to work on these issues, Representative Phelps. Again, I applaud your hard work on this effort, but Chicago nor the State of Illinois is ready for conceal and carry."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Unes. Three minutes, Michael."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Unes: "Representative Phelps, has crime gone down in states with concealed carry?"

Phelps: "Yes, Representative and let me speak first by saying, thank you for all your hard work on this issue, for your people. And I... I do have a few... some data that's not... there's not real new data, but 23 states that have adopted the right to carry law, violent crime has gone down 38 percent, murder has declined 43 percent and those are just a few numbers. And since 2007, when I think it was the last data that was available, violent crime went down 24 percent, murder 28 percent, robbery 50 percent and aggravated assault 11 percent."

Unes: "And how many states have a carry law?"

Phelps: "Representative, right there are 48 states in this country with one on the way, Wisconsin. Wisconsin, if you read yesterday, that they are one step closer to getting this and the Governor said that he would sign it."

Unes: "Right. And... and the statistics, what's statistics do we have about people who get these carry permits?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Phelps: "Permit holders are more law-abiding than the rest of the public. For example, in Florida, Representative, the state that has issued the most carry permits has revoked only 0.01 percent of the undo to gun crimes by permit holders."
- Unes: "That's very interesting because we've heard from opponents, Representative, on this. We've heard from many opponents about people with carry permits. What can you tell us in this Body about those claims of licensees committing the… committing crimes?"
- Phelps: "Well, the information we got, Representative, on that from the Violence Policy Center, a group who supported both the Washington, D.C. and Chicago handgun ban, has claimed that over 300 people were killed by people with a permit and we heard some of that today with some of the other State Reps, but in order to fabricate that number they include a person who didn't shoot anyone but because it took place in his home they blame him. So, these are fabricated numbers that we don't believe in."
- Unes: "Okay. So, we know that the people who apply for this have to go through a background check, they have to go through 8 hours of training, they have to qualify for a handgun on a range and we know that these people are lawabiding citizens, correct?"
- Phelps: "Correct. As we can tell, Representative, there are about 6 million people with carry permits in this country. If you take that number that the opponents used, and I don't agree with those numbers, that would equal .00005

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

percent of the people with a carry permit. Half of 1 million other..."

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

Unes: Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "...to please conclude your remarks."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. And Representative Phelps it has been a pleasure working with you in this effort. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is a great example of what happens when we work together, what happens when we build consensus. This Bill is not only good for my district, the 91st District. It's not only good for Representative Phelps's district, this Bill is good for the entire State of Illinois. Law enforcement is behind this, Chiefs of Police from my area, both Democrats and Republicans support it. Every sheriff from my area, both Democrat and Republican, is supportive. In fact, they were here to testify in committee on behalf of it. Forty-eight states can't be wrong. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "I have 6 speakers left and I'm cutting off debate for anybody who goes beyond that. So, we have Reis, Harris, Nekritz, Burns, Mitchell, Reitz and then Brandon to close. Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Just curious as how does the Chair say that this requires 71 votes? I know there's a practical reason for

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- it, but at least a legal reason I'm curious as how you'd arrive at that figure?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, as you know, those determinations are made by the parliamentarian. And the parliamentarian has ruled that and actually has written copies of that available for you if you'd like to see his... his decision..."
- Mitchell, B.: "I would like it as..."
- Speaker Lyons: "...to make it 71 votes."
- Mitchell, B.: "I beg your pardon? Could you repeat that, Sir?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Pardon me?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Would you repeat what you just said? I'm sorry."
- Speaker Lyons: "I said, the parliamentarian obviously makes the decision on which Bills have to have a requirement of 71 votes. So, that's made by the legal arm of the Chair."
- Mitchell, B.: "And I... and I understand that. But, I would like a... a reasoning why the parliamentarian made that decision."
- Speaker Lyons: "There is... there has been... we have a written determination on that, Representative. We'll be happy to give you a copy of it."
- Mitchell, B.: "I would… would appreciate it. And… and I would like the Chair to state that publicly for the people in the gallery."
- Speaker Lyons: "Repeat that, Representative?"
- Mitchell, B.: "I would like a... a... publ... I would like the Chair to... to give a public reasoning why this Bill requires 71 votes from the parliamentarian for the people in the gallery."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Well, we're going to get back to you on that, Representative, before we take the vote."

Mitchell, B.: "Okay. And I appreciate that and I... and again, to the Bill. I... I certainly understand the practical reasons why this Bill because of the Governor Quinn's announcement the other day that he intends to veto this, but at least from a legal standpoint of why the Chair would possibly say this requires 71 votes, I... I protest. I possibly, I haven't read the written determination, but if the Chair says that because of Home Rule, I did not know since McDonald decision came down that the General Assembly or Home Rule units of government could determine what Supreme Court decisions you wish to follow and what Supreme decisions you do not. I certainly don't agree with Roe v. Wade, but I don't think that this Body or Home Rule units of government could enact ordinances in opposition to that. This is the ... since last year the Constitution ... the Supreme Court said that the Second Amendment is applicable to individuals. So, how a Home Rule unit of government could possibly say otherwise is beyond me. So, I would like the Chair to at least publicly announce for the folks in the gallery how you can determine that it requires 71 votes. I... I have a strong protest against this."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Burns. Three minutes, Representative."

Burns: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. For the time that I've been here in Springfield I've worked with others to advance what I thought is sensible gun control legislation that recognizes the rights, the constitutional rights, that gun

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

owners have, but I will also protect our streets. I rise in strong opposition to this Bill because it will not make our streets safer. Contrary to what other speakers mentioned, the National Academy of Sciences has found that Dr. John Lott's study on the relationship between concealed carry laws and safe streets was flawed and that in many instances of killings, concealed carry permit holders have been involved. Eighteen mass shootings were committed by concealed carry permit holders, 25 murder suicides and 11 law enforcement officers were shot and killed by concealed carry weapon permit holders. More importantly, U.S. News & World Report earlier this year listed the city... the most dangerous cities in the United States and those cities are in states that have concealed carried laws. I stand up, again, on this issue because I am a victim of gun violence. I was carjacked at the age of 17 in Cleveland, Ohio. A couple years later as a student at the University of Chicago I was held up at gunpoint late at night coming back to my dormitory from studying for an exam. And in neither one of those cases would having a gun on my person made me safer. I was shaking with fear, concern for my life and who knows, with a gun on my person the person who robbed me in both those instances may have shot and killed me instead of letting me go. We are all concerned about reducing crime and making our streets safer. We have to invest in early childhood education, we have to invest in programs that provide at risk parents with the skills and abilities to take care of their children. We have to make sure that we jobs and meaningful economic opportunities create

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

throughout the state. But allowing people to carry guns is not the way to make our streets safer. For those reasons, I ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz, three minutes.

Representative Elaine Nekritz, is she on the floor?

Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would just Nekritz: like to clarify the legal landscape that results from some of this recent Supreme Court cases; it's come up several times during the debate and I feel like there's been some mischaracterizations of that. In the Supreme Court in both the Heller case and it was directly reiterated in the McDonald case, indicated that the right to keep and bear arms is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose. The court also said that a wide variety of gun laws are... are still under the ... under the Heller and ... and McDonald cases still constitutionally permissible. So, there's nothing about those Supreme Court cases that requires Illinois to make this change, that urges Illinois to make this change, that mandates Illinois to make this change or even suggest that Illinois make this change. So, I... there... I just wanted to make sure that... that the Body was familiar with that because Ι think, again, this has been some mischaracterizations of that. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And you have been very tolerant in letting everyone speak. I know we're not going

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

to change any minds here, but just to make some points. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor awaits your questions."

Harris, D.: "Let me just verify, Representative, you have to have a FOID card to get a permit, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "How many murders were there in the City of Chicago last year?"

Phelps: "Not being from there, Representative, I... I probably couldn't tell you, but you probably can."

Harris, D.: "Well, let... let me answer that for you. I believe the figure was around 480. And I attended that... that ceremony today for the police officers... the fallen police officers in this state and the fact that we have had... have had officers killed and the... the inference that passing this Bill is going to make it more dangerous for them, I think that's incorrect. The murders in the City of Chicago are not perpetrated by people who have FOID cards, they're perpetrated by the gangs and the others that violate the laws not the people that follow the laws. The Chicago Tribune this morning said that concealed carry probably neither increases nor decreases violence. And my guess is, that's probably true. But if cities and states like New York with New York City, California with Los Angeles, Florida with Miami, if they can do it and you don't have a wild west mentality in those major metropolitan areas, what's going to make Chicago any different? We're just as... as civilized as they are. Now, this is not just a downstate issue. I'm a suburban Cook County guy. My district is in

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

suburban Cook County and I have to tell you that for the past probably 23 years, ever since the Laurie Dann shooting in... in Winnetka, the gun issue has been sort of touchy in the suburbs. But I was absolutely amazed when I walked around my district how many people asked me, what's your position on concealed carry? And the amazing part was, was they were all in support, 93-94 percent of them were in support. So, I think this is reasonable. The Representative has done an outstanding job in trying to accommodate objections. And I would certainly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis. David Reis. Danny, you're next and then David, you're up. Dave. David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, a lot of red herrings going around here.

You've stated that you have to be trained?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Reis: "Is this an annual training or a one time training?"

Phelps: "Actually, it's... some is one time, but some of the police groups wanted requalification back on some of the shooting and we allowed that to be in, Representative."

Reis: "Have to have a FOID card?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Reis: "No felons?"

Phelps: "No felonies in Illinois or any other state."

Reis: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that people knew that.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this has been said many times, but this is a Bill whose time has come. People talk

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

about places that you can carry a gun, malls and parks, yes, just as in other states. One of the Representatives said, it's like carrying a purse, only it's a loaded gun. Absolutely, just like in other states. Summer festivals, parks while you're running, yes, just like in other states. One Gentleman mentioned a lakefront on the 4th of July with hundreds of thousands of people, yes, just like in other states. And you know what, I can't think of anything more un-American than telling someone they can't. If they go through the proper training and the proper screening that they can't carry a gun when the U.S. Constitution, the longest serving Constitution in the world right now, clearly stated that the rights of the Second Amendment shall not be infringed upon. One other thing that came up here is that we're going to overburden the system. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Illinois is the only state that has a FOID card. Let's get rid of it if it's so bad. And what's so frustrating is that on that side of the issue, earlier this spring House Bill 1296 would have put 100 thousand more cases into that system that you're railing on. Where were you at then? Why weren't you railing on the inadequacies of the system then? Representative, I want to thank you for your time and your passion. I hear this on the street. We share counties; we share the same region of the state, but this is just isn't a southern Illinois issue. It's a statewide issue and I appreciate your tenacity and hard work on this on behalf of all the citizens. The Constitution supports this law, Ladies and Gentlemen, U.S. Supreme Court rulings, the precedent and

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

success in other states and the fact that the red herrings that have been mentioned really aren't there. And quite honestly, I think public opinion supports this, too. I support a strong 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Danny Reitz, you're the last speaker. For those of you have lit the lamp, I announced that there would be 6 final speakers; if you didn't hear that, my regrets. Danny Reitz and then Brandon Phelps to close."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Reitz: "There was a question earlier regarding guns and restaurants and other private places, does this Bill provide the ability for restaurants and other private businesses to restrict guns in their establishments?"
- Phelps: "Absolutely. The retail merchants and their manufacturer association wanted that in the Bill, also with the liability and we granted that."
- Reitz: "And... and there's been a number of lawsuits regarding gun cases in Illinois and across the nation. What happens if this Bill does not become law?"
- Phelps: "Well... Mr. Speaker, can we get the noise level down? I want to make one point for... if anybody gets anything today, I want to make this point."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the final questioning of the Sponsor. Could we please get some order."
- Phelps: "'Cause I think... I think today, May 5th, is going to be very... a lot of people are going to remember this day

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

because as what Representative Reitz is asking. The U.S. Supreme Court has made it crystal clear that citizens have a right to own and possess a firearm. Now, there's a lot of people in this chamber that disagrees and opposes what the National Rifle Association says, but when the Supreme Court rules that Illinois cannot have this or it does away with these bans and what the City of Chicago does, there is not going to be any regulations in law of how you're going to be able to do this. That's what this Bill does. Because if God forbid, and when the Supreme Court does this, the NRA is not going to sit down and negotiate any of this that's in this Bill."

- Reitz: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think my seatmate has done an amazing job working with all the interested parties, trying to make this the best Bill possible. I think it's the best concealed carry Bill that we've had and as the previous speaker said, we've had a number of them since we've all been here. This Bill has very stringent requirements before someone can get a license to carry a concealed weapon. I believe it's a constitutional right. I think it's time for us to return that constitutional right back to the citizens of the State of Illinois and it's time to put law-abiding gun owners on a level playing field with the criminals in our state. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Brandon, before we let you close we'll let the parliamentarian address the issue of the ruling."
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Mitchell, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, House Bill 148 preempts Home Rule registration of firearms without

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

providing corresponding state regulation and therefore, falls under Article 7, Section 6(g) of the Illinois Constitution. It requires 71 votes for passage."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Phelps: House, I know this is a very emotional issue. And again, I want to thank everybody who brought their concerns our way. This Bill is just about one thing. We know criminals have guns; they're always going to have guns and we're always going to be at their mercy. But God forbid that you or your wife or you or your husband, mother, grandmother or your kids were being attacked and there's no police around. In that split second, wouldn't you want the option to be able to defend yourself and your loved ones? That's all we're asking. And we put down some of the best regulations because, folks, you're going to be at the mercy of the NRA sooner or later 'cause the Supreme Court's going to rule in their favor and the court case is coming, trust me. Fortynine other states have some kind of carry permit process and Ladies and Gentlemen, they're laughing at us. Laughing at us every day and some... some people here are proud of that. We take an oath of office to serve this office, as a State Rep, as a State Senator and we're supposed to uphold the Constitution. Folks, let me tell you... like it or not, no one in here is above the Constitution. We have two Supreme Court rulings in our favor, more to come and all this is, is a commonsense measure. Somebody also asked and I don't want to use this, I talked to Teddy so he knows I'm going to do this, but one of the other reasons I'm running

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

this is 'cause I made a commitment in the honor of Joel Brunsvold that I would always keep his fight going and I always will. In his honor, the right thing to do was coming down to the U.S. Supreme Court. Let's quit discriminating against law-abiding gun owners, and let's quit delaying their rights. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a very thorough debate. Twenty different speakers on this thing and there's been a request for verification by Representative Harry Osterman. So, please vote your own switch. And the question is, 'Should House Bill 148 pass?' All those in favor signify vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Pihos, Thapedi. Have all voted who wish? Ford. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 65 Members voting 'yes', 32 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "I ask this be placed on Postpone Consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, put this Bill on Postpone Consideration. Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, behind me and I intended to introduce them in floor remarks a moment ago, four of my sheriffs are here today. The Piatt County Sheriff Hunt, if you would raise your hand and rise. Coles County Sheriff Darrell Cox, Douglas County Sheriff Charlie McGrew. And

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, one of the few African-American sheriffs in the history of the State of Illinois and a Republican I might add, Ed Motley from Edgar County. So, let's give them all a big welcome to Springfield. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol; we're proud to have you here. Thank you for coming. Leader Lou Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Acevedo."

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

Speaker Lang: "State your point, Sir."

Acevedo: "Today we celebrate Cinco De Mayo and I need to tell you the history of it. The 5th of May is not a Mexican independence parade... a Mexican independence day, but it should be. And Cinco De Mayo is not an American holiday, but it should be. Mexico... Mexico declared its independence from mother Spain on midnight the 15th of September 1810 and it took 11 years before the first band of soldiers were told to force and leave Mexico. So, why Cinco De Mayo? And why should Americans savor this day as well? Because 4 thousand American soldiers smashed the French and traitor Mexican of 8 thousand in Puebla, Mexico, 100 miles East of Mexico City on the morning of May 5, 1862. The French had landed in Mexico along with the Spanish and English troops five months earlier on the pretext of collecting Mexican debts for the newly elected government of Democratic President and Indian Benito Juarez. The English and Spanish quickly made deals and left. The French, however, had

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

different ideas. Under Napoleon the III, who detested the Unites States, the French came to stay. They brought a Hapsburg prince with them to rule the new Mexican empire, Maximilian, his his wife, Car... name was Napoleon's French Army had not been defeated in 50 years and it invaded Mexico with the finest modern equipment and with a newly reconstituted Foreign Legion. The French were not afraid of anyone, especially since the United States was embroiled in its own Civil War. The French Army left the port of Vera Cruz to attack Mexico City to the west as the French assumed the... the Mexicans would give up should their Capital fall to the enemy as European countries traditionally did. Under the command of Texas-born General Zaragosa and the Cavalry under the command of Colonel Diaz, later to be Mexico's first President and dictator, the Mexicans waited. Brightly dressed French Dragoons led the enemy columns. The Mexican Army was less stylish. General Zaragosa ordered Colonel Diaz to take his Cavalry, the best in the world, out to the French flanks. In response, the French did a stupid thing; they sent their Cavalry off to chase Diaz and his men who proceeded to butcher them. The remaining French infantrymen charged the Mexican defenders through sloppy mud from a thunderstorm and through hundreds of head of stampeding cattle stirred up by Indians armed with machetes. When the battle was over, many French were killed or wounded and their Cavalry was being chased by Diaz' superb horsemen miles away. The Mexicans had won a great victory that kept Napoleon from supplying the confederate rebels for another year, allowing the United

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

States to build the greatest army the world has ever seen. This grand army smashed the Confederates at Gettysburg just 14 months after the Battle of Puebla, essentially ending the Civil War. Union forces were then rushed to the Texas Mexican border under General Phillip Sheridan, who made sure the Mexicans got all the weapons and ammunition they expel the French. needed to American soldiers discharged with... with their uniforms and rifles if they promised to join the Mexican Army to fight the French. The American Legion of Honor marched in the Victory Parade in Mexico City. It might be an historical stretch to credit the survival of the United States to those brave 4 thousand Mexicans who faced an army twice as large in 1862, but who knows. In gratitude, thousands of Mexicans crossed the border after Pearl Harbor to join United Armed Forces. As recently as the Persian Gulf War, Mexicans flooded American consulates with phone calls, trying to join up and fight another war for America. Mexicans, you see, we never forget who our friends are. And you know what, folks, neither do Americans. That's why Cinco De Mayo is such a party, a party that celebrates freedom and liberty. These are two ideals that Mexican and Americans have fought shoulder to shoulder to protect ever since May 5, 1862. Viva el Cinco De Mayo. Thank you for your time."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "State your point, Sir."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you'd help me welcome to the Capitol and to the House chambers a group from my school district in Hutsonville. They're here for the State History Fair. If they'd stand up, right behind me. Thank you for coming and welcome to the Capitol."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Members, on returning to the Calendar. On page 10 of the Calendar, under Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 3039, Representative Lilly."
- "Thank you, Speaker. I rise this afternoon to... for Lilly: reconsideration for House Bill 3039. This Bill addresses the health care needs of individuals in the State of Illinois. We basically are encouraging, in recognition of women's health, women and their physicians to make sure that they're working together to deal with their cardio health. I am excited and I'm encouraged when we bring awareness to our health, our heart health, which is in the women population the third killer ... leading killer for women. I have been working with many of the insurance groups and all those who have mentioned opposition and we are working together to create the language that will make this good for the State of Illinois. I ask that you reconsider, excuse me, I ask for your encouragement to vote for this Bill as I work with the Senate to make the language that will help us to pass this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Eddy: "Representative, the Bill hasn't been changed, is that correct? You mentioned you want to work with people but..."
- Lilly: "Correct. I will be working with the Senate to amend the language so that all those that are opposing or have concerns with the language will be able to dialogue. I did sit down with them and had a couple of conversations. We just have not gotten together to get that done."
- Eddy: "Well, Representative, why... why don't you just move the Bill back and amend the Bill? Why do we want to pass a Bill that we're not happy with and count on the Senate to make changes that we'd like to see before we vote in the affirmative for a piece of legislation that's failed?"
- Lilly: "I... I apologize for not getting that done to this point.

 But speaking with several Members, they thought that this would be a way of moving the Bill and making sure that we are spending time and energy in recognition of women's health and the health of our state to get this kind of partnership with health... with our medical team and our community. I thought it would be a way of getting this done sooner than later."
- Eddy: "Representative, I respect that, but Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This is a... a heavy mandates Bill, one that's going to drive the cost of health care up. I think that's been agreed to and that... that is the real basis for the opposition to the Bill. A number of groups are opposed; the Bill failed once before. There's plenty of time to work on amending a Bill that we know what we're voting for is the final version. There's no reason to vote for this today. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. Let's work

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

together on something, if we're going to get agreed language over here without taking a chance on what might come back. A 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly to close."

Lilly: appreciate, Representative... I appreciate your concern. I really feel that many of our legislation and many of the things we're doing here for the State of Illinois is our ability to really work together. I have asked on a number of occasions that those in opposition to come and sit and dialogue. That did not happen. This Bill came to them to this Body a month ago. I've tried to move the conversations. I'm hoping with the Senate and the House to encourage those entities to sit with us so that this would not be an issue of heavy compliance that a business entity is concerned with. This is about health. This is about encouraging physicians and individual participation in health management. Cardio health is the killer... #1 killer for our men population and the #3 killer in our women population. We here, at the State of Illinois, need to begin to move forward and say to our insurance companies and our health providers, we must work together to increase the life span of our citizens. A young lady in my district at the age of 35 had a heart attack because she did not have the awareness or the partnership with her doctor. She had to learn about her health... cardio health on emergency room table where she expired and came back. She then preached to me that if I had knowledge of how I could take part in my health I would have; this would have never happened to me. I am talking the ability to work with

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

physicians, our citizens, patients, women throughout the state without the heavy burden, without the conversation of this is a money issue. This is a health issue. This is what we need to do as a Body in recognition of women's health month cause women are the backbone of our country. And we are in jeopardy. And if we're saying that this legislation cannot help a partnership between doctor and woman because of a heavy burden on the insurance company, I am concerned. And I'm hoping that you take this into consideration. This is about a partnership that is already on the books of current practices with physicians throughout our state and throughout our country. This is a... a standard or practices that are already in place. Those who are voting against it, is not voting against because it's not something we're doing and that's not something that we... are all ... and we should be doing, you're voting against it because it's a heavy burden on a group entity that you don't want to... want to harm or you don't want to have a disagreement with. I looking to cause any uncomfortable am... Т not amconversations. I am looking to increase the health and wellness of the citizens of Illinois in a partnership with the... with the individual and the physician with the support of the insurance bodies that most of us... that we do have can use to make sure... right... to make sure that we are collectively having a healthier state. I thank you for your consideration. I thank you for your comments. I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Have all voted who wish? Members, record yourselves. Dugan, Hays, Holbrook. Mr. Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes'; 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading appears House Bill 219. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 219, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair is informed that Mr. Tryon's handling this Bill for Mr. Beaubien."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beaubien. Excuse me, Mr. Beaubien is in the chamber. I was told you had left the chamber. I'm sorry."

Beaubien: "I've not left the chamber, but I'm losing my voice and that's why I've asked Mike to..."

Speaker Lang: "Well, I was right in the first place. Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And this is actually a Bill that I've worked on with Representative Beaubien for the last two years. And it's a Bill that simply will affect the… all passengers in a motor vehicle that will require them to wear safety belts. Right now, we are a state that has primary belting in the front seat passenger and the drivers. We also require any kids who are under the age of 16 to be belted in. It's certainly an issue when we see fatalities in our state that are caused by unbelted backseat drivers. This is a Bill that will save lives, it's a Bill we should have adopted in the past. And it will make

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- our seatbelt law consistent. I would be glad to entertain any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the alternate Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "The alternate Sponsor will yield."
- Reis: "Representative, who will… who will get the ticket if someone in the backseat or in the passenger seat does not have a seatbelt on?"
- Tryon: "It... it... it will be the same as who would get the ticket if a passenger was unbelted today, which would be the driver of the car."
- Reis: "What do you mean, if the passenger was unbelted?"
- Tryon: "Okay. In Illinois today, the front passenger and the driver..."
- Reis: "All right. So backseat... backseat?"
- Tryon: "In Illinois today, in the backseat any children have to be belted in. So, the ticket would go to the... to the driver."
- Reis: "So, four 18-year-olds are in a car and someone in the backseat doesn't have their belt on, the driver's going to get the ticket?"
- Tryon: "That's correct. The driver is responsible for the passengers of the vehicle and that's the way it is in our... in our law today."
- Reis: "And I... I understand that. But and now it's just the person beside them and they can see and a lot of times

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

there's an alarm that goes off that that person does not have their seatbelt on. Now, you're talking about a backseat where a driver may be hauling around a friend who doesn't have their seatbelt on and now that driver is going to get a ticket."

Tryon: "And today in Illinois, you could have..."

Reis: "Would you like your daughter to get a ticket like that?"

Tryon: "...you... you... I would... I ve taught my daughter to make sure everybody's belted in. I can't imagine even getting in a car without getting belted in, in a backseat or a front seat. But I might suggest to you that in Illinois today you could have two 18-year-olds and two 16-year-olds in the backseat and he would be responsible for that and get a ticket."

Reis: "Is this a... the way your language is drafted, will this, too, be a primary cause, reason to be pulled over?"

Tryon: "This... this does... this essentially would take the seatbelt law we have today and apply it to the backseat."

Reis: "So, the answer is yes?"

Tryon: "The answer would be yes."

Reis: "They could be pulled over just for this violation?"

Tryon: "Right."

Reis: "Representative... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the current seatbelt law passed the year before I came in and that's a Bill that I probably would not have supported. There just comes a time where the government can't be everything to everybody and regulate everything. I get numerous calls from my district, from the State Police giving out seatbelt tickets in small rural towns. Every

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

week, every month, just people furious with this. And we all want kids to be safe, it doesn't have to necessarily be just kids, but if we made this, along with the current law, not a primary pullover I might support it but not if it's a primary pullover."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate, but the Chair did not announce that. There are five Members with lights on: Mr. Eddy, Mr. Franks, Mr. Rose, Mr. Bost and Representative Flowers. I'm going to call on each of you, but please make it brief. The Bill is on Short Debate. Mr. Eddy for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, first of all I want to know if Representative Beaubien's aware of your batting average?"

Tryon: "I have a pretty good batting average."

Eddy: "I don't know..."

Tryon: "If you remember..."

Eddy: "...I remember..."

Tryon: "...he was not here when..."

Eddy: "Ah, we'll see."

Tryon: "...one of the Bills I had, the only Bill I ever had, went down."

Eddy: "Well. Let me... let me ask you, there are exceptions to this Bill, correct? What... what are the exceptions?"

Tryon: "There... the exceptions are in statute today, they don't affect the driver or they don't affect somebody who is medically unable to be belted in. They don't affect people such as emergency operators... emergency vehicle operators.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

It wouldn't affect a passenger in a backseat of a taxicab or delivery..."

Eddy: "Why... why the exemption for taxicabs? I'm just curious 'cause they're some of the most dangerous vehicles I've ever ridden in."

Tryon: "Well, a taxicab actually in many cases has a partition between the driver and... and the backseat. So, the driver is not in a position to observe the passengers in the... in the vehicle."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the idea then is that the driver would not be responsible for the fact or having to pay attention or couldn't see whether the person was in a seatbelt, so they didn't... wouldn't be responsible..."

Tryon: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...because they get the ticket. Now, couldn't that also be the same in the backseat of a car? If a driver is paying attention to the road and watching the road and sometime during the time they're driving some passenger in the backseat takes the seatbelt off that they weren't aware of?

Because the same thing happened and they don't..."

Tryon: "I... I think that could happen in the front seat today."

Eddy: "Well..."

Tryon: "And I..."

Eddy: "...I understand. I'm just kind of..."

Tryon: "...maybe that's not a..."

Eddy: "I understand the exemption, but how... how does... is this for shoulder harness or seatbelt or both?"

Tryon: "No, no. There are no shoulder harnesses in backseats.

So, you know, I mean..."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Eddy: "Well, I... there are... I have shoulder harnesses in the backseats of my vehicle."

Tryon: "Well, then you're..."

Eddy: "But I'm just saying, how do you know? If you're a police officer, what is the reasonable suspicion or cause to pull someone over to think that they... as a primary stop, to think that they don't have a seatbelt on when you can't see inside that car?"

Tryon: "Well, they would have to have... they would have to have reason to pull you over in order to observe that."

Eddy: "Okay."

Tryon: "And you know, would work... would work just like today."

Eddy: "So, they would have to maybe see movement in the car that would identify that the person probably is not restrained, movement around. They would have to have some reason though to believe that that person wasn't in a seatbelt. They couldn't just stop to check."

Tryon: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Well, Representative, I appreciate those answers. Just kind of... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I just was wondering why the exemption for one and if that same thing would apply to others, but... but I appreciate the... the fact that that you really didn't know the answer. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost for an announcement."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, we need to excuse Representative Jerry Mitchell and Representative Hays, Chad Hays. And... and an inquiry of the Chair, if I may?"

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Bost: "On this particular Bill, if it gets 100 'no' votes who gets the trophy?"

Speaker Lang: "The Chair will take that under advisement, Sir. We'll ask Mr. Dunkin the rules regarding the trophy. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "This is your first Beaubien Bill, is it not?"

Tryon: "Yes. Representative Beaubien and I have worked on many Bills in the past. Absolutely."

Franks: "It's so good to see him back in the chamber with Dee.

Dee, thank you for being here today. I understand that the underlying Bill, Mr. Tryon, was a Bill that you had pushed forward and that would require seatbelts in the backseats of all vehicles, I mean, the use of seatbelts."

Tryon: "Correct."

Franks: "So, but now you seem to have a change of heart because this... the Amendment would have exemptions for certain classes, such as those that would ride in a taxicab?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

Franks: "Okay. Is this a safety issue?"

Tryon: "Absolutely. I mean, as... as any Bill that we work on in this chamber, a Bill that's been around for two or three years, you work with groups and you find out what is needed to be done to alter the Bill and that... that's where that exemption came from. Most of these exemptions were already there. And certainly this is a safety issue. We have every year passengers in vehicles who are killed by unbelted passengers where they become airborne in a... in the case of

50th Legislative Day

- an accident. And that was the primary cause for belting in children in the backseat of a vehicle. So, it's no different if you have an airborne child or an airborne adult."
- Franks: "No, I understand. That's why I'm wondering why you would exempt a backseat passenger of a taxicab. How would that be more safe to exempt someone in a taxicab, for instance and not exempt someone in the back of an identical vehicle?"
- Tryon: "The... the problem with the taxicab in a livery situation is you have the... you don't have the operator of the vehicle able to enforce the seatbelt rule, you don't have the operator of the vehicle in a position even to observe it in many cases."
- Franks: "I'm not sure what you mean by observing? It's not...
 they're not like it's blocked."
- Tryon: "A lot of taxicabs have security windows in them... in the back and a... a taxi driver isn't in a position to be able to, you know, get out of the car and look at it so."
- Franks: "Okay. But that would not necessarily be a safety issue. That would be a fact that the taxi driver couldn't see whether his or her passenger was adhering to the law."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, could your bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"
- Franks: "Wouldn't it make more sense perhaps not to have a ticket for a taxicab driver if they could not physically observe whether their passenger was in the backseat, but still keep that requirement? And people should say, you should tell them when they get into the cab that you need

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

to wear your seatbelt and if they choose not to, then that passenger would be the one who would be ticketed and not the taxicab driver. Because if we really care about the public safety issue, we would have those folks in the backseat required to wear them and if they chose not to, then they would be the ones who would be responsible and not the driver. Would that make more sense?"

Tryon: "I think that's... I think that's an Amendment you could propose."

Franks: "Well, would it be something you'd be willing to do now or should we vote 'no' on this Bill?"

Tryon: "I would encourage you to vote 'yes' on this Bill because I think this is a Bill that's very important for safety... vehicular safety and... and this was to answer a concern of the livery industry."

Franks: "To the Bill then, I'll just very briefly. I appreciate your answers. I understand what the Sponsor's trying to do, but I don't think this Bill will do it. If we're… if we're concerned about safety and the requirement is that people in the backseat should wear safety belts, then they should wear safety belts. And if they don't, then they should be the ones who are personally responsible, not someone who is paid to cart them. And you may wish to extend this also to those who ride in the back of limousines because those who… limo drivers can't see in the back oftentimes as well. So, if you're worried about the individual who's driving having the liability, I think that we should shift it to the people who make their own decision, but I don't think that

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

we should take away the requirement. So, I'm going to vote 'no' on this. And... but welcome back anyway, Mr. Beaubien."

Speaker Lang: "The last speaker on this Bill is Representative Flowers for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Flowers: "Representative Tryon, according to my analysis it says House Bill 219 would require everyone traveling in a motor vehicle to use a seatbelt. And then it goes on to say, deletes specific requirements for drivers under 18 to wear a seatbelt. So, drivers under 18 no longer have to wear a seatbelt?"

Tryon: "No. Drivers under 18 have to wear a seatbelt. I'm not sure where that's coming from."

Flowers: "So, according to may analysis here it says, deletes specifics requirements. Are you deleting certain..."

Tryon: "No."

Flowers: "Okay. So, that's wrong. Let me ask you this. Number two says, require travelers in a motor vehicle to wear a properly adjusted and a fastened seatbelt. Who defines what is properly adjusted?"

Tryon: "In a seatbelt situation, front or back, it has to fit.

And it... I don't..."

Flowers: "Who defines properly adjusted?"

Tryon: "That is, in fact, what the current law is. And let me repeat, all this law does is it takes the current seatbelt law and applies it to all passengers in the vehicle."

Flowers: "The backseat?"

Tryon: "Correct. That's the same..."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Flowers: "Well, let me ask this, if..."

Tryon: "...the same way."

Flowers: "...if I have four passengers in the backseat and I only have three seatbelts that come with the vehicle, what am I to do?"

Tryon: "That wouldn't be the case."

Flowers: "That would be against the law?"

Tryon: "No. You have seatbelts... you have seatbelts for every passenger now in... in the front seat and the backseat. You wouldn't have three seatbelts."

Flowers: "I have four passengers in my vehicle and I only have three seatbelts."

Tryon: "I'm not sure why you would only have three seatbelts, but if you only had three seatbelts, one would be in violation of the law."

Flowers: "I, too, would urge everyone a 'no' vote on House Bill 219. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The very last speaker on this Bill will be Mr. McCarthy for two minutes."

McCarthy: "I... I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I just want to make it very clear, the Illinois Fire Chiefs are opposed to this Bill after it was amended to take them out, correct?"

Tryon: "I... that... that I don't know."

McCarthy: "Let me tell you before you... before you say anything.

I just... I just got off the phone, that's... that's why I jumped in late."

Tryon: "Yeah."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

McCarthy: "'Cause I thought I was maybe misremembering it, but I just called the... the head of the Illinois Fire Chiefs and he says they want everybody buckled up, that they are an opponent of this since they were now exempted. They do not think that is the right message to send, that people in vehicles responding to fire emergencies should not wear their seatbelts. They want their guys wearing their seatbelts. And I just called former Chief Bob Pugh to make sure I remembered it correctly and he assured me I did. So, they are... I just want to make sure that's on the record. They are opposed to this legislation at this time."

Tryon: "I am told that the Fire Chiefs did not oppose this in committee. So, this would be a new opposition. We were also told that Fire Chiefs and fire departments have their own protocols and... and enforce their own rules for safety within how their firemen travel."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Tryon: "And they didn't want... some didn't want that to collide with their own protocol."

McCarthy: "Well, I'll tell you. I know there's a brochure back on my desk over in the beautiful Stratton Building that told me that they were opposed. This is a former... the head of the Fire Chiefs is now... he's a former fire chief from Orland Park so..."

Tryon: "Well..."

McCarthy: "I know him personally. So, I just did call and he did say..."

Tryon: "That... that's the first we've heard of it our staff is saying anyway."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

McCarthy: "And I'm sorry... I'm sorry to jump on at the last second, but I was wondering if I was remembering correctly. So, after I made the call, I thought I'd make you aware of it. So, but the..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beaubien to close for Mr. Tryon who handled the Bill for Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes, thank you very much. President Cullerton and I were the primary Sponsors of the first seatbelt Bill that's been in effect for 8 years. It's been extremely successful, saved many lives, many serious injuries. This merely extends to to the passengers in the backseat. There's an issues with the fire departments, perhaps we can work with that in the Senate, but I urge that we move it along. This just an extension of what's already been a very successful program, which is strapping in our drivers or our passengers. And there are many cases in even our own area where people are killed, the parents in the front, the grandparents in the back, car rolls over and people in the backseat don't have seatbelt, they both die, people in the front walk away. This is a public safety issue; we've been through this before. The process of enforcing seatbelts has been very, very successful. It saves lives, it saves serious injuries, medical bills are usually paid by one form of government or another. You have workers that have become disabled and they're on workmen's comp forever. This is... makes all the sense in the world; this is an extension. And we'll work with the firemen on it in the Senate. Thank you very much."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? David Harris. Please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 on the Calendar appears House Bill 929. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 929 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 2, offered by Representative Burke, have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

Burke D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this initiative has been discussed for some time. My Amendment would do some very basic things would give counties of our state who have opted in with the ICE Organization to participate in the Secure Communities Program. If they determine that it is not working in their best interest, it would give them the opportunity to opt out. And certainly, we are asking for some reporting details with regards to the number of detainees and some other technical issues. I think it's a very basic issue to say that if this program that the Federal Government has proposed to apprehend the worst of the worst criminals in our community who are not documented, if it's not doing what it was intended to do, these counties would have the option to not participate any longer. I'd be very happy to answer any questions."

50th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Ramey. Mr. Ramey on the Amendment."
- Ramey: "Oh, we're just talking about the Amendment, Mr. Speaker? We'll move to the Bill next."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair did not hear your question, Sir."
- Ramey: "We're just adopting the Amendment now, we'll move to the question next?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has Amendments 1 and 2; that's what we're doing at this moment."
- Ramey: "We'll talk on Third. Thank you. Sorry for the miscommunication."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Basically, Amendment #2 does pretty much the same that Amendment #1 has proposed. It talks about requiring the collection of data and that that data be made available to the public. And that further, the State of Illinois should modify its memorandum of agreement to provide that no Illinois arrest record information may be analyzed by ICE through the Secured Communities Program unless the individual has been convicted of a criminal offense. Be happy to answer any questions."

50th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading appears House Bill 1958, Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1958, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "No running in the House chamber, Representative Gabel. Representative Gabel on House Bill 1958."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1958 fixes gaps in the 1999 legislation banning the shackling of women in labor. We have talked about this Bill before. We have amended it so that it only applies to Cook County. And I don't think there's any opponents at this time. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Brady, Fortner, Kosel, Senger, Zalewski. Fortner, Senger. Please take the record. On this question, 86 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, we're going to go down the list, First one we will call is Senate Bill 1336, Mr. Riley. Please read the Bill."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Essentially, Senate Bill 1336 asks that the Department of Transportation be notified... will require the Department of Transportation to be notified... to notify CMS whenever they have a vehicle that has to be repurposed, such that CMS can then look for other state agencies that might be able to use that vehicle. If there are none, then they would open it up to local governments to be able to transfer or... or otherwise disposition the vehicle. It's a commonsense kind of Bill and I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. The one speaker on the Bill will be Mr. Reis for two minutes."

Reis: "I just have one question, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reis: "Representative, this is so commonsense why do we have to tell CMS to do this?"

Riley: "Well, I... I think you're right in a lot of ways. It's just a procedural Bill. Prior to this, whenever IDOT wanted to replace a vehicle they would go to DNR and there were other procedures that they went through. They would make it available directly to local governments. This way, they'll give it to CMS first who is tasked with, you know, working with other state agencies and so forth. So, it's... it's... it's a Bill whose time has come."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Reis: "I agree with you... I agree with you, Representative and will be supporting your Bill. And this is just one more example as to why this Body needs to take a serious look at the effectiveness of CMS."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis yields his last one minute and six seconds to Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen yields."

Reboletti: "Representative Riley, will the… will CMS charge 8 percent to transfer the vehicles or transfer the vehicle titles since they charge other agencies 8 percent to do the business that they should be doing anyway at taxpayer expense?"

Riley: "The state agencies or... or local units of government."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I... as you know, you've sat through some of these appropriation hearings that they charge our other agencies 8 percent. Will they be charging anybody 8 percent to transfer these vehicles?"

Riley: "To be honest with you, Representative, I am not sure. That was really not... that did not come out, you know, during the crafting of this Bill. You would think that it would just be something that would be part of their... their normal duties, since they deal with all of the other state agencies anyway, that they would, you know, they would handle it just as a matter of course. So, I... I really can't say that they would be charging 8 percent in some method like a chargeback. I'm really not sure."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- Speaker Lang: "You made it, Mr. Reboletti. There being no further debate, those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mendoza. Please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1344, Mr. Nybo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1357, Mr. Watson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Watson."

- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill from the EPA. It's agreed upon Bill with the business community. The EPA then allows for CCAs, which are Compliance Commitments Agreements, and it provides EPA with the ability to... to enforce these commitments. It passed the Senate without any opposition. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

 There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

 And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1360, Mr. Lyons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Lyons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill... Senate Bill 1360 directs the Secretary of State to complete a feasibility study for implementation of a corporate sponsored license plate program. A year ago, I sponsored something... some initiative from the community came forward from an individual about an idea to try to raise money for the State of Illinois. So, it's an idea that it's time has come. The State of Texas has already started this program; they've made a couple couple dollars the first months implementation. Florida is looking into it; Virginia is looking into it. This just allows a feasibility study by the Secretary of State to look into how we practically put this together. So, I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives Cole and... Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1372, Mr. Bost. Mr. Bost. Somebody tap Mr. Bost on the shoulder. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Bost: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1372 simply puts in the... the Good Samaritan Law for when equipment is donated to veterinarians. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo in the Chair."

Speaker Acevedo: "On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1372. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "I ask... I ask for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Acevedo: "Okay. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson. Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there is 115 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill is declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank... thank you, Speaker Acevedo. I just want to say you look amazing up there. And I was wondering, can I go up there and be the Speaker for the day?"

Speaker Acevedo: "We'll get back to you on that."

Chapa LaVia: "Awww."

Speaker Acevedo: "On page 3... 5 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1379, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thirteen... Senate Bill 1379 came over to us from the Senate unanimous from a Dental Society initiative.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Currently, we have some outdated regulations here in Illinois we've been following on fluoride that we put into our water, and this would get us caught up with the federal regulations where we would actually be adding less fluoride to our water system. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1379. All those in favor of the Bill shall say 'aye'; all those opposed say '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, with 115 voting 'yea', 0 nay, 0 present, this Bill is declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar there appears House... Senate Bill 5015... 1585, I apologize. Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1585, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Mr. Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You do look marvelous up there,

Leader."

Speaker Acevedo: "Thank you, Representative."

Lyons: "Senate Bill 1585 is an initiative of the Illinois Academy of Physician Assistants. It basically allows the Driver's License Medical Review Law in the Illinois Vehicle Code to allow a licensed physician assistant or a licensed advanced practice nurse to sign the medical reports which the Secretary of State's Office reviews to determine an individual's fitness to drive a vehicle. So, this is... this is allow... there's no known opposition to it. Michigan and

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Iowa... as promised in committee, Michigan and Iowa have already approved this. There's other legislation pending in surrounding Midwestern states. There's no known opposition. It passed unanimously out of the Senate. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1585. And on that question, no one voting to... no one wishing to speak? Mr. Clerk, call the... The question is, 'Will this Bill pass?' All in favor say 'yea'; all opposed say 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 115 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 'present', this Bill is declared passed. On page of the Calendar... on page 5 of the Calendar there appears... appears Senate Bill 1589. Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1589, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's good see you up on the dais. Senate Bill 1589 simply states that if a person had been previously convicted of a felony and they are therefore convicted of aggravated unlawful use of a weapon, imprisonment shall be the only sentence available to the judge. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1589. And on that question, no one wishing to speak. The question is... I'm sorry. Representative Reboletti."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Zalewski brings us a good piece of legislation. We talked about this in committee where it would be mandatory prison for an aggravated UUW of a felon. If we recall when we talked about police officers killed in the line of duty, those folks were using illegal weapons. And we've had this debate just previously. But I know the speaker's friend who lost his life last year... lost his life because the person that killed the Chicago police officer, Mr. Valadez, was killed by somebody who was on probation for unlawful use of a weapon. That person violated his probation three times and was out and about in the community and was then able to kill a Chicago police officer. This Bill potentially could have prevented that senseless tragedy. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative, for those... the support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Acevedo: "And on that question, Representative Zalewski moves to pass Senate Bill 1589. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost. And with 113 voting 'yea'... Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, 111 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 4 'present', this Bill is declared passed. On page of the Calendar there's Senate Bill 1602, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1602, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amends the Dental Practice Act. It adds another testing agency to... for licensure for dentists. It allows dental hygienists to make sure they have proper training and certification for carving and enamel gram restorations. It deals with dental van unit and it also deals with continuing education. It allows up to four hours credit granted to licensees who volunteer time for nonprofit community services or local or state health departments or charity events. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Acevedo: "And on that question, the... The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1602. No one seeking recognition, Mr. Clerk. All those in favor say 'yea'; all opposed say 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dugan. Representative Dugan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on all that... and on Senate Bill 1602, 114 'yeas', 0 'nays', 1 'present', this Bill is declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1612, Representative Mell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1612, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill makes it easier to... to collect... It... it does two things. I don't have my sheet with me right here, but it does two things. One, it makes it easier to collect moneys for child support. The first one is it counts workers' compensation

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

as income so then that can be levied for child support. And it also makes it... it... the person when we are confiscating someone's passport due to lack of... of complying with their child support it makes it more difficult for them to reappeal it. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Sorry for my messed up explanation."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1612. And on that question, no one seeking recognition, all those in favor say 'yea'; all opposed say 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, there's 112 voting 'yea', 1 voting 'nay', 2 'present', this Bill is declared passed. On page of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1643, Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1643, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1643 caps driver's education fees at \$250. This is similar what we did with Representative Chapa LaVia's SJR27 last week, where we only authorized schools asking for waivers and put a cap of \$250 on them. The only thing that ever comes up in the waivers Bill in terms of a fee is driver's education. So, by capping it at this amount, we wouldn't have to deal with waivers in the same way anymore. This would take place at a school board meeting; it would have to be on a school board agenda.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Nobody would be mandated to raise their fee, but only after having it subject to the Open Meetings Act and having a vote by the school board could this happen. We all know this is a very labor intensive course. And some school districts have a net cost of anywhere from 750 to 1 thousand dollars per student. All students on free and reduced lunch are exempt from the driver's education fee. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1643. No one seeking recognition, all those in favor say 'yea'; all opposed say 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bellock, Representative Hammond, Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, 79 voting 'yea', 35 voting 'nay', 1 'present', this Bill is declared passed. Representative Morrison for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Acevedo: "State your point."

Morrison: "I know we're getting close to wrapping up for the day, but just wanted to let the Members of this chamber know that today is the 60th anniversary of the National Day of Prayer. And there was a service that was held last night at the First Presbyterian Church here in Springfield. And this Body should know that it is being prayed for by citizens all across the State of Illinois and all across this country. And just wanted you all to know that. So, thank you."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1643 I wish to have voted 'no'. You can let the record reflect, I appreciate it."

Speaker Acevedo: "The record so will reflect."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Acevedo: "On page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1668, Representative Pricker... Pritchard. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1668, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is patterned after one that was enacted two years ago and it follows similar language to that for the University of Illinois. It gives the Board of Trustees of Northern Illinois University the authority to set a comprehensive consistent policy of controls for serving and selling alcohol in facilities under its control for public nonstudent… and I will repeat, nonstudent related events. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1668. With no one seeking recognition, all those in favor say 'yea'; all those opposed say 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kay. Representative Mulligan. Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, 74 voting 'yea', 39 voting 'nay', 1 'present',

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

this Bill is declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1669, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1669, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1669 is... involves student transportation safety. As you may know, student bus transportation is one of the most regulated services in Illinois because it covers our most vulnerable population. As a cost savings measure, some school districts have opted to utilize taxi service to transport some students, particularly special needs students. The problem is there are a lack of regulation oversight of taxis and taxi drivers that are transporting our students. This Bill would simply add some very basic public safety measures for the transportation of students via taxi including requiring regular background checks of drivers, prohibiting the use of junked vehicles, regular safety checks of vehicles and minimum insurance requirements. I know of no opposition. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Acevedo: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1669. And on that question, Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Acevedo: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, does this apply to school districts that contract school transportation?"

Williams: "Yes, it would apply."

50th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Okay. So, this is... this is basically... this says they have... if they have a contract with a... with a taxi company."
- Williams: "A contractual arrangement, yes."
- Eddy: "So, what would a contractual arrangement be, ongoing transportation of a regular basis nature?"
- Williams: "Well, what this Bill addresses is a situation where there may be only one special needs child that may need transport. And may only have, you know, may have a certain distance to go that other students would not be along that route. So, instead of utilizing a bus for that purpose and utilizing the associated cost, they may do a contract with a company to transport that one particular student."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, this... this is for ongoing use. This isn't a situation where an emergency or a... a once in awhile occasion, the school doesn't have any other choice, they use a taxi once that they have to do it... it's for contractual situations."
- Williams: "I don't believe it's intended to apply to that sort of situation. And of course, parents can opt to transport their students... with their students any way they liked it. This specifically deals with school districts that utilize this in lieu of traditional bus transport."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, if they're trying to do this... set up a contract to transport a kid back... back and or forth 'cause it's... it's really less costly, but maybe less costly because the restrictions aren't there. If they use a... a taxi once in awhile, that's not a contractual arrangement; that's a... that's a use once in awhile. So, you'd say that that intermittent use might be allowable?"

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Williams: "Well, I'm not really sure how... how that would work,

Representative. What sort of intermittent use are you
referring to? Just... the parents didn't show up or something
and they called a cab?"

Eddy: "No."

Williams: "I mean, I'm not sure where it would be used."

Eddy: "In situations where students are late stay, they're kept late. In certain situations for special education, behavior disorder students sometimes have to stay late, but it's once every month or so, there's not a contract, but the only transportation available might be a taxi. Would this apply to that or is this... The way I read it, it was specifically for contractual relationships of an ongoing nature. And I just wanted to make sure that was the intent."

Williams: "I'm not sure that situation was contemplated in the Bill, but I'm not familiar and haven't heard of examples of that being utilized. Part of the problem is, you know, the contractual arrangements don't provide for the additional regulation. That's why we reference the arrangements. And we're thinking of more regular use, but I'm looking at the language right now. I don't think the Bill contemplates this."

Eddy: "Well, the language says very specifically on line 21 on page 13, no school district that contracts with. So, if you don't have a written contract to provide transportation, then I'm assuming this wouldn't apply to you?"

Williams: "I agree with you. I see that language. I don't think the Bill contemplated the sort of scenario nor have I heard

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

of this sort of scenario you mentioned, but if it does apply it does seem to be outside the scope of the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Acevedo: "She indicates she will."

Franks: "Representative, I'm reading the analysis and it indicates that the purpose is to make sure that students who take taxis to and from schools have a safe mode of transportation, correct?"

Williams: "Yes."

Franks: "And this Bill would require those drivers to have school bus driver's licenses, correct?"

Williams: "It outlines a list of requirements and they include things such as background checks and other things that are similar to the school bus driver licenses, yes."

Franks: "And it would require background checks as well?"

Williams: "It says... yes."

Franks: "Now, my question is, just a few moments ago, Representative Tryon had a Bill that would indicate that those who rode in taxicabs don't have to wear seatbelts and that would no longer be the law. That Bill just went to the Governor. And should this Bill go to the Governor, I'm wondering if children who are riding in taxicabs will now be exempt from using seatbelts?"

Williams: "Well, I think that's a good question. And actually, it's a question that Representative Moffitt brought up in committee. I'll certainly be happy to take a look at it and if that is a con... if that is something that is a result of

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Representative Tryon's legislation, certainly we'd want to modify it to ensure that children, particularly special needs children, are properly restrained within taxicabs."

Franks: "Well, here... here's the issue though. Should we pass this Bill right now, it will go right to the Governor. We won't have a chance to look at it. So, perhaps what we should do is move this to Second, 'cause we still have a few days, put an Amendment on there to make sure that our children are being protected because I'm not sure they will be should the Governor sign Mr. Tryon's Bill."

Williams: "Well, your point's well-taken. I don't see the necessity of moving it to Second. I will take it out of the record, answer your question and we can come back and revisit it."

Franks: "Thank you."

Williams: "Okay."

Speaker Acevedo: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record.

On page 6 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1708,

Representative Biss. Out of the record. And the last Bill

of the day, on page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill

1739, Representative Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1739 expands the offense of aggravated intimidation to make it an offense to intimidate a civilian who reports information about a forcible felony to a law enforcement agency. I will answer questions at this time."

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

Speaker Acevedo: "And on that question, the Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1739. No one seeking recognition, all those… all those will vote 'yea'… all those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed say 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And on that question, 115 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the Bill is declared passed. Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Acevedo: "State your point."

Reis: "I would like the Body to help me in joining my seatmate, his birthday today, he is celebrating the 34th anniversary of this 30th birthday. Happy birthday, Representative Kay."

Speaker Acevedo: "Happy birthday. Representative Will Davis for an announcement."

Davis, W.: "Thank you... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Eight years of being here, it's the first time I've seen you in the Chair. Good to see you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Democratic Members of the House Appropriations Committee for Elementary and Secondary Education will meet in the fifth floor conference room. If you take the elevator in the back up to the fifth floor and exit, you'll see the conference room. Again, the Democratic Members of the Appropriations Committee for Elementary and Secondary Education will meet immediately after Session in the fifth floor conference room. Thank you."

Speaker Acevedo: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

50th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 319, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 320, offered by Representative Colvin. House Resolution 323, offered by Representative Winters. And House Resolution 324, offered by Representative Osterman."
- Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Human Services Appropriations Committee will also meet again 30 minutes after Session in Room 100."
- Speaker Acevedo: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Resolution 322? On that Resolution, Representative Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. House Resolution 322 congratulates President Obama and members of his administration for successfully bringing Osama Bin Laden to justice and honors them for their continued efforts to secure our nation and eradicate terrorism throughout the world. So often we're very critical of our government when they make mistakes. So, this is a reason for us to congratulate and celebrate our President and Commander In Chief of the United States. He happens to be one of ours, he's from the State of Illinois. He served in the same Legislature that we serve in today. So, I just want to make sure that we don't miss the

50th Legislative Day

- opportunity to congratulate our Commander In Chief, Barack Obama, and his staff. Thank you."
- Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 322. And on that question, Representative Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that the President is to be commended for having the courage to... to make the decision that he made, but we would be remiss if we did not also thank and recognize the brave men that went in there to finish that job."
- Speaker Acevedo: "Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "I think it was a team effort and I rise to congratulate our President, the team members who went and caught the person responsible for all of the deaths of those Americans. And I think it's remarkable that we could stand here today and say to President Barack Obama, we honor and congratulate you. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."
- Speaker Acevedo: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Resolution 322. All those opposed say 'aye'; all oppose... all those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee announcements. For Friday, tomorrow May 6, and Session begins at 10 a.m., the committees will meet at 8:30 a.m. is the Appropriations-Higher Education in Room 118. At 8:30, Approp-Higher Ed in Room 118. At 9:30

50th Legislative Day

- a.m., Approp-General Services meets in D-1 and Approp-Public Safety meets in 114, both at 9:30 a.m."
- Speaker Acevedo: "And now, Representative Currie moves for the adjournment 'til Friday, May 6 at 10 a.m., allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 3772, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3773, offered by Representative Ramey, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 115, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 172, offered Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 335, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 959, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1449, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1644, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2002, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2185, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #5, as amended, First Reading in full.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article XIII of the Illinois Constitution by adding Section 5.1 as follows:

ARTICLE XIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 5.1. PENSION BENEFIT INCREASES

(a) A bill shall not become a law without the concurrence of three-fifths of the members elected to each house of the General Assembly if that bill increases a benefit under any pension or retirement system of the State, any unit of local government or school district, or any agency or instrumentality thereof. However, if the Governor vetoes a bill so passed by returning it with his objections to the house in which it originated, then that bill shall not become law unless, upon its return, it is passed by a record vote of two-thirds of the members elected to each house of the General Assembly. Likewise, if the Governor returns a bill so passed with specific recommendations for change to the house in which it originated, then those recommendations may be accepted only by a record vote of two-thirds of the members elected to each house of the General Assembly. The provisions of this subsection (a) apply notwithstanding Article IV.

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

- (b) An ordinance, resolution, or other action of the governing body of any unit of local government or school district shall not be valid without the concurrence of three-fifths of the members of that governing body if that ordinance, resolution, or other action increases a benefit under any pension or retirement system for officials or employees of that unit of local government or school district, or any agency or instrumentality thereof.
- (c) For the purposes of this Section, a bill, ordinance, resolution, or other action increases a benefit if it increases the amount of an existing benefit, adds a new benefit, or expands the class of persons eligible for a benefit, regardless of whether it includes an increase in contributions or a reduction in any other benefit.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. First Reading of this Constitutional Amendment, offered by Representative Madigan. Representative Lang offers House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 29. Second Reading in full.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Section 8.1 of Article I of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

ARTICLE I

BILL OF RIGHTS

SECTION 8.1. CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS.

- (a) To preserve and protect a victim's right to justice and due process, a crime victim shall have the following rights:
- (1) The right to be treated with fairness and respect for the victim's dignity and privacy and to be free from harassment, intimidation, and abuse throughout the criminal justice process.
- (2) The right to refuse to disclose information that is privileged or confidential by law.
- (3) The right to timely notification of all court proceedings, including related post-trial proceedings.
 - (4) The right to confer with the prosecution.
- (5) The right to be heard in person or in any other reasonable manner the victim chooses at any proceeding involving a post-arraignment release decision, plea, sentencing, post-conviction or post-adjudication release decision, or any proceeding in which a right of the victim is at issue.
- (6) The right to receive a report prepared for sentencing, reduction in sentence, parole, early release, or clemency, when available to the accused.
- (7) The right to be notified of the conviction, the sentence, any proposal that would reduce the sentence or result in release, the imprisonment, and the release of the accused.

50th Legislative Day

- (8) The right to timely disposition of the case following the arrest of the accused, including related post-trial proceedings.
- (9) The right to be reasonably protected from the accused throughout the criminal justice process.
- (10) The right to have the safety of the victim and the victim's family considered in denying or fixing the amount of bail, determining whether to release the defendant, and setting conditions of release after arrest and conviction.
- (11) The right to be present at the trial and all other court proceedings, including related post-trial proceedings.
- (12) The right to have present at all court proceedings, subject to the rules of evidence, an advocate or other support person of the victim's choice.
 - (13) The right to full and prompt restitution.
- (b) Definition. For the purposes of this Section, the term "crime victim" means a person directly and proximately harmed as a result of the commission of a criminal offense. In the case of a crime victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the legal guardians of the crime victim or the representatives of the crime victim's estate, family members, or any other persons appointed as suitable by the court may assume the crime victim's rights under this Section, but in no event shall the accused be named as such guardian or representative.
- (c)A victim, the victim's lawyer, or the prosecuting attorney upon request of the victim may assert the rights enumerated in subsection (a) in any circuit or appellate

50th Legislative Day

5/5/2011

court with jurisdiction over the case as a matter of right. The court shall act promptly on such a request.

- (d) The General Assembly may provide for an assessment against convicted defendants to pay for crime victims' rights.
- (e) Nothing in this Section or in any law enacted under this Section shall be construed as creating a basis for vacating a conviction.
- (f)Nothing in this Section creates any cause of action for compensation or damages against the State, any political subdivision of the State, any officer, employee, or agent of the State or of any of its political subdivisions, or any officer or employee of the court.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This has been Second Reading of this House Joint Constitution Resolution #29, offered by Representative Lang. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."