28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "The hour of 10:00 having arrived, March 18, 2009, good morning. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis who is the Illinois State Director of Capitol Ministries, serving the political leaders of Illinois. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Shaun Lewis."

Pastor Lewis: "Thank you. If you could bow with me in prayer. Father in heaven, in tumultuous times as these we recognize our inefficacy. You, who spoke the world into existence, have established the institution of government and have granted a measure of authority to each that is present in this chamber today. May they use their authority in all humility as servants eager to execute what is good and pleasing in Your sight. More than being held accountable by their constituents, they are accountable to You, Oh, Lord. We pray for our Governor, Pat Quinn, and those in the Executive Branch and we pray for our Speaker, Mike Madigan and our Senate President, John Cullerton along with each Member in the House and the Senate. We pray for our Chief Justice Thomas Fitzgerald and those in the judiciary. Grant wisdom to these men and women, indiscriminate of Party, comfort them as they spend long hours away from home and use the trials they face this day to draw them to You. May they seek Your glory, may they seek Your honor and may they seek Your face before seeking Your hand. In Jesus' name we pray, Amen."

28th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge today by the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker... thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Crespo is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and good morning. On the Republican side of the aisle, Representative Black should be excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect. There are 116 Members voting 'present', a quorum is present and we shall proceed with business. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 18, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 2016."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Flider, for what reason do you rise?"
- Flider: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to call your attention to two Pages that I have today. One of whom is the… Kevin Clark with my district and the other is a young lady by the name of Victoria Taraszewski. She is also serving this year as Miss Teen Illinois and she's also working with the March of Dimes today. I just wanted to call that to your attention and you get a chance to visit with her, she'd be happy to page for you today. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joe Lyons, for what reason do you rise?"

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it's my... my privilege and my honor, along with Representative Mike Zalewski and John D'Amico, we have some special people down here for representing the State of Illinois's Polish-American community. We have the Polish Roman Catholic Union; we have Anna Sokolowski from the Polish Women's Alliance; we have the Polish Museum of America, and we have Frank Spula who is the president of the umbrella organization, the Polish-American Congress visiting us. They're above us in the Repub... across from the Republicans, above them. Let's give them a warm Illinois to the Polish-American organizations of Illinois. God love you. Long live Polonie."

28th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. Long live Polonia.

 Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to go to the Order of...

 We've got a couple Bills on Second Readings and then we're going to move to the Order of Third Readings. We will go Democrat, Republican, back and forth. Ask that you pay attention and be prepared to move your legislation. The first Bill we're going to do on Second Reading on page 7 of the Calendar, Representative Beaubien on House Bill 402.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 402, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Tryon, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon on Amendment #1 to House Bill 402."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House.

 Amendment #1 just amends the… this Bill which will create
 the Private Sewage Disposal Fund to allow for the
 Department of Public Health to give grants for training and
 to local health departments."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 402. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. On the Order of Second Readings we have House Bill 764. Representative Cultra.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Out of the record. On the Order of Second Readings, Representative Dugan, we have House Bill 1055. Representative Dugan. Read the Bill, Mr... No, out of the record, Mr. Clerk. We're going to move to the Order of Third Readings and the first Bill on that Order, Representative Bellock, under House Bill 281. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 281, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bellock: "Thank you very..."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock.

Take your time."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 281 is a Bill that requires the State Board of Education in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Public Health to develop and make available guidelines regarding the students with life-threatening food management of allergies. It also requests that local school boards implement a policy based on the four guidelines that have been put into the Bills. So, I want to thank, first of all, all of the groups that have been involved over the last seven months in drafting this Bill. It has been a lot of discussion. I especially want to thank Representative Roger Eddy who has worked so hard with us on this. And we have finally come to an agreement with all of the agencies involved, pretty much and I'm presenting it before you today. There are approximately seven or eight children in every school in Illinois who have a serious foo... life-

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

threatening food allergy and that is what this Bill is to address."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Thank you. Just a couple of questions of the Sponsor, if she'll yield."

Speaker Turner: "She said she will."

Eddy: "Representative, for clarification purposes regarding the term 'in-service' in the Bill. There was a little concern about what that meant and I want to clarify for the record that 'in-service' does not just mean an institute day, but they... the guidelines that a school district eventually adopts based on the recommendations, can be... the training can take place at teachers' work days, other types. It does not have to be one of the institute days. It could take place, really, whenever the school could fit it in."

Bellock: "Right."

Eddy: "Okay. That's all. And I just want to thank you for your willingness to work on this. I... I don't know. There was probably at one point a dozen people working on this Bill and for you to pull it altogether, I think, speaks well of your... your determination and what you think of this legislation as its importance. And I would urge folks to support this. This is a serious problem and I think the Representative has provided us with a... a well-thought-out solution."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 281?' All those in favor

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Readings, on page 15 of the Calendar, Representative Dugan, we have House Bill 1055. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1055, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Beiser, we have House Bill 437.

Representative Beiser. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 437, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speak..."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Madison..."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 437 has to do with the bonding ability of two community college districts that I represent. Currently, they are limited... the community colleges are limited to four and a half million dollars of bonds for like... what I would call... health life safety. What this does is adds a provision that would allow for resource sustainability, greener type initiatives for all community colleges. But also, for two colleges I represent, it would take that four and a half million and move it to twenty million because of

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

the needs of those two campuses. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Sullivan: "Representative, you are asking for increased bond authority absent of front door or any type of referendum."

Beiser: "Yes. The current law allows them to do up to four and a half million. It's been that way since 1996, if I'm not mistaken. But this does is just takes that four and a half million and moves it to twenty, but it also... the provisions are there's... the college board of trustees has to approve of the project, there has to be an architect engineer stamped architect that says it's a need... a needed improvement and then also, it takes the executive director of the community college board has to sign off. So, those three layers are still in there..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Beiser: "...to guarantee that this has been looked at."

Sullivan: "Representative, can you expand for the Body on how and what funds will be used to pay these bonds off? Are there any increased in certain funds? Let's get into how we're going to pay these bonds back should they go up to the twenty million."

Beiser: "It would be done as they currently are through their annual tax levy. I was assured that... in speaking to my community college president, that it could be done under the cer... the same level of tax levy so that it would not be

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

a tax increase passed on to the taxpayers of that community college district."

Sullivan: "So... so, to pay these off, we're not talking about increasing taxes, we're using existing revenues to pay off potential increase in bond authorizations?"

Beiser: "Certainly. We're not… we're not looking for a way to increase the taxes on the people that…"

Sullivan: "Okay. So... so, to vote for this, this isn't a tax increase. This is just giving you spending authority that you will have to find somewhere in the budget to pay for the additional spending authority."

Beiser: "Yes, that's what... that's what..."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Beiser: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 437?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bassi. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Boland, we have House Bill 934. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 934, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Boland: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. What House Bill 934 does is that it prohibits felons from owning un... unsterilized or vicious dogs."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

Bost: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Representative, I think we've had this Bill... this is a...
We've had it before, correct? What..."

Boland: "Yes."

Bost: "...what exactly is the definition of 'vicious dog'?"

Boland: "Let me get that here. A 'vicious dog' in Illinois is a dog that has bitten someone causing serious physical injury or has been declared a dangerous dog on three separate occasions."

Bost: "Okay. It has nothing to do with the breed of the dog."

Boland: "Right."

Bost: "It has to do with the action of the dog."

Boland: "Right. Has nothing to do with the breed of a dog.

It's not breed-specific or anything like that."

Bost: "The... and in detail, because I just looked at this right quickly, what does this allow us to do when a dog has been identified as a vicious dog? What all does it allow for?"

Boland: "You know, I'm not sure on that."

Bost: "Okay. Well, the reason why I'm asking, and there is a specific reason why I'm asking, and years ago, and this is why I'm familiar with this law and that's why I really want to know what we're doing with it, my daughter, who is now an adult, was four years old and she was attacked and there were 25 stitches put in her face. Four of those stitches were underneath her right eyelid where a dog had attacked her and pinned her down and if it hadn't been for a very

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

aware... aware that... that... if they hadn't been paying attention, she probably could have been killed. I can remember going and holding her. There was a surgeon that told me, you need to come in here and hold her down and they wrapped her in the papoose blanket and they're saying, daddy, don't let them do anymore, don't let them do anymore and she's bleeding viciously. And when I wanted something done... and I was a county board member back then... and I contacted the... I contacted the animal control person the very next day and I said, okay, what's going to be done with this dog. And he said, 'Well, we'll quarantine it for 10 days.' And I said, okay, well, what else? He said, 'Well, we'll quarantine it for 10 days to make sure it doesn't ... it doesn't have any rabies or anything like that.' And he said... I said, no, what are you going to do to the dog? He said, 'You're wanting to kill the dog.' I said, I want to put the dog down, yes. He said, 'In the State of Illinois a dog must attack three times before we can do that.' Does this Bill deal with any of that? That's... that's my concern."

Boland: "It... it does not. I would agree with you 100 percent that, you know, we ought to do something to tighten up those laws dealing with that type of attack and so forth. This doesn't have anything to do with that specifically."

Bost: "Does... does this then just clarify the language of what a vicious dog is?"

Boland: "I believe serious injury is covered one time. But...
but this Bill specifically just is trying to prohibit
felons, you know, folks..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Bost: "From... from owning a vicious dog."

Boland: "...from owning a fighting dog."

Bost: "Okay."

Boland: "Yeah."

Bost: "All right."

Boland: "A dangerous dog."

Bost: "But... but here's the problem. When we first went down this path and it doesn't do this, it does not... Okay. When we first went down this path, we were saying that it couldn't be a Pit Bull, it couldn't be a Rottweiler, it couldn't be a German Shep... you know, they were identifying breeds."

Boland: "Right, right, right. Yeah. This has nothing... it's not breed specific."

Bost: "So... so, how... and that's what I'm trying to do is figure out how we identify what a vicious dog is because this dog that viciously..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this is some serious questioning that, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to have answered on this issue. What is... if this is a vicious dog clarification, the dog that bit my daughter was a Beagle."

Boland: "Mmm mmm."

Bost: "How do we clarify that? What... That's what I'm trying to say is, what does this Bill do that says, okay, you're a felon. Do you have a vicious Chi... vicious Chihuahua? What do you do?"

Boland: "It... it could be if that... if that Chihuahua has already bitten someone and they caused serious physical injury or

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

they've been declared a dangerous dog, you know, have threatened or attacked on three occasions then they come under that definition."

Bost: "Okay. Here's... here's my question, though. Because if you just... by the language, I believe we have a conflict in the law, because if you do the three... if on three different occasions a dog is attacked, it doesn't matter they're not going to own it anyway. So, you're not really getting at your problem because that dog can be put... is put down according to the other law. So... so..."

Boland: "Right."

Bost: "...not only do you not have a vicious dog, you won't have a vicious dog if the other law is implemented here."

Boland: "Right. I mean, I... I completely agree with you on... on the situation. I mean, you and I probably have been in situations when we're going door-to-door and we've ran into a, you know, loose..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost..."

Boland: "...dangerous dog."

Speaker Turner: "...your time is up."

Boland: "But this is only hitting at the felon."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you. Representative, I would say that there's several problems with what you're... and I'm looking at the actual text of the Bill and the actual text of the Section that you're changing. First of all, for people who

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

are under mandatory supervised release for any of this Section, or what we used to call parole, they could be on parole for up to 3 years, but yet for a period of 10 years the people... upon release of a person from incarceration, they're going to be under a watch for whether or not they have a... whether or not they have a vicious dog which is not defined as Representative Bost said, so you have that problem. And second of all, who's going to be the one who's enforcing this since after 3 years potentially you no longer have anyone watching them which would be a parole agent, for example, and then they're no longer under the jurisdiction of the court. So, who's going to be enforcing this in year 7, for example, just because they're a convicted felon and no one's watching them?"

Boland: "Well, right. They would not..."

Gordon, C.: "Because the whole Section... the statute in and of itself is problematic."

Boland: "Well, the... Well, number one, a vicious dog is defined in previous statutes, but the... the problem of, you know, it's sort of like a... a felon who's been off of prohibition... or I mean, probation for whatever years and whatever they do, they're... nobody's watching them directly. But if something happens and that fact is brought in, then they would come under this."

Gordon, C.: "But I... I'm telling you that any of the Class IIs or IIIs, and I think Representative Reboletti would agree with me, nobody's going to be on MSR for past 3 years on this, but yet you're going to ask for enforcement for up to

28th Legislative Day

- 10 years for a vicious, which is undefined, or unsterilized dog, which you don't have enforcement for anyway. And so the statute that you're changing is problematic and somewhat unconstitutional and there's no way to enforce it anyway. Do you understand what I'm saying? You can't enforce this."
- Boland: "Why, I understand your objection. Obviously, the folks who brought this to me, I mean, they are active in the whole animal area."
- Gordon, C.: "Well, and I appreciate the… I appreciate the folks who brought this to you and I'm sure that they have nothing but good intentions, but I would ask that you take this out of the record and maybe we could work on this and perhaps, make it a little better so that it actually could be enforced and it actually could be done properly so that we don't make the Criminal Code worse than it already is."
- Boland: "I will do that. Mr. Speaker, take it out of the record and I'll... we'll work with, you know, Representative Gordon."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor asks leave to take the Bill out of the record. Take the Bill out of the record. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 2244. Representative Biggins. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative... the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Actually both, Mr. Speaker, but that's fine. House Bill 2254 has been here before. 2244 and it's a... call it a

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

stroke Bill. I had one myself five years ago. Our former colleagues had one, some of them: Larry McKeon, and Milt Patterson, of course, former Senate Republican Leader, currently, and the Bill creates with the cooperation of the Illinois Hospital Association, the American Association, the American Stroke Association, ambulance providers, all of the participants in treating stroke and them being involved in getting care to the people that suffer them are supporters of this legislation. know of any opposition. It creates certain hospitals as stroke centers and in the short period of time that professionals have to get someone care is a big... a large difference in the condition of the person who has suffered a stroke. So, I would ask that... Be happy to answer any questions and ask for the passage of this Bill."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2244?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bradley, we have House Bill 2557. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2557, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley."

28th Legislative Day

- Bradley: "This is a Bill we've passed overwhelmingly a couple of times out of here. It's got caught up in infighting among the chambers. Basically, it encourages the state pension systems to invest in Illinois. It seems like an honorable and a worthwhile thing that we ought to be doing. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2557?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Riley. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brosnahan on House Bill 3670. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3670, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3670 is an initiative of the State Treasurer's Office. This authorizes the Treasurer to invest in commercial paper that, with the Governor's approval, will mature with... within 270 days after the date of purchase. Currently, it has to mature within 180 days after the date of the purchase. This would allow the Treasurer's Office to receive better rates of return on the commercial paper having longer maturities. I don't know of

28th Legislative Day

- any opposition to this Bill. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3670?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, we have House Bill 587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 587, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 587 makes mostly technical changes to the municipal handling of the fire... foreign fire tax and it deals specifically with fire protection districts. After yesterday's Amendment, it does deal strictly with the... those districts that are full-time, paid employees in those districts and basically, the fire protection districts will do exactly what our municipalities are doing at this time with that foreign fire tax."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 587?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson. The Clerk shall take the record. On this

28th Legislative Day

- question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, we have House Bill 47. Representative Brady. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 47, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Brady: House Bill 47 is an initiative of a local law enforcement agency in my department (sic-district), which simply seeks that when individuals will supply voluntarily information concerning a family member and special needs that those members may have for dispatch purposes, law enforcement and other related emergency services would be better made aware of those special needs by means of the dispatching. This would simply just allow the fact that the information would not be released or FOIAable from the medical side of the FOID (sic-FOI) Act. There is an Amendment that I will be putting on to the Bill in the Senate should the Bill pass from here which is agreed to by the Illinois Press Association and myself. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to... I want to thank the Sponsor. We had this up briefly yesterday, but we had some questions and he had a chance to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

talk with the opponent. And I know that he'll put on the Amendment in the Senate and I very much appreciate that. And as a result, I encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 47?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia on House Bill 4122. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4122, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is almost a identical Bill I ran last year in the House and it passed out 91 to some opposition. I have since removed higher... the municipal portion of this so it doesn't affect municipalities. But what it does, it amends the Criminal Code by making it unlawful for any governing body, state agency, county government... oh, I took that out. So, it's just for higher learning that employee peace... if that employee peace officers that have a police department to have the ability to either carry a firearms in the performance of his or her duty under any of the following occurrence: the peace officer fails to qualify with a firearm, they will not be able to do it; the peace officer

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

is declared unfit for duty or the peace officer is unable to be armed for some reason. The piece of legislation is brought to me by the Illinois Association Chiefs of Police and the Illinois Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. And we discussed not too long ago, last year, on the eve of the NIU shootings, that that police department that was hired by the university was able to carry their weapons. throughout the State of Illinois there universities, there are community colleges and there are a private universities that do not allow their police officers to carry their weapon to conduct their job and their responsibility. Just like we have our police departments in our state and our cities, they're able to carry their weapons and the tools that they need to protect themselves and the public, we're asking that them the peace officers or police officers that are employed by these universities have the ability to do the same and their board of directors cannot deny them the ability to carry their tools of the trade and what they've been trained on. And as recently as last week, I clipped a article because of the Alabama shooting that happened. It went through a section of this that shows all the mass shootings in the past decade in our country and the issues that we put our children at the universities at harm on. And I couldn't help to look back at April 20, 1999, student Eric Harris, 18, that killed... kill him and the 17-year-old that killed 12 classmates and a teacher and wounded 23 others at Columbine High School. Now, this, you know, the days and times in which we live in, we're assuming as parents that

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

we're sending our children on to universities that, if they do have a police department, that they have the right tools to conduct their business as a responsible peace officer in the state or police officer and what we find in the states is that some of the university boards are denying them the ability to carry their weapons in order to perform... to be a good, responsible, professional in that arena. asking for your support again once more and just please understand that this has come because of all the issues that are happening in our country with the mass shootings that are happening on our campuses and the universities and we just want to protect, not only the police, we want to protect our students, but a lot of these campuses are freeroaming campuses during the off hours of 4 a.m. and 1 a.m. and we want to make sure that the campuses are safe for the students of this state to be protected and the enforcement agencies that work for the universities to be protected. Now, if a university hires a security operation, that's fine. We're not asking that they carry weapons. A security guard is not the same as a peace officer or sworn officer. So, the universities and the public institutes and the community colleges have the ability to hire a security group and that's fine. not going after them. We're saying if the university is hiring police department to conduct responsibilities and duties, they must have the ability to have their weapon on them to protect the campus. forcing them to hire police departments, but if they are, if they're a police department, they should be able to be

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

armed as like every other professional in the state under law enforcement. And I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "There's a lot of them. The first person requesting recognition is the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy. For what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

McCarthy: "Thank you. Representative, I think you made a great description of your Bill and unfortunately, very few people seem to be listening in here. But once again, I stand in firm opposition to the Bill. It is your intention that if a university decides on their own by their board of directors to tell well-trained policemen that they cannot carry their weapons that the will of the university would be overruled by this legislation."

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah... yes. Because we're talking about policemen. I mean, you wouldn't say that to your municipal policemen that they can't have their weapon. If the university chooses to hire a security company, that's fine; we're not talking about that. But if you're going to give the impression to the State of Illinois, to the parents, that their children have a police department at the university, then I'm expecting them to have the tools to protect my child, to protect the teachers, to protect the campus and protect themselves if something happens like Columbine again or NIU which..."

McCarthy: "Right."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Chapa LaVia: "...good enough, NIU had a police department that was carrying and they had the ability to use their tools.

I understand your opposition..."

McCarthy: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "...and I, you know..."

McCarthy: "Okay. Well, I just want to make the Body aware of this that if a university, through its own board of directors, determines that they want to be a gun-free zone, but they do want to hire well-qualified policemen so that in case of emergency they can access weapons that are stored somewhere on the campus. Under this legislation, they would not be allowed to tell those policemen that they're hiring that they cannot carry their weapon on campus. Many of our private universities in the state have chosen to be a gun-free zone. This way they can only hire security guards if they wanted to continue with that policy. They couldn't hire well-trained officers who passed the standards board so that they can do it in case of emergency, but they don't want them on an everyday basis carrying their weapons there. I think our universities across the state... we want to... we talk about local control in here all the time. I think the boards of those universities are well-equipped to determine what they think is the best environment for their university and if they choose to tell their officers, we don't want you to carry your weapon during regular routine patrols, they should have that right. And I don't think we should be telling the universities of our state that we're going to overrule them and tell them that they have to allow these men just

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

'cause they're trained, they might be part-timers at the university, full-time policemen somewhere else, I'm happy these people are well-trained, I'm happy they're available in case of emergency. But the universities, I think, have a strong right to say if they want to choose that, they can choose a gun-free zone for their university and today they can choose to have either way. This Bill basically says you can't choose the other way if you have well-trained police officers. So, I would strongly urge you to allow our universities to have their decision making process to determine what is best for them and I think we should not pass House Bill 4122."

Chapa LaVia: "And then, once again, they don't have to hire police officers, but you're saying that they can have a police officer that has something... a high-powered rifle stored three blocks away when it's happening right then and there in time. And not only that, Representative McCarthy, our police officers that are trained..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. McCarthy."

Chapa LaVia: "...to carry a weapon have to... have to conduct themselves that they do a wide variety of things throughout a 24-hour period. So, the campus, like Northern that's a open campus..."

McCarthy: "I move the previous question on myself."

Chapa LaVia: "...you have people driving on your campus, you have no idea who you're pulling over at 3 in the... 3:00 in the morning. You could be pulling over somebody at 3:00 in the morning, not be a student of that campus, have intent to do danger to somebody and you're asking a sworn police officer

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

to stop that person without having a weapon at their side to protect themselves, let alone to protect the students on that campus. So, I understand your argument. I think that the findings of Columbine, a Northern, fatality shootings in... in all the places that it happened since February... I mean, April 20 of 1999, there's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10 instances that were on a campus that somebody came on there, had a weapon, either did damage and killed children, young people that should have been very productive right now in their lives, dead, in the midst of they should be teaching them to be... professionals and remember, once again, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police and the campus... the campus law..."

Speaker Turner: "That was McCarthy's time you were using. Give McCarthy another minute or so. Go ahead, Representative."

McCarthy: "Thank you. I don't know of every one of those 10 instances, but the Northern Illinois incident... the unfortunates of Northern Illinois was brought up in committee... and let's remember, the armed policemen there did not stop that. The man shot himself to death before the armed policemen could even take effect. So, saying that that was going to stop this in some way in overruling the rules of the university. Once again, as parents you go to that university, they'll make their policy well-known. I would hope that you would have enough faith in our universities across this state and their boards allow this decision up to them."

28th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? I think it's rather noisy in here for the type of Bill this is, quite frankly. Representative, I... in reading the actual language of your Bill there is no definition of 'peace officer'. Is there a 'peace officer' definition in some other part of the language that you would refer to in another piece of legislation or another part of the state statute because this does not define what a police... a 'peace officer' would be? Is it someone that had psychological testing in order to use a gun?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Correct, correct. It's all the same... Peace officer is coma... common... commonly used throughout statute and it is defined. Do you know what the code is? It's the highest level of law enforcement officer in the state and yes, they have to qualify with the firearms. They have to pass mental capacity analysis annually, 400 hours of basic law enforcement training. So, they have to be... they have to qualify with all that before they can be considered a peace officer... a sworn peace officer in the State of Illinois."
- Mulligan: "All right. Some of our... the Gentlemen on our side of the aisle are telling me there's a difference between... a peace officer is the next highest up or the highest up over security guard."
- Chapa LaVia: "Right. There's a separation. We're not talking about security guard here at all. We're talking if you are a sworn peace officer or a policeman that... a woman... that's

28th Legislative Day

- hired by an institute as a police department, those are the people we're talking about. 'Cause some of the campuses have that, but they're unable to use the tools of their trade, which is their sidearm."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, do they have the same training psychologically as a regular police officer would have?"
- Chapa LaVia: "They are a regular police officer . That's what we're telling you."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, then the only people that can hire...

 that can only hire... your university can only hire a regular

 police officer if they want to have this type of guard?"
- Chapa LaVia: "No, they can also hire security guards, but we're not talking about security guards. We're only talking about if you are a professional police officer... peace officer that you should have the ability to carry your trades of the tools of your job on... at your job to protect..."
- Mulligan: "I'm just curious. As when I go to vote for this, who am I giving the ability to carry a license around young... or to carry a gun around young people? Are they psychologically qualified..."
- Chapa LaVia: "A full-fledged sworn police officer."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, that they would be allowed to come on a campus..."
- Chapa LaVia: "They're already on campus. They're employed by higher education institutions to be on campus. They're part of... Can everybody please quiet down? This is a really serious piece of legislation. Thank you very much. So, they're already hired as a police department. This

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

would be, Representative Mulligan, this is like Aurora hiring their P... PD, Aurora Police Department. The campus is hiring a police department to protect the students, to protect the staff, to protect the administrators, to protect the public on the campus. And they are not allowed in some instances, at Northern they would... they were, but in some instances in our state they are not able to carry their tools of the trade which is a firearm. They're not allowed to carry that on them. It could be locked away in their locker room that's a block away, but they can't get to it."

Mulligan: "All right. So, the goal here is to do what the right thing is to have a psychologically safe person carrying a gun..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Mulligan: "...as opposed to someone that isn't or to overreact because there's an incident anywhere."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, correct. And right now, I mean, there's a federal piece of legislation that allows all police officers or policemen and what have you to carry their weapon at all times, at the federal level it was just passed. But what we're saying is that universities should not supersede the Federal Government and say that their police department cannot carry their firearm because the university board doesn't want it. You tell that to the parents that have lost children on universities that have police departments but have no weapons."

Mulligan: "All right. This still leaves the decision to the individual university as to whether or not to hire."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Chapa LaVia: "Exactly. If they want to have a police department, great; if they don't want to have them and want security is fine. I'm not talking about them; let's leave them alone."
- Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know it's been very loud in here.

I know everybody's anticipating the Governor and his arrival, but this is obviously a very important subject with school safety. What happened... was it... did anything happen at Aurora University to trigger this? Did they approach you?"

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Reboletti: "Was there an incident that happened?"

- Chapa LaVia: "Well, there were some suspects on campus that they didn't feel really comfortable with and just recently they had one, in fact, there was a chief... this just happened this year... that there was a known guy that was on campus, he had a background, but they couldn't do anything about it but follow him around. You can't, you know..."
- Reboletti: "So, these people are hired by the university. Are they acting in capacity of the police department or as an employee of the university?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well, they're a police department that's hired by the university."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Reboletti: "So, they're still… they're technically still Aurora police officers, still executing their job…"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, not..."

Reboletti: "...but being paid for it by the university?"

Chapa LaVia: "No. They should be a separate department within the university that's on campus."

Reboletti: "So... so, the point is..."

Chapa LaVia: "A law enforcement agency that they're hiring..."

Reboletti: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...to protect people on campus."

Reboletti: "Okay. So, then the intent of this is that the university doesn't disarm a peace officer so that when they go to some type of burglary or robbery in progress that, if the suspect has a firearm, they can use the appropriate amount of force to try to stop the… the incident."

Chapa LaVia: "Absolutely. And you brought something up even more... more obvious is the residential units, you know. The police are watching the residential units, too and you... there's always somebody on campus having too much fun, getting out of hand and they don't have their weapons to control the situation. All they have is... maybe their cuffs and their weapons back in their locker room 'cause they're not allowed to have it. So..."

Reboletti: "Well, it's not... it's not going to do them any good over there, so..."

Chapa LaVia: "No, it's not."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this vo… this Bill I think almost passed unanimously last time. I think it should. I know there are some objection there, but we

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

can't disarm the police when we're asking them to put their life in harm's way. So, thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the Sponsor yield? And... and..."

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Bost: "Maybe, Representative, I don't need an answer to the question 'cause I support the Bill, but I just want to confirm a few things. And I think Representative... a Representative earlier brought this up. You're not trying to give this authority to carry a gun to somebody who's not trained, qualified and certified. Is that correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Bost: "They are a sworn officer any place else, anywhere else, they would be able to carry a weapon."

Chapa LaVia: "Carry a weapon..."

Bost: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...except for on the universities."

Bost: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Bost: "Listen... listen to what the Representative is saying here. You have sworn police officers that have and need the ability to do their job. We would not allow... and as a firefighter... you wouldn't want me to be a... or to be a firefighter on a campus and all of a sudden they say, well, we tell you what, you can keep your hoses back in the department but whatever you do don't bring them out

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

whenever a fire comes up. You can keep your ladders for fighting those fires back in the shop, but don't bring them out, we'll have to wait for a different fire department, but we're going to tell all the students that they're protected from fire with our own fire department. Folks, it's a very simple Bill. It simply allows police officers to do their job. Nowhere else are police officers asked not to carry the tools of their trade. I think it's a wonderful Bill. I think we should vote for it unanimously."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard, for what reason do you rise?"

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Pritchard: "Representative, this Bill is similar to some others that are moving through the House this Session. One of them is a Bill that I've introduced, 2253, which speaks to Representative McCarthy's concerns that universities and community colleges have a choice in whether they're hiring a law enforcement agency or whether they're hiring just a regular security force that wouldn't have the same responsibilities. Again, a university or a college that hires someone, what expectations do they have for that person? Do they have a job description?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. And I did see your piece of legislation.

I also support that 'cause it kind of adds for br... more specifics than my Bill. So, I appreciate you putting that in and I know we were thinking about running it together, but it's important that people understand just the facts

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

that we're sending our kids to these schools thinking that it's a police department and it says they're a police department and they don't have the weapons to protect our children. So, this is all we're trying to do and I know you have some cleanup language and I thank you for carrying that piece of legislation. I want to mention one thing 'cause you're from NIU and you represent that university and that was sparked before... this legislation came before NIU, from Aurora... Aurora University, is that ... I don't ... there's no opponents on this. You know, the universities don't oppose this. They haven't told me they oppose this and they're not on record opposing this. So, I want to make that very clear. They might not like it and might tell you as a Legislator that has one, don't do it, don't do it; it's taking away our control. What about the control of the person that goes on campus and shoots one of our children? Where's their control and who's going to stop them? So, I'm glad you're bringing your legislation forward as well."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Representative and to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we live in a different society than when many of us went to school. Today there are risks and challenges and people that would wish to do harm to other students and universities have a responsibility and colleges have a responsibility to provide security. It doesn't have to be with sworn law enforcement officers; it can be with contracts with the local community police or the county sheriff's department, but whoever that person is that's providing security needs to have the tools just like

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Representative Bost mentioned a fire department has to have They have to have the tools to stop the tools. case of individual. And in the Northern Illinois University, Representative McCarthy, the individual took his life because he saw a police officer and he thought that police officer might be armed. We can't assume that's going to be the outcome in the next occasion that happens in this state. We've got to give the universities the tools they need and the officers the tools they need to protect students. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Wa... from Lake, Representative Washington, for what reason do you rise?"

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Washington: "Representative Chapa LaVia..."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, Representative Washington."

Washington: "...can you give me some clarity before I make a point. So, this Bill, it seems to be in the analysis synopsis seems to be that it's stripping the oversight powers of a board consisting of more than one individual whether it's state, county, local or institute of higher learning that employs peace officers to prohibit a peace officer from carrying a firearm. Is that correct or..."

Chapa LaVia: "No. No, the Amendment only applies it to higher universities. We struck out with the… the Amendment #1. We took out municipalities. So, there was opposition last year 'cause we had the municipalities in here because there was an instance when a police chief was mad at one of his officers and told him he couldn't carry his firearms for a

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

whole week. So, he was on the job on the streets without a firearm from retaliation from the chief of police because he wanted to teach him, you know, to respect the chief. So, there were... we were trying to widen it initially, but we removed all municipalities. This only concerns higher education at this point, so we removed that."

Washington: "Okay. But if you look at the… if you look at the synopsis that I'm looking at on my screen, it doesn't say what you just said; it says what I was reading off. So, if you could, I mean, it said..."

Chapa LaVia: "If... if you look at House Amendment #1, it will clarify it for you. It's under line 4. It is unlawful for any institute of higher learning. So, it strikes out all the municipality and..."

Washington: "So, that's not the case then?"

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Washington: "Okay. Well, here... here... To the... to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Washington: "No, no, I'm sorry. Representative, one last question. Would you be willing to take this Bill out of the record for the following reason: you know, I've been listening to my colleague on the other side, who's name starts with a 'B', and I know he was right when he said it's simple. But see, I wish I could... I wish I could join him in looking at the simplicity of something that should be simple. But it's complicated for me being a black official because I know more often than enough officers with guns will engage minorities first and foremost in large numbers as we've seen in a report that just came out

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

in the <u>Sun-Times</u> reprofiling the purpose and intent that we try to do with racial profiling with blacks and Latinos being stopped more than everybody else."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. I..."

Washington: "See, so, I can't as a ..."

Chapa LaVia: "I respect you..."

Washington: "Let me... let me finish. As a so-called minority, I can't have the luxury of saying how simple. I've got to think of the aftermath and those people who call me later on who have a problem. And what I would like to recommend in taking the Bill out of the record is that you allow myself and some of my other colleagues who share my point of view, not because your Bill is not good, but based on experience that we need diversity training as mandatory with these officers on campus and we also need a diversity officer..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Washington: "...at these institutions to make sure that the mandate and to minimize the potential risk and abuse of officers with guns not only put the students in jeopardy but also leads to a possibility of some other situation."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Representative, in their 400 hours, they go through that training. If... a police officer goes through that training in their 400 hours of classroom and instruction. Regarding..."

Washington: "Totally different."

Chapa LaVia: "It's already done. And I understand your issue 'cause I was on that..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Washington: "Representative, I've been in law enforcement.

Totally different than what I'm saying."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. But I was on the task force that you're talking about for profiling. This has nothing to do with that. This is not the Bill to say pull off record to work on that."

Washington: "Representative..."

Chapa LaVia: "I am willing to work with you..."

Washington: "...I've carried a firearm before and I've had that training. And I'm telling you what you're saying and what I'm saying is two different things. But I'm saying in the spirit of your intent because I know you mean well, I would appreciate a courtesy if you would take this out of the record. I'll sit down and work with you and others here who are sitting next to me have expressed similar views that diversity training must be mandatory and must be stated in the language and also these institutions whether they be four-year institutions or two that they have a diversity officer to balance out situations that occur much too often with students of color and so-called minority. So, it is a preventive measurement in which I speak not ra..."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was mentioned in debate quite a few times and I'll be very brief. I think that the Sponsor's trying to keep this discussion about what this Bill actually does. It has nothing to do with whether these people are well-trained. I want them well-

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

trained as much as everybody else in this place wants them well-trained. The entire gist of this Bill is it takes the right of the universities of Illinois, public and private, if their board says they want a gun-free zone, they have no right to do it after this. All else unless they can just hire, you know, unqualified security guards. If they want to hire qualified people, keep those guns somewhere on the campus so they can access them in case of emergency, so you either believe in our university boards and their right or you don't. This takes away their right to create a gunfree zone and yet have qualified people. But to talk about whether these people are qualified or not, nothing that the Sponsor's Bill does changes that. She understands that these people have to be more qualified, just like I have to be well-qualified. The entire gist of the Bill is whether you feel the universities have a right to create this gunfree zone if they want that or they don't have a right. This Bill takes away the right from both of our universities, public and private, across the state. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce, for what reason do you rise?"

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye'. The previous question is put. And the 'ayes' have it and the previous question is put. Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 4122?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Annazette Collins on House Bill 1126. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1126, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We simply ask for an 'aye' vote. This... what this Bill does is, a lot of kids get picked up and they're arrested. And so as they're arrested, we want to make sure that their case is expunged. These are kids who had never been adjudicated or delinquent, so the case was never reported to the court. So, the State Police holds those and then sends them over to the FBI and then the records come up later. So, we want to just keep it there and then at the end of their 17th birthday, that the case will be expunged because they're just arrest. The case never went through court... through the court system or anything like that. And so, we ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Reboletti: "Representative, what... who... do you recall who testified in committee in opposition to the Bill?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Collins: "No. You know, this was one of the ones that they... I don't think we had any disagreement about."
- Reboletti: "I know that I've talked to the Cook County State's Attorney Office. They had some objections. Did they share those objections with you, do you recall?"
- Collins: "No, because the two Bills that they had objections with we're holding on Second and we are drafting Amendments for those Bills."
- Reboletti: "What... And so, if there's an arrest right now and the minor is not adjudicated delinquent, wouldn't... what's the process that they'd have to go through right now to get an expungement?"
- Collins: "They'll have to go through the process. We want it to be automatic, but what happens now is the case goes to the FBI and then the case comes back up when it goes to the clerk's office. But these cases are just a... like a lot of times, just say, for example, you got a bunch of kids at a party and the police picked up a bunch of kids. So, they were all arrested, but nothing happened after that. They were just arrested. They realized that maybe they were drinking too much or hanging out too much or whatever. Well, a lot of municipalities pick up kids for loitering, but... they were just arrested. Well, a lot of kids and faced with adjustment and those cases stay on file. So, at the end of their 17th birthday, if the case never went any further, then it's just going to be automatically expunged. But okay, these were arrest records, never expunged... I mean, never... never adjudicated a delinquent minor.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

kid was just picked up and arrested. Nothing else happened."

- Reboletti: "Well, I thought that at the 17th birthday... well, actually, now it's at the 18th birthday, we've changed the Juvenile Act for misdemeanors. Wouldn't those arrests already be sealed and wouldn't it be accessible to anybody except for law enforcement or unless a judge unseals the records?"
- Collins: "No. It's not automatic. Illinois does not have automatic concealment and expungement, so when you go... like if you apply for a job, those arrests come up... comes up and then the State Police sends those files over to the FBI. So, now, the FBI doesn't have the authority; they are not abided by Illinois law. So, what happens is, if you apply for a federal job or if the Federal Government is looking for something, all that stuff comes up. Now, in Illinois, of course, if nothing happens, then it won't come up, but then we send the records to the... to... the State Police send the records on before that. So, we're just saying wait until the kid... if nothing else happens by the time the kid reached 17, then it goes away."
- Reboletti: "Who would do the automatic expungement? Would the court then have to file an order that would expunge it immediately and there will be no motion, it'd be on the court's motion?"
- Collins: "It'll come up on the computer system. Automatically it'll trigger... on the 17th birthday, it'll be a trigger into the computer and then it will just be deleted. So, if... and it doesn't cost anything."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Reboletti: "You mean, on the... on the Cook... on the... like the Cook County Clerk's screen? But..."
- Collins: "Yeah. The Cook County Clerk's screen."
- Reboletti: "But then the..."
- Collins: "It'll come up... the trigger will come up, okay, the 17th birthday, it'll go through the files. If nothing else is there, then it goes away."
- Reboletti: "But deleting it from there doesn't necessarily delete it from the LEADS database. I mean, there's... the police use those databases..."
- Collins: "Well, that's the whole point because then it goes through... we... they send this file over to the State Police so that it is the LEAD and then the police won't send the file on."
- Reboletti: "Well... this is for the expungement of any arrest. I know that police and prosecutors use those arrests not necessarily to take a look at other investigations and so, if we erase those, aren't we try... aren't we somehow harming the investigatory process of other crimes?"
- Collins: "The state's attorney still can have access to those records, but these cases were not adjudicated delinquent, they were just picked up for an arrest. They weren't adjudicated."
- Reboletti: "What if the minor has a prior adjudication and then picks up other cases and..."
- Collins: "No, it won't happen until the 17th birthday."

Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate..."

Collins: "So, everything would have happened..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Reboletti: "What I'm saying, Representative, let's say there's an adjudication for a battery and then subsequent to that there's an arrest for truancy, whatever the arrest may be, and then the case is no longer prosecuted. Are we... we're only going to erase the... we're going to expunge the arrest not the adjudication?"
- Collins: "That's correct. We're only talking about arrests in this case. If a kid was arrested, never adjudicated for a crime, he was just picked up for whatever, he didn't go through the process through juvenile court, nothing else happened, he was arrested. So... and we're not even going to do nothing at that point; we're going to wait and see. It's at the end of the 17th birthday or the day you turn 17, if he hasn't had anything else prior to that, then the arrest will be expunged."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what purpose do you rise? Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

- Reis: "Representative, you said just a moment ago that there was no opposition in committee to your Bill. Would you like to reclarify that?"
- Collins: "No. I said that... I'm looking on my... I said we had two Bills... we had five Bills we ran that day. Two of those..."

Reis: "No, I'm talking about this Bill."

Collins: "All right. So, we do have a slip from the state's...
the Cook County State's Attorney."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Reis: "Oh, and there were several concerns that came up on this and the Cook County State's Attorneys Office certainly shed light on several of them, but my question to... to you as the Sponsor was, what if you had a situation where a juvenile was arrested three, four, five times, but was never convicted and then turned around and got arrested when they were 18. They need to have this ability to go back and see that there's a pattern there. And I asked you if you would consider doing something where if there was just one or possibly two, but if they went any higher than that then they would cross that threshold and then they would not allow it to be expunged."
- Collins: "Representative Reis, we're talking about a kid that were arrested and never adjudicated. You may have a kid, depending on where they lived at, to be picked up because a lot of times the police pick up just a group of kids..."
- Reis: "Three or four or five times, that's a pattern, Representative and then..."
- Collins: "No. It may be a pattern depending on what it is. If you're in some municipalities and if you are loitering, standing on the corner doing nothing or talking or whatever, you may get picked up. And then you run your fingerprints and everything and nothing comes up, you're let go. Or kids go to a party and then they're out and maybe they were doing... they shouldn't have been there... there's too much noise in the community and the police take them all down to the station. You were arrested, but you weren't adjudicated. We're talking about kids who were arrested, minor offenses, as a delinquent juvenile. We're

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

not talking about it until they're 18 they're considered an adult, if they were picked up and arrested. But we're talking about the..."

Reis: "But there's a pattern there and that's the reason for the opposition by the state's... or the Cook County State's Attorneys Office..."

Collins: "Right."

Reis: "...is that they think that this will reduce the effectiveness of juvenile screenings, investigations and other information that may assist in prosecutorial investigations."

Collins: "Yeah. And well..."

Reis: "And this information is vital, this prior..."

Collins: "How will it do that? First of all, as a juvenile we're talking about a delinquent minor and we wouldn't do it until they're no longer a juvenile. So, they were arrested on a..."

Reis: "But this information in their eyes... and these are the people that do this every day..."

Collins: "And they will that information that they were adjudicated before their 17th birthday then they wouldn't be an adult at that point and they were never convicted. The state's attorney can still look at that and those records are not going to the FBI, which is what we're mainly trying to focus on, that the case not going to the FBI, but the municipalities still have a right to look at those court records. It's not like they're going to go away. They're just not going to send them to the State Pol... the State Police is not going to send those files on

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

to the FBI, but the municipalities would still have a right to look at those records."

Reis: "Okay. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a major shift, a major paradigm shift and I think that comment was brought up in committee of not allowing the state's attorneys, people that are on the frontline, to do They feel that this information is vital to their job. providing LEADS and other information in cases that happen after they turn of age. They spoke out highly in committee and afterwards to us saying how this is going to harm their ability in using past situations in determining sentences and investigations in the future. So, I would ask for your 'no' vote on this. There has to be consequences for these kids and I understand the one or two times that this may happen, but now the Sponsor's not willing to just limit the threshold on numbers. There has to be consequences for these repeaters that repeat and repeat and repeat. We can no longer just have them come in and get off and have records expunged when..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Reis: "...that information is there and can be used. So, I ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Sacia: "Representative, this Bill has a definite ring to it.

We dealt with this Bill last Thursday in Room 115 and we

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

literally voted on this Bill before the opponents were given a chance to speak. Do you recall that?"

Collins: "No, no, I don't."

Sacia: "That did happen, Representative."

Collins: "All right."

Sacia: "And I don't think it was malicious, but it literally There were folks with opposition from the did happen. State's Attorneys Office of Cook County that wanted to speak and they were allowed to speak, but the vote had already been taken and it did, obviously, pass out of committee. But... but this ... in the essence of time, I'm not going to hammer this, but this really is a Bill... and Representative Reis said it so well... we're making a major paradigm shift. The Sponsor would have you believe that numerous times young people are picked up, they're herded downtown and I'm not denying that things like that happen, I'm not denying that at all, but by the same token many young people are arrested with legitimate charges by the law enforcement officers on the scene, they're taken downtown, the matter is dismissed and it may have been of great significance and to just expunge this without having a future employer or others with concern have access to is a tremendous detriment to information enforcement, to good hiring practices. I appreciate what Sponsor is trying to do, but I think this legislation that would be very hurtful and I ask for your 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

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

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Bost: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and I hope that... I know that we're right here on the time when the Governor's going to be coming and speaking, but I hope you're listening very closely to the debate that's going on. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are certain crimes that can be committed by juveniles that are information that does need to be transferred on to the time that they became... become There are certain repeat offenses that can an adult. happen whether it's... whether it is arson, sex offenses, those type issues that law enforcement and the prosecutors need the opportunity to have these records available to them and it needs to be very clear where it is and so that they can find it and use it as a tool as necessary. Folks, none of us want to see the antics of a... of a juvenile that are minor, something that'll affect them in long-term; however, there are antics that are not just antics. are things that are true crime that need to be observed and this would remove a tool, an important tool, to law enforcement and to prosecutors. I suggest that it gets a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "Will the Lady yield for some questions?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Rose: "Representative, you say that this applies to the age of 17; however, did you not last year pass a Bill that raises misdemeanors to age 18?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Collins: "We raised misdemeanors to 18, but we didn't carry this Bill to 18. This Bill is still only going to affect you until the… until you get to 17 because the purpose of the Bill is it's not for conviction. These are children that have been arrested, not convicted and the reason why we didn't take it and we… when we discussed the Bill, we took into account that the 18th… that we raised misdemeanors up to 18, but the purpose of keeping it at 17 because this is the age that a lot of kids are graduating from high school, getting ready to fill out their college applications and go on and so that if the kid was never, never, never convicted."

Rose: "Representative..."

Collins: "We're just talking about a kid that was picked up and arrested, so when they get ready to fill out their college application, they can have that on file and that... that the state's attorn..."

Rose: "Representative, let me give you an example of why this is important information. We have a program called diversion, Representative, where you get a kid who makes a one-time mistake, it's the first time through the system; they're arrested, but they're not charged. They're diverted. They go to the animal shelter and clean it on Saturday mornings, et cetera, et cetera. Ninety percent of those kids you never see them again, they learn their lesson, you know, Godspeed. Ten percent come back, 10 percent come back. I don't know what the percentage is, but some of them come back. My point is, how then... when

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

they come back a second time... are you supposed to know that you've already diverted them once before?"

Collins: "'Cause they..."

Rose: "The records are gone."

Collins: "The records are still there and you're talking about..."

Rose: "No, they're not. You just expunged them."

Collins: "...the records are not going to change until their 17th birthday. You're saying that the kid... they're not going to expunge it. Like if you were 16 today and you're... you were arrested, well, you're going to wait a whole year 'til that kid gets 17..."

Rose: "That's... that's my point."

Collins: "...or say if the kid was 15 or say if the kid was 14..."

Rose: "Let... let me ask you this question. If you are 17..."

Collins: "...you're going to wait long... you asked the question.

You have to wait until I finish responding..."

Rose: "Well, Representative, you..."

Collins: "...before you can continue to talk."

Rose: "Well, Representative..."

Collins: "Now, the first thing is is that if you are 13, 14, 15, 16 years old, you're going to see all of that. So, our point is that the Bill says a year, if you've had..."

Rose: "I understand that. I... I read it. It said a year."

Collins: "...if you've had nothing else happen before your... you may understand, but everyone else is going to... you are trying to say..."

Rose: "Here's the question, Representative."

Collins: "...something else is going on, but what I...

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "Representative, Representatives...

Representative Collins... Representative Rose."

Rose: "If someone..."

Collins: "I'm trying to answer his question very clearly..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Collins: "...so that you... so that people can understand."

Speaker Turner: "We understand. We understand, but we're running out of time. So, we're going to ask that you take the Bill out of the record and we will come back to this Bill when we... after the Budget Address. So, we're going to take the Bill out of..."

Collins: "Okay. Thank you."

Rose: "No. Come on..."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady's Bill is being removed from the record. Those who asked questions earlier probably won't have to ask them when we bring it back again. Mr. Clerk, with announcement."

Clerk Mahoney: "For an announcement. The Agreed Bill List that is circulating... the Agreed List... to turn in for the Agreed Bill List... is due at 12 noon today. Please turn it in by 12 noon today."

Speaker Turner: "The regular Session will stand in recess. The Doorkeeper is recognized for an announcement. Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper Crawford: "Mr. Speaker, the Honorable President Cullerton and the Members of the Senate are at the door and seek admission to the chamber."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Doorkeeper, please admit the Honorable Senators. As designated... as designated in House Joint

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Resolution #34, the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Joint Session of the 96th General Assembly will now come to order. Will the Members of the House and our esteemed guests from the Senate please take their seats. Mr. Clerk, is a quorum of the House present?"

Clerk Mahoney: "A quorum of the House is present."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, could people begin to take their seats. Ladies and Gentlemen, please take your seats. Would everyone take their seats. Would everyone please take their seats. Would everyone please take their seats. Democrats, please take your seats. Mr. Clerk, a quorum of the House is present. Mr. President, is a quorum of the Senate present in this chamber?"

President Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A quorum of the Senate is present."

"There being a quorum of the House and a Speaker Madigan: quorum of the Senate in attendance, this Joint Session is convened. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, please. We're very pleased to have with us some esteemed guests. We would like to introduce them. First, the Chief of Staff to the Governor, Mr. Jerry Stermer, Jerry Stermer. The Governor's Chief Operating Officer, Mr. Jack Lavin. The Attorney General, Lisa Madigan. The Secretary of State, Jesse White. The Comptroller, Dan Hynes. The Treasurer, Alexi The Auditor General, Bill Giannoulias. Superintendent of Education, Chris Koch. Chair of the Illinois Arts Council, Shirley Madigan. The Chair recognizes the Majority Leader, Representative Currie."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Clerk please read Joint Session Resolution #1."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Joint Session Resolution #1.
 - RESOLVED, That a committee of ten be appointed, five from the House, by the Speaker of the House, and five from the Senate, by the President of the Senate, to wait upon the Honorable Governor of the State of Illinois and invite him to address the Joint Assembly."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Majority Leader Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for the adoption of Joint Session Resolution 1."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Pursuant to the Resolution, the following are appointed as a Committee of Escort to escort the Governor into the chamber. The appointments from the House will be: Representative Soto, Representative Joyce, Representative Yarbrough, Representative Moffitt, Representative Connelly."
- President Cullerton: "The Senate Members: Senator Edward Maloney, Senator Willie Delgado, Senator Heather Steans, Senator Dan Rutherford, Senator Kyle McCarter."
- Speaker Madigan: "Would the Committee of Escort please convene at the rear of the chamber and await the arrival of His Excellency, the Governor. If the Committee would please

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

retire to the rear of the chamber, the Governor has arrived. The Chair recognizes the Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper Crawford: "Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Governor of the State of Illinois, Patrick J. Quinn and his party wish to be admitted to this chamber."

Speaker Madigan: "Admit the Honorable Governor."

Governor Quinn: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. Okay. Okay. Thank you. I hope you're applauding at the end of this speech. Okay. Thank you very much. I think... I certainly appreciate the kind and warm reception. I want to thank everyone for everything you've been able to do for me and for our state in past seven weeks and indeed, in the past months before the last seven weeks. I think the people of Illinois are proud of the Members of the General Assembly and how you've conducted the public's business. I want to say good afternoon to everyone. We believe in warm greetings in Illinois. And I want to point out to everyone that our state is one state and we believe in everybody being in and nobody being left out. It was nearly seven weeks ago that I had the honor of being sworn in at this very place as the 41st Governor of the State of Illinois, was a high honor indeed. And as you know, this came about... this event after a political ordeal that harmed embarrassed the people of the State of Illinois. And for too long, our state has suffered from corruption that has damaged our political reputation and most tragically it's deeply hurt our citizens. Illinois is still recovering from the conviction of former Governor George Ryan and our state is still reeling from the arrest of former Governor

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Rod Blagojevich and his subsequent removal from office. many serious problems have resulted from bipartisan betrayal of the public trust. Our government has an integrity crisis and Illinois must embrace farreaching ethics reform. Illinois also has a fiscal crisis. Our state is staggering today to pay an eleven and a half billion dollar deficit and we have a mountain of unpaid The Illinois economy is also in bills. crisis. Unemployment is rising. Our people are hurting. direct and honest, our state is facing its greatest crisis in modern times. But I am not here to dwell on the past nor preach gloom and doom. On the contrary, I am an optimist and I have complete faith in the good people of Illinois. They have the strength of character to meet any challenge and to save our state we have to make tough choices. So, today I present a budget for fiscal year 2010 and this budget is balanced. It also speaks honestly and directly to the people of Illinois about our tough choices. When it is approved, this budget will achieve three crucial outcomes. It will cut costs while dramatically raising the ethical standards for doing the public's business. It will provide tax relief to millions of people while rescuing our state's finances. And it will create thousands of Illinois jobs with the first major plan to rebuild our roads, our bridges, our schools, and other public works in a decade. This budget focuses on 'three Rs': reform, responsibility, and recovery. It's important that we talk honestly about our need to reform. In tough times, everyone... everyone must live within their means and that goes for government,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Right now, our state revenues are dropping too. precipitously. We have a decline in our revenue and a failure of our revenue and in this calamity, the state is spending more than it should. And that's a bad situation, but for the first time in a generation we intend challenge the way State Government does its business. can no longer sustain out-of-control spending that we've seen in the past under both Parties. Today, I am proposing major cuts and cost reductions that will save at least \$1.3 billion. These cutbacks include: ordering state employees to take furloughs of four days, requiring across-the-board reductions in grant programs and making targeted cost reductions at every state agency. I pledge this is only the beginning of the belt-tightening because today I'm also appointing a new Taxpayer Action Board to evaluate all state spending and all programs. This board will examine every nook and cranny of State Government finance. Johnson, who is the President of the Taxpayer Federation of Illinois, will head the Taxpayer Action Board. I want to thank Tom for his help and his support. And the purpose of the Taxpayer Action Board is to put Illinois taxpayers first. We have to root out waste and inefficiency and we must fix yet another enormous problem while we do that and that's our giant underfunded public pension systems. For 30 years, these systems have been allowed to spin out of control and the result is we have at least a \$55 billion underfunded pension obligation. Without bold reform, these pension systems will go bust. If that happens, the lives of thousands of state retirees and workers will be terribly

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

disrupted. Failure to fix our public pension systems will also hurt our entire state. It will add to our growing deficit and pile more public debt on to the taxpayers. cannot allow this to happen. So, on behalf of the people of Illinois, I am proposing groundbreaking public pension reforms and modernization. Under my plan, employees and retirees will keep their current pension benefits from their years of service. They are safe. Meanwhile, newly-hired, and mostly younger employees will part of a modernized system. For example, the retirement age for new workers will be higher. closely match Social Security and other public pension systems and the cost-of-living increases will be capped at a rate that's in line with other public retirement systems. The pension system for new employees will still provide a generous retirement income and if we act now, this plan will reduce the taxpayers' pension obligations liabilities by \$162 billion over the next 36 years. By enacting groundbreaking public pension reforms, we can and we will reduce future payments. And as part of this plan, we will still make a pension payment of \$1.5 billion to fund this year's benefits. And to sum it up, under our public pension reform plan current retirees and employees are protected. Future employees will still enjoy a very good benefit package. And the taxpayers of Illinois will save billions of dollars in future obligations. That's a good deal for everyone. So, as we prepare for a better future, we must also make tough choices about cleaning up our government right now. Ethics reform is of paramount

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

importance to me and to the people of Illinois and in the our past political scandals, the people demanding honest and open government and they are going to get it. My first act as Governor was signing an Executive Order establishing the Illinois Reform Commission. independent board is investigating government practices from top to bottom. The Reform Commission is led by former U.S. attorney... assistant U.S. attorney Patrick Collins. And in April, the Illinois Reform Commission will issue its recommendations for cleaning up State Government. I want to thank Pat Collins and his 14 fellow commissioners for their hard work and I look forward to their Already, my administration is making government responsive to the people. Last month, I directed all state agencies to cooperate fully with the Freedom of Information Act and I implemented the Illinois sunshine project. As a result, the public can now go online and view unprecedented amount of government information. I believe, and I know you do, that sunshine is the best disinfectant. The purpose of these measures... these measures are a great start of changing the old way of doing business and it's time to make Illinois government a model of service and openness. It's also time to strengthen our voters, who are the heart and soul of Illinois. State Government belongs to the people, not to the officeholders and that's why we need to give the voters of Illinois the power to recall statewide elected officials if they betray the public trust. Along with reform comes responsibility. All of us are responsible for making tough choices during these very

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

difficult days. And there's no more immediate crisis than Illinois's eleven and a half billion dollar deficit. state's general revenue projections are bleak because the deep... of the deep recession that we're in. Next year, our annual revenues could drop to their lowest level in many, many years, but that's not the only reason for our deficit For nearly 25 years Illinois has lived off the dilemma. credit card, racking up deficits under Democratic and Republican administrations and as a result, the state is staggering under a shameful mountain of unpaid bills. When we don't pay our obligations on time, that hurts every business in our state. The businesses that we deal with are damaged. And what are these businesses: they're hospitals, nursing homes, pharmacies, schools, thousands and thousands of small businesses located throughout Illinois, throughout our state are affected. Failure to pay is forcing these good businesses to cut their operations. They have to lay off their workers, which adds to unemployment. These businesses hold back on paying their own bills, which injures other companies and in some cases, businesses go out of business which deeply hurts our economy. Now, this is wrong, we know it's wrong and it's not a blueprint for sound fiscal or public policy. Illinois has a moral obligation and responsibility to rid itself of this destructive deficit. Illinois is not... is not a deadbeat state that refuses to pay its bills. people of Illinois will not take from our children by forcing them to pay our debts. And I strongly believe there is a fair and honest way to pay our bills and meet

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

our obligations. Together, we can do it by approving the Illinois Economic Recovery and Tax Reform Act of 2009. Let's talk about tax reform and I mean reform, tax reform that produces tax relief for middle-class and working families. Under the plan that I'm presenting today, five million people in Illinois will get major tax relief, there will be no gas tax increase and moms and dads will enjoy a sales tax holiday for 10 days in August on the purchase of their kids' school clothes and school supplies. of my tax relief plan is this: the state should not tax struggling families into poverty. Working families who live from paycheck to paycheck must have tax relief and it's a... it's a principle that's as old as the Bible. should be based on ability to pay and the most compelling case for tax reform is found in our own Illinois Tax Code. For two decades, our state has had one of the most unfair tax systems in the United States. A major problem is that the Illinois personal tax exemption is only \$2 thousand per person. Now, the whole purpose of the personal exemption, it's meant to shield income from taxation so that families have more money to raise their kids, but the current Illinois personal exemption amount of only \$2 thousand doesn't come close to providing enough tax relief for is especially true for middle-class families. This families, for modest-income families, for working-poor families and especially in these difficult times. something wrong when our state gives more tax breaks to those who raise thoroughbred horses than it gives to parents raising children. When I was growing up, I

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

remember hearing Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of the late President say, 'if you bungle raising your children, nothing else in life matters.' And I think in Illinois it's very, very important when we deal with taxes and revenue that we remember children first. And the personal exemption for 100 years in our country has been the essence of protecting families raising children. We have to rise to the occasion in Illinois this year and enact fundamental tax reform that provides tax relief to families raising children. Right now, the \$2 thousand personal exemption gives a family of four an \$8 thousand tax break. insufficient. I propose that we improve the value of the personal exemption to \$6 thousand per person. means in a family of four there'll be a \$24 thousand tax break that helps families raising children. By improving the value of the personal tax exemption to \$6 thousand per person, five million people in Illinois will receive tax relief this year and will pay no... no tax increase. a crucial point and it bears repeating. Five million people in our state will get tax cuts during this very tough economic time. And that's true even if the income tax rate is raised from 3 percent to 4.5 percent. A family of four with an income of \$30 thousand under our plan will get a 72 percent tax reduction. A family of four with an income of \$45 thousand will get a 22 percent tax reduction under our plan. Families earning about \$61 thousand will break even and those making more will have a modest For example, a family of four making \$75 thousand annually will pay \$146 more in taxes. That's an

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

11 percent increase. Now, there's been a lot of simplistic and loose talk about income taxes going up 50 percent, but when you examine our plan, you'll see that's not true. That's because the personal exemption is there to shield the family income. Working families on their own cannot and should not shoulder the whole entire tax burden. is a time for shared sacrifice. Big corporations that have done well and are doing business in Illinois, they have to do their part and I intend to close millions of dollars of unfair corporate tax loopholes. We are going to balance the budget through a combination of very tough cuts, the federal stimulus dollars that President Obama, through his leadership, has provided to our state and every state, we're going to have groundbreaking public pension reforms, we're going to close corporate loopholes, and there will be a modest tax increase on those with the ability to pay. Together, we will plug this gaping budget deficit of eleven and a half billion dollars. Just as importantly, we will have permanent tax relief for the people who need it the most in Illinois. We will restore our state's financial integrity, and we will save our children from a terrible economic fate that threatens to rob their hopes and their dreams. The great thing about America, and the great thing about Illinois is that parents sacrifice some of their present in order to help their kids' future. That's who we are; we're custodians of our children's future. want our children and their children to be proud of what we are doing today. Now, there will be some who oppose our plan to balance the budget and bring tax reform and tax

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

relief to the people. I understand that. We're in a democracy and no plan is perfect. But if you reject the needed revenue increases to balance our budget, then you must tell the people of Illinois what you will do instead. Illinois's eleven and a half billion dollar deficit, that's \$11.5 billion deficit, the largest in our state's history, it's not going to go away on its own. Some will contend that we have to raise revenues in a more creative way. You might recall that less than two years ago, my predecessor tried to impose a Gross Receipts Tax on the people. would have been the largest single tax increase in the history of Illinois. I opposed it and this unanimously struck it down in this very chamber. for such gimmicks is over. There are others who say more and more gambling is the big answer to our problems, but do we really want to solve our budgetary problems by expanding gambling everywhere the eye can see? I don't think that's a good bet. Now, there are others... now, there are others who will argue for a doomsday budget that simply cuts state spending in a very mean-spirited way without any reform. But if you propose a doomsday budget, then tell us what programs you would eliminate to save eleven and a half billion dollars and balance this budget. Put it out there, let us all see it, look at it, hear about it. Saying a 'no' saying 'no' is not enough unless you are willing to speak the truth and offer real alternatives. entering office, I have spent, at the Governor's Mansion, night and day... It's a very nice house. Everyone is invited and the food is very good. It belongs to the people and I

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

think it's important that we every day remind ourselves that we are here on the peoples' business. And that great mansion that Abraham Lincoln once walked by, I've spent a lot of time pouring over our... the fine print of our state's finances and as your Governor, I can honestly say a budget that only offers mean-spirited tactics will hurt all of our citizens and further damage our economy. Let's face the If we use mean-spirited tactics, 800 thousand children, senior citizens and people with disabilities will lose their health care. If we only use mean-spirited tactics, more than 34 thousand teachers will be laid off, class sizes will increase by 25 percent. If we use meanspirited tactics, more than 10 thousand senior citizens will no longer receive critical state services. If we use mean-spirited tactics, we'll have to lay off hundreds of State Police officers and endanger public safety. are only a few examples of a mean-spirited doomsday budget. Now, I don't believe the people of Illinois support a harsh and mean-spirited doomsday budget. That is not what the Land of Lincoln is all about. Illinois is a community of shared values. We are not a collection of 13 million individuals who don't care about their neighbor. Consider last month, when nine southern Illinois counties were crippled by one of the worst ice storms in history. Fast action was needed to save people and restore power to homes and businesses and repair the entire region. The Illinois... State of Illinois Emergency Management Agency working with county and local authorities saved the day. Among those leading the charge was the mayor of Metropolis, Mayor Billy

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McDaniel and Billy is here today, why don't you stand up, Billy. Billy McDaniel, mayor of Metropolis, the home of Superman, on behalf of the grateful people of Illinois we want you to take a bow for taking care of your neighbors. The people of southern Illinois proved once again that service to others is the rent we pay for our place on God's earth. This is what the people of Illinois are all about. It's about working together to help our neighbors and build our communities. Working together with this General Assembly we will pass a budget that will put us on the road to recovery. Creating an environment that provides useful, important jobs for everyone is my top priority. If you're able-bodied and you're breathing, we want you working in Illinois. In Illinois, the unemployment rate today is 7.9 percent. Over 500 thousand people, our neighbors, are out of work and looking for work. We must get back to work and fast and that's why I urge quick passage of the 'Illinois Jobs Now!' plan. This initiative will support nearly 340 thousand jobs across our state. It's a \$26 billion plan. It will provide \$14 billion to build and upgrade our roads and bridges. It'll provide \$5 billion to improve our public transit, \$4 billion to repair our schools and build new ones, \$2 billion for the environment and for energy, conservation and for technology projects, a billion dollars much needed economic development efforts across Illinois. Included in that number, we will build a third airport in the south suburbs of Chicago and we'll build it as fast as humanly possible. Funding for the 'Illinois Jobs Now!', this plan, will come from a combination of

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

state and federal and local sources. Road and bridge construction will be funded by modest increases in some vehicle usage fees. It will also draw some money from the road fund. Now, passing this plan means creating jobs in the hard-hit construction and building industry, but that's only one important aspect of 'Illinois Jobs Now!'. plan, our plan, will focus on building highways and major projects that are designed for the 21st century. We won't just build a road. We'll also build a trench alongside the road to install fiber optic cable, so everyone can get access to high-speed Internet. Everybody in, nobody left out, when it comes to the Internet. We need as many information super-highway jobs as we can in Illinois and we won't just pour concrete and asphalt. We'll make sure that our major projects are energy efficient and sustainable. We need a green way of thinking... we need a green way of thinking, and a green way of acting and that means a lot of 'green' collar jobs across the Land of Lincoln. We'll also have to make sure that the contract process is open and guarantees that taxpayers always get their money's worth. And everyone who wants a job will get a fair and equal opportunity to find work. There's much to be done and very little time to do it. So, I urge the General Assembly, my friends, to speed our state's economic recovery by quickly passing the 'Illinois Jobs Now!' plan. Our recovery... our recovery depends on you and our recovery also depends on protecting our children and senior citizens. Illinois had a poet laureate, once upon a time, by the name of Carl Sandburg and he once said that the birth of a baby is God's

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

opinion that the world should go on. Therefore, our budget, the budget presented before you today will not cut health care for our most vulnerable citizens, including our children and senior citizens. Our budget will ease the burden of Medicaid providers by reducing the payment schedule, not from months and months of waiting to be paid, but to 30 days the way any good business operates. top priority for the people of Illinois is education. There are two forces in life: on one side there are the movers and the shakers and on the other side there are those who are moved and shaken and the difference between them is education. Education is the key to equal opportunity and economic empowerment. We always have to remember in this day and age that jobs follow brain power. And Illinois needs all the brain power it can muster in the 21st century. Even in tough economic times, we always must invest in quality and accountable education. Therefore, I plan in this budget to increase funding for early childhood education, for elementary education and for secondary education. And at the same time, our plan will commit \$40 million to community colleges and higher education. We're not cutting back on education. The best way to attract and keep business in Illinois is to offer employers, in the 21st century and in an information economy, a smart, welltrained work force. That's what Illinois is all about. Now, I think it's very important at this time that we honor those who serve our country; it's a very difficult week. We lost three soldiers from our National Guard on Monday. Since I've been sworn in, Illinois has had 12 soldiers

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

killed in action in defending our democracy. And we honor their lives and mourn their loss and we honor the men and women of Illinois who have gone forward in the face of danger since 2011... September 11 to protect our democracy. Now, I think it's important that we remember those men and women today and every day. And with us today is the family of Captain Ryan Beaupre and I'd ask them to stand up, Mark and Nikkie Beaupre, their son Ryan. To me, Ryan Beaupre, who gave his life at the age of 30, is the essence of a just man. I attended his funeral, a very sad day, in St. Anne, Illinois. It's almost six years ago to this day and I have the program from Ryan's funeral and it says, 'a just man, though he die early, shall be at rest'. And on that program, it says that Ryan was a great Marine and a great He possessed every good quality I can imagine: physical, mental and moral. And to tell you what kind of a person Ryan Beaupre was, he wrote back to his family in a letter, he was in Iraq and Kuwait, there are so many guys here, who have wives and children, lined up to use the phone, I'll let them go first and I'll be in touch with you, my family, as soon as possible. Ryan never shrank from a challenge whether it was leading his school's 1600 meter relay team to a state title or flying helicopters in a war zone. And I think, as we do the public business, it is important that we realize that among us are great The word 'hero' is bandied about rather carelessly heroes. Someone makes a free throw to win the in our society. game; they're the next day's hero. Or some rock star or celebrity is called a role model. They really are genuine

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

heroes or role models. The heroes and role models are the Ryan Beaupres of our society. They answer the call to duty. They do so with great courage, with great sacrifice, with generosity. They live up to the words of the third verse of America the Beautiful and that says, 'O beautiful for heroes proved in liberating strife. Who more than self their country loved and mercy more than life.' Beaupre and his comrades, they gave their last full measure of devotion to our democracy. We thank him and all service members and their families for doing their duty so well and so unselfishly. It's important, I think, to honor their memory that we make sure that our veterans, our service members, get proper care. Our budget calls for fully funding the Military Family Relief Trust Fund that provides financial assistance to the families of our Guard members and Reservists who are called to active duty. These are our citizen soldiers, 3 thousand right now are in Afghanistan, of our National Guard. It's important that we take care of their families and their financial needs. Our budget also calls for properly funding the Line of Duty Benefit to provide financial assistance to the sons and daughters and spouses of those who are killed in action defending our democracy. And our budget also provides funding... full funding for the 80-bed expansion in the LaSalle veteran's home. It allocates \$17 million to a 200bed Chicago veteran's home... Chicago does not have a veteran's home. Our budget expands funding for veterans' care to provide health insurance to men and women who don't have health insurance and who have served our country and

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

worn the uniform of our country. The family of Illinois believes in the words of Abraham Lincoln. That it's the duty of all of us on the home front, to take good care of those who bear the battle on the frontline. And since taking office, I've traveled all over our state, from Chicago all the way to Metropolis, from Quincy on the west to Champaign on the east, and all parts in between. throughout my travel, people have wished me well and I'm very grateful to them. And they've taken me into their confidence and looked me straight in the eye. Our citizens want an end to past bitterness and friction. they long for brighter days ahead and they are counting on us to make their lives better and we must not let them down. Fellow citizens, inaction is not an option, gutting our state's services is not a solution, playing politics is a loser's game. This is the Land of Lincoln. We celebrate Abraham Lincoln's 200th birthday this year. In many ways the hardships of Lincoln's time match our own: economic distress, war, deep political division. Lincoln confronted these problems with humor, and grace and wisdom and today, I urge everyone to summon the courage and spirit of Abraham Lincoln. We have the mettle to make tough choices. Pass Let's begin budget. a new era of responsibility and recovery. It's time to make the will of the people the law of the land, so help us God. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Will the Committee of Escort please come forward to escort the Governor from the chamber. Will the Committee of Escort please come forward to escort the

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Governor from the chamber. The President of the Senate is recognized for a Motion."
- President Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Joint Session do now arise."
- Speaker Madigan: "The President of the Senate has moved that the Joint Session do now arise. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Joint Session will now arise. The regular Session will come to order."
- Speaker Turner: "The regular Session of the House will come to order. Visitors should exit the chamber. The House will be in order. Visitors should exit the chamber. The Senators, if they would please exit our chamber; we have work to do. The Senators will go back to their respective chamber; we appreciate it. The House has some work to do today. The House will come to order. If the Senate will please exit our chamber, we have some work to do. The House will come to order. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"
- Rose: "Mr. Speaker, will we be returning to that previous Order of Business, the Bill we were considering?"
- Speaker Turner: "That is correct. Representative Collins, are you prepared to continue on House Bill 1126? You want to... The Sponsor wants a reprieve, Representative Rose. She'd like to communicate with you before putting the Bill back in the record. So, we will go to another order and then come back to that Bill later. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan, for what reason do you rise?"

28th Legislative Day

- Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted a point of clarification. It was Senator Murphy that added to the budget debacle that we have by breaking this chair. I don't know what the price was, but you should charge him right now."
- Speaker Turner: "Doorkeeper will make a note. Representative Brauer, are you prepared for House Bill 3641? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. We're going to the Order of Third Readings on page 54 of the Calendar, House Bill 3641. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3641, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Menard, Representative Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that establishes a children's health care partnership in Sangamon County. And the idea is that we have young children with certain challenges and to be able to get their health care under one roof. And with this, they will see the rates paid by the federally qualified health centers. So, this is important. It's a pilot program. And I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3641?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

28th Legislative Day

- Representative Cavaletto on House Bill 769. Cavaletto. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Cavaletto."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 769, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Marion."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 769 requires that each July 31 the Governor must report to the General Assembly and the public about the physical (sic-fiscal) impact of all Executive Orders that were issued or signed during the previous physical (sic-fiscal) year. I have no opposition. And ask your favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Yes, Representative, which Executive Order... I mean, they got to report of all Executive Orders or exactly how does that work?"
- Cavaletto: "All Executive Orders from the Governor... that spend money."
- Bost: "Okay. Just... just very quickly. What... what was the genesis of this Bill originally?"
- Cavaletto: "Well, I think we talked about transparency and accountability and honesty in government to the taxpayers of this state. I think we just heard that statement made."
- Bost: "I... I think that you're... you're onto a very good idea here and at a time whenever we need that and I'm glad you're carrying this Bill forward. And I'll be supporting it."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you very much, Representative."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, where are you? Oh, there you are. This is your first Bill?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Mr. Representative."

Lang: "Would you... would you... Did you call me, Mr.? Thank you very much. No one's ever done that before on the floor of the House, certainly no one on this side of the aisle. Would you like to join us? So, I... Would you agree with me that your colleague on that side of the aisle has kind have took it easy on you?"

Cavaletto: "Possibly."

Lang: "You want me to yield him back my time, so that he can ask his..."

Cavaletto: "No. That's... I'll talk with you."

Lang: "You're good."

Cavaletto: "Thank you."

Lang: "All right. I do have some questions, though, Sir. So, did you think this Bill up all by yourself?"

Cavaletto: "No, I did not."

Lang: "Oh."

Cavaletto: "It was... it was suggested to me. I thought it was a good Bill."

Lang: "Ah. Well, who would have suggested this to you, Sir?"

Cavaletto: "Well, I think it was the Representative right here beside me."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Can you... can you ask him to stand up. It's nice to have a staff person sitting next to you."

Cavaletto: "I sure can."

Lang: "So, let me get... so, did this start out as Representative Reis's Bill or you just like met with him over dinner and he wrote it for you or how did that work?"

Cavaletto: "I think, Representative Reis, did have this Bill pass out of the House at one particular time, but it did not move."

Lang: "Is it possible it was his first Bill and he couldn't pass it so he gave it to you?"

Cavaletto: "I... I can't answer that 'cause I wasn't here."

Lang: "Oh, okay."

Cavaletto: "I don't know."

Lang: "Well, let... I think we should talk about the Bill just for a minute, don't you?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "Yeah. Do you know anything about this Bill, Sir, since Representative Reis wrote it for you?"

Cavaletto: "No, I don't. All I know is it kind of se..."

Lang: "You don't know anything about the Bill."

Cavaletto: "Well, it says a lot. The Bill itself says a lot about..."

Lang: "Can we get some staff people for the Representative to help him with his Bill? All right. So... so, let me... Maybe Representative Reis should stand up and help you with your Bill. So, you indicate in the Bill... you have it near you, Sir?"

Cavaletto: "Pardon?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "You have the Bill near you or just your analysis?"

Cavaletto: "Just the analysis."

Lang: "Oh. Well, then if I refer to the Bill, will it help you at all?"

Cavaletto: "Well, I know what..."

Lang: "All right. Let's give it a shot. So, it says that the Governor shall make available a report of the fiscal impact of all Executive Orders issued or signed by the Governor. Now, you're only talking about Executive Orders here. You're not talking about appropriation Bills that we pass in the House. Is that correct?"

Cavaletto: "Well, Representative, that's right."

Lang: "Can you give us an example of one of those?"

Cavaletto: "I think... I think we're talking about the dollared amounts that might be spent to the taxpayers... the cost to the taxpayers."

Lang: "Well, right, I understand. But can you get... maybe one of your wonderful staff people can whisper something in your ear, Sir."

Cavaletto: "2008-1 would have created that situation that you're speaking of."

Lang: "Well, what it... so, that's an Executive Order that you're referring to?"

Cavaletto: "Yes. Yes, it was."

Lang: "What does that Executive Order do, Sir?"

Cavaletto: "It would... created a share of... a share of service center..."

Lang: "A share of ser..."

Cavaletto: "...without... without legislative order."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "And so your goal in this Bill will be to try to figure out what that cost the taxpayers? Is that correct?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "So, can the Governor, by Executive Order, spend money that we haven't appropriated?"

Cavaletto: "I think that's... they're trying... that's how... possibly have happened."

Lang: "So... but you don't know."

Cavaletto: "Well, I think the past Governor had... had done that."

Lang: "Well, yeah, the past Governor did a lot of things, right?"

Cavaletto: "Well..."

Lang: "I mean, if we dealt with everything a past Governor did, this Bill would be like a thousand pages long, right?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "Right. So... a million pages long according to my colleague over here. So, it says that for each Executive Order the report shall specify the dollar amounts expended, the dollar amount anticipated to be expended in the future and the percentages of something. The percentages of what, Sir?"

Cavaletto: "Well, it would be the percentages of appropriations that might be spent as far as taxpayer dollars. We're talking about being honest and open to the public on our tax dollars and I think that's what this Bill says."

Lang: "So, when you're talking about the percentage, you're talking about the increase in the percentage of the state... the full state budget?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Cavaletto: "Well, I would think any money spent would be part of the state budget."

Lang: "Well, right. So, the Governor can't spend..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative... Representative Lang, bring your remarks to a close."

Lang: "Well, I'd be happy to do that. The Governor can't spend money we haven't appropriated, correct?"

Cavaletto: "Well, he has done that."

Lang: "Which... has Governor Quinn done that?"

Cavaletto: "I think... I think there are programs, other programs were mandated that had taken place where money was spent without the authority of the House and Senate."

Lang: "Spent with... I'm almost finished, Mr. Speaker. Spent without authority, yes, but the money had been appropriated, otherwise where did he get it. There has to be money somewhere for the Governor to spend, right?"

Cavaletto: "And I agree with what you're saying, Sir, but I think the people have to be notified of what's being spent and if the money was appropriated."

Lang: "All right. Just one additional question. Since you seem to be really confused about this Bill, I think most in this chamber, particularly on this side of the aisle and I'm sure by a show of hands they'll agree, I think you ought to take the Bill out of the record... do we think he ought to take the Bill out of the record... until such time that you know what the heck it does. Would you be willing to do that, Sir?"

Cavaletto: "I... I appreciate it. No, Sir."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "No. Okay. Well, we're going to have to rethink our position on your Bill. Thank you."

Cavaletto: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, you understand the term and the… or the position of an 'Executive', correct?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, Representative."

Eddy: "And I... looking at your background and knowing you, I think that you in your past have been in a position that folks might call 'executive' position. You were a former principal."

Cavaletto: "Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "So, there were times where you made executive decisions."

Cavaletto: "Very true."

Eddy: "And do you feel like that this type of transparency is important for the executive of a school that was a principal?"

Cavaletto: "I do."

Eddy: "So, you're really, I guess, with this legislation, stating that what's good for an executive of a school district in transparency would be good executive for the State of Illinois and the Governor?"

Cavaletto: "I'm saying that. That's... I think we have to be open and honest when we're in the positions we're in as far

28th Legislative Day

- as administrative or whatever it is. We owe that to the taxpayers and to the people of our school districts."
- Eddy: "I think you're right. And I have a question, though, for you about this Bill. A lot of your background also has to do with coaching. Isn't that correct?"
- Cavaletto: "Very true."
- Eddy: "Well, there's nothing in this Bill about a man-to-man press."
- Cavaletto: "No, there isn't."
- Eddy: "Well, I thought perhaps in your first Bill that you would address whether or not a man-to-man press versus a diamond in one would be better... maybe that's depending on the team."
- Cavaletto: "I think it depends on the people you're dealing with, yes. And I think the personnel is... the people who kind of set the way you're going to play."
- Eddy: "Well, it just kind of surprised me when I read this Bill. I thought I'd see something about the motion offense."
- Cavaletto: "Well, it's the motion to make the money more secure to the taxpayers. That's right."
- Eddy: "Ah, so... so, this Bill doesn't have anything to do with the man-to-man, a diamond press or a motion offense or any other type of strategy involving basketball?"
- Cavaletto: "It has to do with all types of people, all the people."
- Eddy: "Strategies for transparency in State Government instead?"
- Cavaletto: "Right. Very true, Representative."

28th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Representative, I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. You know, I think you're onto something here, but... but I would expect that sometime in future Bills that you could provide this Body with some of your background and expertise in coaching. I mean, there's a lot of people in here that would like to know whether or not at a certain time in a game they should press or they should pull the press off. If you're up 40 points in the fourth quarter, did you take the press off?"
- Cavaletto: "Well, I think, probably we would. I think you probably would and again, I think there's a time to attack and a time to retreat."
- Eddy: "Very good. That's some good advice. So, Representative, I'm going to listen, going to see what happens with this, but I... but I would expect that at some point, we're going to... we're going to get some pearls of coaching wisdom during some of the Bills that you introduce. Good luck."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Gordon, C.: "Representative Cavaletto, are you ready for the press? Are you ready for the full court press?"
- Cavaletto: "Yes, yes. As ready for the press."
- Gordon, C.: "All right. Just checking. So, as a principal not only did you answer to the superintendent, you answered to a full school board, didn't you?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Cavaletto: "It's true."

Gordon, C.: "And sometimes you played man-to-man, sometimes you played zone defense, sometimes you played the full court press, sometimes you were at half court. Is that right?"

Cavaletto: "Very true."

Gordon, C.: "All right. Just checking. Now, you say... and I'm looking at the actual Bill and it's too bad that you only have the analysis, sometimes the analysis is a little slanted... but the Bill says that the Governor's Office shall make... the Governor shall submit to the General Assembly and make available to the public a report of the fiscal impact of all Executive Orders issued or signed by the Governor during the immediate previously fis... immediately previous fiscal year. So, do you want to... is the Governor going to be the one to write this or is a member of his staff going to be the one to write this?"

Cavaletto: "Well, I think that as you ask how we're playing the game and I think the Governor is part of the team and I feel that when he's a part of the team, then we must decide collectively on sometimes on that, what kind of press we're going to have."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. Well, you see, my... my background is I'm an attorney and so I like to have things specifically spelled out and that's not what your Bill says. So, right here it says, that specifically that the Governor is going to be the one to write this, so I think that's, one, your first problem. Second of all, your problem is that how are they going to come up with, you know, all the executive meetings that... or the Executive Orders that were signed. Is there

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

supposed to be a staff meeting? Is there going to be a special person that's going to do this? Is this going to all come together because that's not spelled out in your Bill, either? It just says that, you know, that the Governor's going to do this. And another thing is, is that you have no specific starting date of when they're supposed to look at these Executive Orders and start to write this. Did... did you have an idea of when... how far before July 31 that they're supposed to sit down or exactly what your Bill says, when the Governor is supposed to sit down and write these... write up this... this report for the General Assembly?"

Cavaletto: "I think the report is supposed to be given on July the 1st or July the 31st, yes."

Gordon, C.: "Well, I understand... I understand that the..."

Cavaletto: "And it... it all has to do with spending money..."

Gordon, C.: "Well, I understand that..."

Cavaletto: "...the money that's spent."

Gordon, C.: "I understand the report is supposed to be done on July 31st, but how far before July 31st are they supposed to start writing the report, 'cause it doesn't say that in the Bill?"

Cavaletto: "I would think that this would be up to the Governor as long... it would take... he would take a long... as much time as he needed, but again, July 31st would be the deadline for presenting that."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. And how are they actually supposed to present it? Is this going to be in disc form? Is this going to be on... are they going to e-mail it to us? Is this

28th Legislative Day

- going to be in a three-ring binder? I mean, how's this going to be presented to the General Assembly, 'cause that's not in the Bill either?"
- Cavaletto: "All right. I think that the rules would determine that."
- Gordon, C.: "Well, it's not in your Bill. I'm just saying, your Bill's not real clear here, Representative. I mean, you made it... you made the good ol' college try here. You... mean, good coaching, good... way to go, but you sure didn't make this clear and in my background, things have to be spelled out specifically so that we know exactly what you're talking about. So... and I think that that's, you know, problematic as well. And another thing you don't have in there is whether or not, you know, what if the Governor himself, if he's the one who's supposed to write this like your Bill says, are extension allowed, because after the Governor gave his budget address today he's going to be a pretty busy guy. So, are extension allowed if he's not done with this by July 31?"
- Cavaletto: "I'm sure he would have a staff to help him to do these minimal things and I feel like that the… his Executive Orders to spend a lot of money probably won't be that great of an issue, but… however, when he does choose to do that, then he should let the people know the amount of money that's going to be spent. That's… that's all to the public."
- Gordon, C.: "Well, I... I'm all for knowing... I'm all for knowing how much money is being spent, but are you saying that only

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Executive Orders, where taxpayer dollars are spent, are the type of..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. Just two more questions, Rep... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Just one."

Gordon, C.: "The only type of orders that are covered are the type of orders where taxpayer dollars are spent. Is that's... is that what's covered in your Bill?"

Cavaletto: "Yes, that's what I'm saying."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. Well, I think you've got some problems and if I were you, I sure would clarify this and if I were the Body, I don't think I'd vote on this today. And I also would urge you to either take this out of the record 'cause I think you've got some big problems with your first Bill here, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Cavaletto: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Well, what a great day this is. You know, we... a lot of us were involved in races downstate in the last two, four, six years and we... the fruit of that labor is presenting his first Bill today. And Representative, I've got to tell you, there's a few lessons that you have to learn here on the House Floor. The first one is that the Lady from Grundy, you've really got to spell it out for her, okay. Those were her words, not mine. My... were her words. I'm sorry, Representative, but that's just the way things are. The... the fact of the matter is you said earlier that there's a time for retreat. Do you know that

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

you sit to... two sit chair. No, not two, next to a Marine? There is no word 'retreat' in the Marine Corps manual. Are you aware of that?"

Cavaletto: "I'm aware of that, Sir."

- Stephens: "All right. You... you know what, in your closing, I hope that you can maybe rephrase those remarks. Representative, we are happy to have you in our midst. It looks like you've got stellar legislation and speaking of the Marines, here they are, late again, coming up to help you out. Mr. Speaker, I think that this debate has really gone on too long and I move the previous question."
- Speaker Turner: "That request is out of order. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Turner: "That Motion is in order. The Motion's been made, the previous question. The previous question is put.

 And with that, Representative Cavaletto to close."
- Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a good Bill for the greater transparency of government. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote for it. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "No further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 769?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Miller. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Crespo. Out of the record. Representative Currie, we have House Bill 2245. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2245, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. was a horrific accident in my area when a grandfather out with his five- and nine-year-old grandchildren were hit, were mowed down by a car clearly driven recklessly. younger child was killed, the grandfather was thrown 30 feet from the place of impact, broken pelvis, broken leg, the other child, the child surviving, is traumatized by the experience. The mother thought that these problems would Illinois Crime probably be covered by the Victims Compensation Act, after all, it is illegal to hit and run, to leave the scene of an accident, but according to the interpretation of the law that's on the book, it probably wasn't covered. So, this is an effort to see to it that when there is death or serious injury resulting from a reckless driver who leaves the scene, then those people would be eligible for help from the Crime Victims Compensation Fund, whether that means counseling for the traumatized child or help with burial expenses for the one who is dead. There's a second portion to the Bill and that is that under current law, if you are a crime victim but you yourself are a convicted felon, you're not eligible for help from the fund until you have discharged your felony

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

penalties, whether that means completing probation or parole or finishing a term in prison. The difficulty is this. sometimes someone who has not yet had time to discharge that debt to society is, in fact, the victim of a felony... of a murder and the family of that individual is today not eligible for compensation because the felon is not in the position ever to rectify ever to finish out the penalty provisions of his conviction. It seems to me that that's kind of unfair to the folks who are left behind. So, this Bill provides that the families of those felons who were themselves the victims of a violent crime would be eligible if the... the felon is dead and is not in the position to finish out the sentence. So, I know of no opposition. And I appreciate your support and I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2245?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have Representative Connelly on House Bill 379. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 379, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Connelly."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 379 amends the Illinois Procurement Code to allow for the electronic reverse online auction method for the purchase of commodities. There are two Amendments: one from central... the Capital Development Board that wished to take construction contracts out of the purview of the Act and the second one is to allow non-Home Rule entities to utilize this method of procurement. I ask for a 'yes' vote and I anticipate a question or two."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, if I'm not mistaken, it's possibly your first Bill."

Connelly: "This is."

Eddy: "This is? Let me ask, probably the most pressing question I have right now. I'm looking up at the board and your first Chief cosponsor is Representative Tryon?"

Connelly: "Indeed, that's true."

Eddy: "Is that is good as you could do on your first Bill, really? Wow, I thought you were trying to pass this. The other thing that concerns me about this right off the bat..."

Connelly: "Yes."

Eddy: "...our analysis says that there have been two Amendments to this Bill."

Connelly: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So, what you're telling everybody here is on your first attempt to write legislation to be presented before the...

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

the colleagues here in the Illinois House of Representatives, you couldn't get it right the first time."

Connelly: "That's your take, Mr. Representative."

Eddy: "And..."

Connelly: "I think we've just made it a better Bill."

Eddy: "Well, furthermore... Mr... Representative Lang and I are now Mr. That's nice. I'm not sure I want to be in that company very long, but that's all right. Now, you're also telling... not only could you not get it right the first time... you couldn't get the Bill right the second time. Is that right? 'Cause you have..."

Connelly: "No, actually, that's not right. I think what we did..."

Eddy: "And then you had another Amendment..."

Connelly: "...we made the Bill better, more inclusive."

Eddy: "So, you couldn't get the Bill right until the third time."

Connelly: "No. That's your take, Representative Eddy, but my take is we've made the Bill better, more inclusive and it allows for more units of government to utilize this 21st century method of procurement."

Eddy: "Well, obviously, you needed help, but who helped you?

Who offered the Amendments? Who came up... who fixed your legislation? Who provided you with the brain power to... to fix the Bill?"

Connelly: "The great staff of the Capital Development Board and the county of DuPage wanted the ability to utilize it. It's a non-Home Rule entity and they asked for authorization."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Eddy: "Do you think in the future that you're going to be able to write Bills without help of the Capital Development Board or the county of DuPage?"

Connelly: "I hope so."

Eddy: "So, do I. That's going to take a long time if you, you know, bring those people all together for every Bill. You know, this could have promise. I don't know what a reverse auction is. I've been to auctions before. I guess in a reverse auction you'd... you'll start with a high bid and then people purposely lower their own price so they can make less money."

Connelly: "No. What happens is the prequalified bidders go online for a term to be determined by Central Management Services. They're allowed to see the other bids. They can, obviously, undercut their competitors. Usually, it's a 48-hour process. In private industry, they usually save 30 to 40 percent on contracts."

Eddy: "That's extremely confusing though. For example, if I were to try and auction off this handy-dandy CD of the Governor's budget address, I would... I would start at zero, and of course I'd have Representative Sacia helping me because he could probably auction it off very well, then we would go up... then we would go up. I'm not saying we'd get more than a buck for it, but I'm saying we would go up. You're presenting we would start at a dollar and we would see who would take the least amount for this."

Connelly: "I'm not purposing putting that on the reverse online auction. It is a commodity."

Eddy: "Ahhh."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Connelly: "But no, CMS and the procurement experts would determine what they would budget."

Eddy: "Very, very confusing to folks who are in the auction.

I'm sure Representative Sacia is confused by this whole thing, too, the reverse auction. You would get less... I think you'd get a commission with the higher the price, so Representative Sacia could be out of business. I'm not sure I'm going to support this. Thank you."

Connelly: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Thank you. Do I get 10 minutes because my name was used in debate, Sir?"

Speaker Turner: "You can start."

Lang: "Thank you. Where's the Representative? Oh, hi. Nice tie, Sir."

Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Representative."

Lang: "It's a good... Another Mr. Thank you very much. So, I heard Representative Eddy's passionate comments and not only don't I understand your Bill, I have no idea what the heck Representative Eddy was talking about either. So, maybe you can enlighten me. So, according to my analysis, this Bill is supported by something called the Illinois Chapter of Americans for Prosperity. Who are they?"

Connelly: "They're a group that's run by Joe Calomino. They're looking for a more transparent government and the reduction of... on the cost side of government."

Lang: "So, if you were an American who was not for prosperity, that would mean you weren't for transparent government?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Connelly: "No, I don't think so. I think you would want to join the Americans for Prosperity."

Lang: "Well, I... actually, it's the Americans for Prosperity."

Connelly: "Yes."

Lang: "I think you got the title wrong. You really should know who's supporting your Bill, Sir. If you think that's a really good organization, perhaps you can have all 118 of us get some application forms and we'll look through them. Would that be good?"

Connelly: "I can look into that, Sir."

Lang: "Are you a member of their organization?"

Connelly: "Not... not at the time... not at this time, Representative, but I..."

Lang: "In fact, it would be a..."

Connelly: "...I'll get an application."

Lang: "...in fact, it would be a conflict of interest, if you were a member, 'cause they support the Bill, right?"

Connelly: "That I'm not sure."

Lang: "Well, you really should study these things before you come to the House Floor. So, this Bill talks about units of local government and according to my analysis units of local government mean counties, municipalities, townships, special districts and units. Is that correct?"

Connelly: "That's correct."

Lang: "What about school districts?"

Connelly: "School districts actually, Representative..."

Lang: "Don't... don't point, Sir, on the House Floor."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Connelly: "...Representative Eddy has a Bill that is very similar to this Bill that will allow school... school boards to utilize the same method of procurement."
- Lang: "And so, whatever happened to efficiency here on the House Floor? So, you have a Bill where school districts could be included, but you've excluded them because your colleague, the veteran Mr. Eddy, has apparently browbeaten you into eliminating that from the Bill so he could have his own Bill?"
- Connelly: "I wouldn't use the term browbeat. He brought the...
 his Bill before my Bill."

Lang: "And..."

Connelly: "So, it was already in the record."

Lang: "And so, you don't even need to be standing here. You could have taken all of your stuff along with the Americans for Prosperity and given them to Mr. Eddy, couldn't you?"

Connelly: "I could have, but I didn't."

Lang: "And that would be because you want to waste our time on the House Floor with this?"

Connelly: "No, I think this is a better Bill separated for units of local government."

Lang: "Really? Well, then why didn't you have a separate Bill for each unit of local government? Why don't we have like eight thousand Bills 'cause we have eight thousand units of local government? They could have all gotten on the Agreed Bill List."

Connelly: "Could you repeat the question?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Never mind, we'll move on. So, I know I had another important question. Can you explain to us what a reverse auction is, Sir?"

Connelly: "The reverse auction..."

Lang: "And you only have a minute and two seconds."

Connelly: "The reverse auction allows for... it allows for prequalified bidders to go online for a specific amount of time and bid against one another anonymously and it allows for it the continuous driving down of the cost... the ultimate cost. My understanding from the private sector and from Delaware and the State of Pennsylvania, Governor Rendell is a big proponent of this, that in the last 10 minutes of these auctions the price goes down dramatically and it saves the taxpayers a lot of money."

Lang: "Do you think Governor Rendell is doing a pretty good job in Pennsylvania, Sir?"

Connelly: "I think on this Bill and this concept, it's... he's doing a tremendous job."

Lang: "Right. So, he should stay in Pennsylvania though, I presume, you would say?"

Connelly: "This is Illinois, yes."

Lang: "Yes. So, how do you think our new Governor's doing so far?"

Connelly: "I just hope not to be a mean-spirited person."

Lang: "Well... and I... to that I say, I hope so too."

Connelly: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

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

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Bost: "I have a few concerns. Since you're dealing with the Procurement Code and you've met with all of these people, I can remember a certain person that when we revamped... revamped the Procurement Code several years ago, our then former Senator Steve Rauschenberger, actually helped draft most of the language along with several others. Did you meet with those before any modifications occurred?"

Connelly: "No, I did not."

Bost: "Did... did you ask staff maybe if they did?"

Connelly: "I didn't ask staff that, no."

Bost: "Okay. All right. Well, you know, you should always check to make sure. I've got another question on this reverse auction thing. Do you know... did you... have we asked Representative Sacia, by chance, are there any reverse auctioneers in the state?"

Connelly: "I haven't asked Representative Sacia, but I'll do that today."

Bost: "And... and the reverse auctioneers... reverse auctioneers, do they have to speak backwards or just take bids backwards?"

Connelly: "Could you repeat that question, Representative?"

Bost: "Well, do they have to speak backwards or just take bids backwards?"

Connelly: "They help to bring bids down to reduce costs.

That's the objective and the goal."

Bost: "Well, that... Well, I'm a little... I'm very concerned because many Bills that we have out here... I know, for instance, there's one Bill out here that calls for a

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

special insurance plan, okay, and nobody writes the insurance. If we're going to have a reverse auction and we don't have any reverse auctioneers, what's your plan? How are we going to do this?"

Connelly: "Actually, most states util... utilize and I'm confident CMS and our procurement experts would utilize a private company that does this. I think it's called e-bid. The Federal Government uses it as well. So, there are companies out there that already..."

Bost: "That are reverse auctioneers?"

Connelly: "That's correct, online."

Bost: "Do they go to auctioneer school? I... Really, I think... I think Representative Sacia should get involved in this debate because, you know, he understands the auctioneers of the state and to know that you did not go to him directly as the expert on auctioneers, because reverse auctioning is not something that you want to take lightly."

Connelly: "I'm not taking it lightly, Representative. Thank you."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Sacia: "Maybe, Representative, I could help."

Bost: "Please."

Sacia: "Would you allow that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "Well, you're..."

Sacia: "I was..."

Speaker Turner: "...you're using Bost's last minute, so go ahead."

Sacia: "Okay. I just wanted to share with Representative Bost how a reverse auction works. It goes, a thousand bucks,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

ten hundred dollar bid and now nine, nine hundred dollar bid and now would you give nine hundred dollar, but I can't get nine how about eight hundred dollar bill, eight hundred dollar bid and now give me eight would you give me eight hundred dollar, but I can't get eight how about seven hundred dollar bid and now six, six hundred dollar bid and now give me six hundred dollar, but could you give me five hundred, five hundred dollar bid and now give me five, I sold it for five hundred bucks. That's how it works."

- Bost: "Okay. Fantastic. And, Mr. Speaker, in my last 30 seconds here, the only concern I have is he may be the only reverse auctioneer in the state. This may be a conflict of interest and he may need to vote 'present'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Turner: "Moves the previous question. The previous question is put. Representative Connelly to close."
- Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a 'yes' vote.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 379?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Monique Davis. Take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having

28th Legislative Day

- received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, my switch was locked, but I was voting 'yes' on that legislation."
- Speaker Turner: "Bidding that'd been a reverse auction."
- Davis, M.: "Yes."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Order of Second Readings, we have House Bill 472. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 472, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 2235, Representative Monique Davis. Representative Lyons in the Chair."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2235, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2235 requires the governing boards of all public school districts, universities and community colleges to report to their respected agencies, the State Board of Education or Board of Higher Education, the base salary and all the benefits of an administrator, teacher or faculty employed in its district. The benefits include but are not limited to: vacation days, sick days, bonuses, annuities, and retirement enhancement. This legislation has no opposition that I know of. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."

28th Legislative Day

- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Davis, according to our analysis it requires the governing board to report this information to the State Board of Education. Is that correct?"
- Davis, M.: "If you... if that is your reporting agency, you report to the state board or if you're a university, to the Board of Higher Ed."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. And is the State Board of Education or the Board of Higher Ed required to do anything with that information?"
- Davis, M.: "They're required to release it, if asked, on a Freedom of Information request."
- Mitchell, J.: "So, it's still not going to be just public knowledge. You'll have to request that through the Freedom of Information Act."
- Davis, M.: "That is correct."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. But that will be allowable so that newspapers, any other person that has an interest in this will be able to acquire that information?"
- Davis, M.: "That's Rep... that's correct, Representative Mitchell. These are tax dollars."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good..."
- Davis, M.: "And this is putting sunshine on that pay that people are receiving as they leave or work for our universities or our public systems."
- Mitchell, J.: "Certainly. And anyone that receives any kind of compensation should not be worried about that."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Davis, M.: "No."

- Mitchell, J.: "It should be public knowledge and quite frankly, I... I think you could have written the Bill even better to say that it's just available; however, at least it will be in one place and people will know where to go to get that information. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good Bill and I certainly recommend an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis to close."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that puts sunshine on the pay that educators receive in universities or public school districts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2235 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? Frank Mautino. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Beth Coulson, on page 50 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 979. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 979, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 979 is a Bill that we actually passed unanimously out of the House last year and it was caught up in the rulemaking issue. But

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

basically it provides that beginning with the 14th birthday of a student who has an IEP that those IEPs must include measureable postsecondary transition goals. It also provides that if a transition services are from outside the school that those people who would be able to provide those are invited to the IEP meeting. It also makes a few technical corrections and I can answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 979 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 Thapedi, Representative Verschoore. Pat Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention, Members. This is the last call to submit suggestions for the Agreed Bill List. Please turn in Agreed Bill List proposals as soon as possible."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ken Dunkin, on page 51 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2266. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members... Members of the House. House Bill 2266 amends the Criminal Code of 1961 in

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

provisions concerning the offense of unlawful visitation interference, changes the name of the offense to unlawful parenting time interference and changes references from visitation to parenting... parenting time. Also, adds references to custody time and simply amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act to change a cross-reference to the offense effectively immediately. This is a technical Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2266 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? Representative Flowers, Representative Mendoza. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keith Farnham, on page 47 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 706. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 706, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keith Farnham."
- Farnham: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is... will provide that the Department of Healthcare and Family Services shall conduct an evaluation regarding health care for access to veterans who are residents of Illinois taking into consideration the program established by the Act, programs and services established by the U.S. Department of Veterans and other

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

programs available. It'll provide that the evaluation shall determine whether there are limitations and barriers to care, gaps in service or other deficits that should be overcome to ensure that veterans are... are provided appropriate and high-quality care."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 706 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Durkin, on page 50 of the Calendar... Okay. Out of the record. Representative Roger Eddy, you have, on page 50 of the Calendar, House Bill 1079. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1079, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 1079 is legislation that is a result of a task force formed by the 95th General Assembly that had as its goal to look at the dual credit system in Illinois and to recommend to the General Assembly changes regarding the quality of dual credit programs, the access and availability to high-quality, dual credit programs in the state and recommendations about data collection and increased accountability. The Bill contains

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

provisions that will secure the quality of dual credit programs taught at our high school by community college instructors and high school instructors. It also deals with attempting to make access and availability to especially students who are at risk or not traditional college bound students and also increases the accountability for community colleges when reporting the quality of dual credit programs and sets up for a data infrastructure. I would appreciate the support of the Body and I'd attempt to answer any questions."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Eddy, we've, for quite some time now, have had AP courses that... that have that same kind of luxury of being accepted by a college pretty much anywhere in... at least in Illinois, as well as fulfilling a high school requirement. This would create more courses similar to that so that there would be more access to college credit along with high school prepared... or college preparedness and a high school credit?"

Eddy: "Yeah. It would actually... part of... part of the goal of the legislation is to attract nontraditional students into the college life, so that they can explore career options and perhaps get the kind of education that might lead to a better life style. So, that's one of the goals of it and I think we've done some things to help it with this Bill."

28th Legislative Day

- Mitchell, J.: "And I think this... this probably will strengthen the community college aspect of... of education locally with our high schools and community colleges that are working well now in that area."
- Eddy: "That is one of the goals. We hope that if cooperation and the articulation between the high schools and a community college district and those community colleges will be strengthened. In fact, in the Bill there is a requirement that a dual credit course taught at a high school by a high school teacher must have articulation with the same college teacher that teaches that course. So, it's exactly what we tried to address with this. We had a lot of help. The task force was comprised of folks from the Board of Higher Ed, community colleges and I think because we had such a diverse group, we were able to really make some progress with dual credit."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This...
 this is long... has been needed for a long time and I think
 it's an excellent Bill. And I recommend an 'aye' vote.
 Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1079 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 Jefferson, Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tim

28th Legislative Day

- Schmitz, on page 52 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2481. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2481, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government, which may be referred to as Lily's Law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Tim Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would require the Department of Public Health to create a three-year pilot program for the monogenic neonatal diabetes mellitus registry. I'm not going to say that fast again. But it's a... it's a registry that deals with juvenile diabetes. We had an Amendment that we presented in committee that came from the State Medical Society and it also required that written informed consent by the patient with the doctor prior to that family being put on the registry. So, they do have the written informed consent just so nobody will just pop up on the registry without... without knowing about it. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2481 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Representative Bob Flider, on page 50 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1033. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bob Flider."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the committee. House Bill 1033 is a piece of legislation that passed out of this House unanimously last year and we're taking another try at it because it remained in the Senate, didn't make it out. And what it would do is it'll provide treatment for uninsured or underinsured men and it would create the Prostate and Testicular Cancer Diagnostic Evaluation and Treatment Program. The program is modeled after the Illinois Breast and Cervical Cancer Program. And what it does is the Bill requires the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to establish a Prostate and Testicular Cancer Diagnostic Evaluation and Program. I'd like to, in addition, thank Chuck Jefferson for his work with me on this legislation and also mention that this is subject to appropriation. I'd ask for the approval of the Body."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Mulligan: "Representative, are we able to expand this coverage without seeking a waiver from the government... Federal Government?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Flider: "The intent of the legislation is to put the program in place with the concept that if we, as a Body, would receive funds for... from the Federal Government for these purposes and/or appropriated dollars, then this program could go forward."

Mulligan: "That, unfortunately, does not answer my question. I would very much like to support this, but you're making it appear that it's going to be paid for under Medicaid. I don't know if we can automatically expand this to cover men because single men are probably the most discriminated against under the Medicaid program. It all has to do with women and children. So, men are not covered for the most part and what I'm asking you is, are you putting this program forward so that we pay for it no matter what? Has anybody told you that we don't need something from the Federal Government in order to get it paid, like a waiver or is the state... is it your understanding that the state's allowed to expand this to a certain amount money if we choose to without a waiver?"

Flider: "Well, this legislation simply would put in place this program. It would enable this program; it would enable it for underinsured and uninsured men under guidelines established for those who need assistance. And so, right now, we have a number of programs that provide for additional... or excuse me... for initial kinds of testing, but this would take us to the next level. And so, you know, this legislation was written with the assistance of the State Department of Healthcare and Family Services to make

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

sure that it... you know, those who would qualify meet certain obligations and requirements."

Mulligan: "It still doesn't answer my question, unfortunately.

So, I guess the second question would be, are you willing to pay for this even if we don't get Medicaid coverage for it?"

Flider: "Well, what I'm suggesting to you is this legislation will be in place and as I mentioned, it is subject to appropriation. So, if we do not appropriate funds for this, then this project or this legislation would be on the books, but it could not be paid for unless we appropriate money. So, we're setting the stage."

"You're setting the stage to pay for it totally Mulligan: unless HFS comes and says they're seeking a waiver or that they can expand it. Just because they wrote the program for you and it's somebody that they want to cover, somebody we may all want to cover, doesn't mean we're going to get Medicaided... Medicaid match. So, if we're... you may want to do it... you don't know how much money we'd appropriate and once we appropriate that amount of money then that would cut off the testing when we reach that amount or are we going to get matching funds? I'm sure people are going to vote for this program because it seems like a good idea, but the bottom line is, you're not assuring me and I don't think they explained it to you whether we're being covered or whether we have to seek a match or whether we're just paying for it totally, which appears to me right now we would have to pay for it totally from whatever we appropriate for that amount so if we wanted it to be other

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

than a feel-good Bill. So, I would like the department to probably let me know how they feel they would handle this because you're not... chances are you're not going to get a match for it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan, have you completed your remarks? Representative Mulligan, are you finished?"

Mulligan: "Yes. He can't answer the question. Obviously, the department didn't brief him on it and I need that answer, but I'm... I'm willing to support it to the extent that we have money, I don't know if we're going to have the money and I don't know if they're going to get a waiver. So, it's a good idea; it's just not quite soup yet and we don't have the answers yet it appears."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flider to close."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body. And I think those are some good questions that definitely need an answer. I would say that, we, again, the intent of this legislation is to put this legislation in place... this law in place for the time when we know that there had been efforts in the Federal Government to appropriate money to the states for prostate and testicular types of programs in addition to whatever we, as a state, might be willing to appropriate. That is up to us in the future, but with regard to prostate cancer, it is the kinds of... it's the kind of cancer that if detected will save lives. And so, with this legislation we definitely can and will be saving lives in the future and it increases exponentially, you know, those over 40 are more likely to be diagnosed, 1 in 39 have it for ages 40 to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- 59 and 1 in 14 have it for ages 60 to 69. So, it increases... the possibility of it increases with age, so therefore the treatment's important and the diagnostics are important, as well. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1033 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 Beaubien, Senger. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative LaShawn Ford, on page 45 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 436. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 436, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. I hear a little noise. It's a little rudeness going on in here. This is a serious Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could please give the dignity to the Representative. He has a Bill that obviously is very important and let him proceed. Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you. This Bill is unlike yesterday's Bill on St.

 Patty's Day that I couldn't possibly get the 'green' votes necessary because it was believed that it caused some type of impact on the state. This Bill simply allows people in Illinois to receive funds from Congressman Danny K. Davis

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Second Chance Act which was signed by President Bush. So, it allows the State of Illinois, the DCEO to administer a program for ex-offenders to receive grants and loans to start their own business. This Bill deserves a favorable vote and I ask that we vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Representative, good afternoon."

Ford: "Good afternoon."

Stephens: "You..."

Ford: "Where are you at? Oh..."

Stephens: "You mentioned George Bush..."

Ford: "Yeah."

Stephens: "...in a positive... He's one of your heroes, isn't he?"

Ford: "Yes."

Stephens: "You know what, I..."

Ford: "You should follow his lead on this one."

Stephens: "...I ...you know what, I knew that and the fact that I heard you say that George Bush is your hero is enough for me."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Ford, in you legislation... if I understand this correctly, an ex-offender is... is it a guaranteed loan?"

Ford: "No."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Sacia: "Okay. But is there... is there any benefit here for non ex-offenders? I mean, for people that want to start a business... Is there any incentive for them? I mean, we are..."

Ford: "Yes."

Sacia: "...creating a incentive for ex-offenders and I applaud that. I mean, I understand where you're going, but does it not give an ex-offender a leg up on somebody that's never been an offender?"

Ford: "I would think that it actually sort of levels it off a little bit, because ex-offenders, as you know, as we discussed yesterday have a difficult time of getting and gaining employment. Therefore, it's very difficult to apply for a loan like people who are employed, through their credit unions, through banks, through the SBA. This Bill puts them in a place where they could borrow \$5 thousand to start their very own business without interrupting any taxpayers' revenue."

Sacia: "I appreciate, again, your response. I... My question is, it appears to me by your legislation and I'm looking for your help here, that you're actually better off being an ex-offender. You've got a... you've got a better perk to start a business, to get a loan. I go in and I say, 'I'm an ex-offender and I should qualify for this ex-offender loan, but my neighbor who's never been involved in any crime but really has no other... anything going for him or her, does that person have less of an opportunity of obtaining similar funding necessary finances..."

Ford: "Absolutely not."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Sacia: "...that type..."

Ford: "They actually have better opportunities to apply for larger loans. This is a very simple \$5 thousand loan where the person may be able to open up a shoeshine business, maybe even be able to open up a lawn service, window washing, anything that will allow them to be productive citizens and pay taxes to the State of Illinois. This is an opportunity and I think that we, in Illinois, should lead the way in providing opportunities for people. And I know that people that have backgrounds seem to be cut out of the system and that's why we have a high recidivism rate. This is just a \$5 thousand loan and it does not cost the state one penny."

Sacia: "Where does the money come from, Representative..."

Ford: "Yes."

Sacia: "...and it probably says it here..."

Ford: "No, that's fine."

Sacia: "...I just didn't pick it up."

Ford: "It... the state will apply for the funds from the Congressman Davis Second Chance Act. His Second Chance Act which was signed by President Bush. It was a bipartisan effort of the U.S. Congress and now, states can apply for funds to provide second chances for people with backgrounds. But it wouldn't cost you as a taxpayer anything, but it'll actually help you because now you have more people on the tax rolls in Illinois."

Sacia: "Right, right. Representative Ford, based on your comments and your very candid answers I applaud your

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

legislation and it appears that IDOC is a proponent of it. Is that correct? Have they..."

Ford: "Yes."

Sacia: "Have they made any comments regarding it?"

Ford: "No. No opposition to it and I believe they'll be ready."

Sacia: "Okay. I'd like to be added as a cosponsor, Sir."

Ford: "Amen. All right."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is on Short Debate.

We have about seven or eight speakers here. The next one in line is Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I don't think this is going to be déjà vu all over again. I think we'll be all right. But I've got some questions for you. First and most importantly, this is subject to appropriation."

Ford: "It's subject to an application process by the state to the Federal Government. So, we have to apply for the funds to be approved to put the funds in this."

Eddy: "Okay. So, it is subject to an appropriation that is made from a federal program that would come to Illinois for the expressed purpose of providing low interest loans to ex-offenders?"

Ford: "It's a..."

Eddy: "So, it's not a state General Revenue..."

Ford: "Exactly."

Eddy: "...appropriation."

Ford: "Right."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Eddy: "This is... this is specific. Now, do you know how much money is in the fund that was created for Second Chance?"

Ford: "Fifty-five million."

Eddy: "Is that nationwide, \$55 million?"

Ford: "Yes, that's correct."

Eddy: "Has Illinois made an application for this money at this time?"

Ford: "You know, I'm not sure if we've made the application, but I'll be pushing for it and the Congressman that is the Chief Sponsor of it is from Illinois and he's like the godfather for... for ex-offenders. So..."

Eddy: "Well, one other question that I have regarding the fund. Have you taken great care to make and I... it's federal money, I understand that, but I guess that would make it free from any sweeps. I know that one of the things that is being proposed by the Governor in this budget could include some fund sweeps. Now, this being federal money if this is... if we receive this money, it wouldn't be subject to sweeps. Isn't that your intention or..."

Ford: "I would hope that it's not swept because the money is earmarked from the Federal Government only for Second Chance purposes."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, I mean, that hasn't stopped us before from trying to take money that doesn't belong in a certain program to go to GRF and then have to be backfilled, but... but I think you're probably right. It says in the Bill that the awarding of grants to qualified ex-offenders or to entities or organizations assisting ex-offenders. So, not

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

just ex-offenders could apply for this money, right? An entity or an organization could also apply?"

Ford: "Well, the entity and organizations will have to administer the loan process for the ex-offender. The ex-offender would not be able to just really apply from the state. They would need to apply from a Safer Foundation from entities that will approve them and be responsible for administering the loan."

Eddy: "And am I correct that the ex-offender would have to provide an applica... or submit an application to receive the funds and also provide 50 percent of the cost to develop the business plan for which the grant funding will be used. Is that..."

Ford: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, they have some skin in the game, so to speak.

They..."

Ford: "Yes."

Eddy: "...they also have to provide money to go along with this. Okay. Well, Representative, I think... well, I hope... I'm hopeful that Illinois is able to secure funds for this purpose because it sounds like this could be a leg up, a way that they're investing some money in a process that might provide them with a business that creates jobs and produces a Second Chance for them. So, I don't... I think you've got a good idea here and I appreciate the fact that you did amend this Bill to remove the requirement that an eligible participant has to contribute a minimum of \$200, but just the 50 percent. Thank you very much. Appreciate the answers to the questions."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have quite a few speakers waiting to speak. This Bill is on Short Debate. The next one in line is Representative Connie Howard."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. most of you know, I have spent much of my career in the General Assembly working to help ex-offenders and I've always believed that they should have a second chance. Unfortunately, unlike some of my colleagues who believe they should serve for their rest of their lives and in fact, many of them have had to serve because they cannot get a job. Not many people, not many businesses are willing to give jobs to ex-offenders. And so, when Congressman Davis's Second Chance Act passed, I was ecstatic to say the least, because I believe that this legislation could provide an opportunity for those persons who've had negative interaction with law enforcement and the criminal justice system to get on with their lives, to turn over a new leaf to become productive citizens. And so, I'm very happy to see that Representative Ford is, in fact, pursuing this legislation because in... in the long run it is going to help. It's going to help those individuals; it's going to help our state. It's going to make certain that these persons are not necessarily going to have to go back to prison and become furthest recidivism statistics. So, the money is all coming from the Federal Government. I'm certain that those within State Government are going to make a decision to apply for it. It is subject to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

appropriation that's not going to hurt us at all. Representative Ford, I commend you and I certainly hope that all of my colleagues will vote 'yes' for this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Yes, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative Ford, this concept sounds unique in that we're trying to do some micro loans. Is that what you would call these?"

Ford: "Yes, Representative."

Pritchard: "So, this would be similar to what we do with developing countries and other areas, is putting some money into the hands of individuals to start a new business. Now, obviously, it's going to be difficult for someone that may have never run a business to run one. Is there any training involved in this Bill?"

Ford: "Well, the... training would be a business plan, so they would not be able to acquire the loan if they don't produce an effective business plan. And most likely someone that's going to start a small business will be doing things that they feel comfortable with, like maybe washing windows, cutting grass, shining shoes, something that will allow them to feed their families and pay taxes."

Pritchard: "But I think if there's anything we've learned in this meltdown of our economy is that people need to have economic education and too often people seem to be missing that in school. So, I know our Department of Correction

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

has been strapped with personnel, hasn't been able to give the kind of training and education in our prisons and our juvenile institutions as they need. I clearly think that you ought to rethink the idea of providing some kind of education and training besides a business plan in your program here, 'cause I want these to be successful. I would hope that these individuals would be able to get their feet back on the ground and find a way of living legally. So, I support what you're trying to do and I would ask you to keep working on it. If this Bill gets out of the House, I would ask you to work with the Senate Sponsor in trying to get some training involved in this as well. Thank you very much."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "I have three more speakers: Dugan, Rose, and Reboletti, then we'll cut off debate. Representative Dugan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Representative, I just wanted to check with you. I know we've talked many times about reentry programs and what we can do to help as a state, which I think as Representative Howard said helps the entire state. When we talk about education and some of the things that we've talked about that go along with helping people to be able to come back into society and reenter into society, I think we have some programs in Illinois and organizations that now try to work with people to help them learn different

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

steps in this. Is that... is that correct? I think we do have some."

Ford: "Yes, we do. Safer Foundation is one."

Dugan: "And I think that... isn't it the John Howard Institute."

Ford: "John Howard and the community colleges, yes."

Dugan: "And I think there's also some local nonprofits throughout communities all over the state that also provide this type of help. So, this money can also be used for those types of organizations to help in any way that's needed to help ex-offenders be able to reenter society and become a important part, again, of society in our communities, correct?"

Ford: "That's correct."

Dugan: "And so, I, too, also commend you on this legislation, and would like to be placed as a cosponsor."

Ford: "All right."

Dugan: "And it is certainly something that we as a state have recognized the need for. This will give us the finances to go along with those programs that we know certainly can work. So, thank you very much."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Chapin Rose and then Representative LaShawn Ford to close."

Rose: "Thank you. Representative, will the Gentleman yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, you've mentioned that there was a godfather of ex-offenders."

Ford: "Reformed."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Rose: "Reformed. Who's that godfather?"

Ford: "Oh, Congressman Danny K. Davis."

Rose: "Danny Davis and Danny Davis is the godfather of reformed offenders. Is that right?"

Ford: "In my opinion."

Rose: "What's that?"

Ford: "In my opinion."

Rose: "In your opinion. Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you very much. And I really appreciate the discussion and I really appreciate the Chief cosponsor of this legislation. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 436 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? Bassi, Beaubien, Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 75 Members voting 'yes', 40 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Bob Biggins, for a personal privilege."

Biggins: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to recognize and honor the other representatives that are here. The Youth Market representatives of the American Heart Association are in the gallery. Can we give them a nice welcome. I don't know where they are, but they're there somewhere."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Jack Franks, on page 43 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 7. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 7, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was... I wish I would have gotten my Agreed Bill List out earlier. This is a Bill that I think is important to help in our ideas that we heard today and we've heard for quite some time about reform and renewal and transparency. And this is a Bill that I think would help us get there. And what it would require would be disclosure of... like we do for campaign finances... also requiring disclosure for those that are giving for legal defense funds. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Fritchey: "You leave for a few weeks and they break your microphone."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is the lollypop getting in your way there, Representative."
- Fritchey: "Apparently. Representative, I understand what you're trying to do and I guess what jumps out at me here is the fact that there may be a big loophole here. And that is, rather than calling something a legal defense

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

fund, couldn't an individual facing charges simply call it a personal use fund or a... whatever it may be. I just... I'm wondering if there's... if you get at that in the legislation or maybe the only other way to do it is to say any type of fund generated by an individual under indictment or something along... along those lines. Do you see what I'm getting at?"

Franks: "I... I do and I think and if we need to amend it we can do it in the Senate. I'll look at the language. But I think that the way we've drafted it, we talk how they define legal defense of a candidate or public official. I don't know if you've seen the analysis..."

Fritchey: "Yes."

Franks: "...but they define it as 'obtaining, providing or financially assisting with the obtaining or providing of legal counsel, representation, services, advice, opinion or guidance for a candidate or public official in connection with an offense', et cetera, et cetera. So, I think we've defined it strongly enough. If we need... if you, after reading it, if you think we need to define it stronger, I'll ask our Senate Sponsor to do so."

Fritchey: "Well, it's... it's not... it's not so much how a legal defense is defined. It's simply they would say, well, we're raising money for individual A for personal expenses. And then individual A simply comingles that money with their personal funds and you know, money that is raised there... You know, here, their money that... their personal money that they had would be used to pay legal defenses and the money that's raised at this event would then be used to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

pay personal expenses instead of the legal fund. You see what I'm saying?"

Franks: "Yeah."

Fritchey: "I mean, we... I... obviously, I'm fully with you what you're trying to do, but I... I think that what we're going to do here is think that we've accomplished something and maybe not have gotten at it. So, just keep it in mind and you know, I think it's something... something that should get dealt with over on the Senate side because otherwise this is going to be a lot of bark with no bite."

Franks: "Certainly. And I know now, for instance, even though we have disclosure laws sometimes people try to launder the money by giving it to a different group or... and then sending it that way. And I know every time we pass laws, we always... there's always unintended loopholes that are sometimes there, but you're right, if we need to tighten it up and let's talk to some experts on this."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Franks, not having been in your committee when this passed or in a committee where it passed, I'm looking at the analysis and wondering exactly what's happening here. Are you saying that anything over \$3 thousand, you have to set up a separate committee to receive?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Franks: "Yeah. We need... we need to do that because right now one could receive funds and then use them for a legal defense and whether those funds are given to the individual or to a campaign fund, as we've seen from some of our officials that use their campaign funds to pay legal defense. It's like what we have now. If you raise or spend \$3 thousand, you have to... you have to have the full disclosure and create the... and create that committee and I think we should do the same."
- Mulligan: "Well, wouldn't you prefer that it goes into a fund...
 into the campaign fund so that you know who's giving the
 person money and that they designate it as that switch..."
- Franks: "Well, that... that would be required under this Bill.

 They would have to tell us who's giving the money and then where it's being spent."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, if it goes over \$3 thousand and you want a separate fund, you couldn't make that fund have any name you wanted and it wouldn't necessarily be linked to a person."
- Franks: "Well, it doesn't matter what the fund's called. I mean, it could... it could be called the Better Government Fund, for all I know, but if they're using the money for legal purposes and if you see the definition of why it's being used, then they would have to dis... then they'd have to disclose."
- Mulligan: "Well, I agree with you that the state board should be more definitive in how you would apply this. I had a recount where there was quite a bit of legal expense and they would never give us an answer on how we should report

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

that money and so it caused quite a problem the next time I ran as to how it was reported or not reported and some of it was pro bono work so that..."

Franks: "You show an in kind, for instance."

Mulligan: "So, you would want it defined at least by the state board on how you would define what the expense is for, but I would think you would want it all linked to the candidate or the elected official so that you would actually know who's giving the money. My only concern is, if you switch the fund to another fund and you call it, you know, Better Government, whatever, how would I know when I go online to look up... I tried to pass legislation over another issue that said you had to define at least what the source was so that when you went online to look up, you could find out if the Better Government Bureau was to the sole expressed use of Representative Jack Franks and if it just said the Better Government Fund, I could never figure that out by going online as John Q. Public or as Representative Mulligan who knows a little bit, unless there's something linking it to how you would define that committee. So, once over \$3 thousand, which is real easy to get there..."

Franks: "Right."

Mulligan: "...how would you make sure that the public could figure out who was benefiting from that fund?"

Franks: "Well, right now, we've got the same issue whenever you have any fund. And I was trying to mirror what we had in the Election Code now, because no matter who you may be you can name the fund anything you want and... as long as you raise or spend 3 thousand you have to disclose. So,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

perhaps that's something that we could change for the entire Election Code, having to be more specific. I don't think we need to necessarily say for this legislation, because we have the same problem right now under the Election Code."

Mulligan: "Right. I've tried to change that several times."

Franks: "I'd be happy to work with you on that. I think you're a hundred percent right."

Mulligan: "And quite frankly, it was... there are a number of funds like the Leader's Fund, different people that don't want that defined. And so, I think it's really important to be able to define who benefits from a fund, so if you want to look it up and see where that money's going. Like I could say I'm for greener environment and take money from the biggest polluters in the world and no one would know that I'm getting that money because they couldn't track it that it was just going to me. So, I think there's a real issue here with starting a fund that is unspecified as to who's benefiting it."

Franks: "I think we need a lot of reform when it comes to our...

our sunshine when it comes to the election. So, I'd be
happy to work with you. I think that's a separate Bill and
we could do it for all the different funds."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Sandy Cole."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Cole: "Representative Franks, I just have a couple questions.

Would this just apply to elected officials or also to candidates?"

Franks: "A candidate or a public official."

Cole: "And... I'm trying to read through the Bill and I just have a concern based on, what if it was a candidate who had fraudulently or the allegedly... fraudulently obtained signatures? That candidate can... has to have a legal defense fund in order to..."

Franks: "No, no, they don't have to do anything. I'm just saying if they do… if they are using donor money for legal defense, I think we ought to know about it. I think we ought to know who's giving…"

Cole: "Okay."

Franks: "...for the purpose of the legal defense and who... and where that money's being spent. Because I think if we were able to track some of the... those type of transactions in the last administration, I think there would have been more red flags."

Cole: "Okay. So, if... what if that candidate hasn't raised enough money to start filing?"

Franks: "Then it... then it wouldn't be... Under \$3 thousand, I think we've made a decision here that it's de minimis and we don't require other entities to register. So, I was just trying to be consistent..."

Cole: "Okay."

Franks: "...in the Code."

Cole: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks to close."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Franks: "I appreciate the suggestions and the comments that we've had. I'd ask for a favorable vote. And if there needs to be changes in the language, I'll... I'll talk to the Senate Sponsor, but I think this is important to get where we need to be to a more open and transparent government. And I'd certainly hope that you agree with me."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 7 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? Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Bob Biggins, for the point of personal privilege. Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Yes, for purposes of an introduction. I would like to welcome on the other side of the gallery on the Democratic side, a group from the American Heart Association, the Youth Market representatives. Would you please welcome them?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to Springfield and thanks for all your hard work on the first floor today. Glad to have you. Representative Mary Flowers, on page 55 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3... 3999. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3999, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mary Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3999 merely combine two very successful programs: one of them being the Golden Apple Scholars along with the Illinois Future Teachers Corps and merge the two together and they will become known as the Golden Apple Scholars of Illinois Program. And I know of no opposition to this Bill and I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3999 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kay Hatcher, on page 51 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2295. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2295, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Kay Hatcher."
- Hatcher: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2295 amends the Park District Code. It provides that a person's not eligible to serve as a park district commissioner if they owe money to the entity or if they are a felon. This basically brings the

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Park District Code in line with the Municipal Code and is sponsored by the Illinois Association of Park Districts."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Question #1 and if you answer this question correctly, you're eligible to answer additional questions regarding this Bill. Is this your first Bill?"

Hatcher: "Maybe."

Eddy: "I don't think... I don't think you're making it any easier on yourself by trying to avoid the question. We'll try it again. This is a 'yes' or 'no' question. Is this your first Bill?"

Hatcher: "This is my first Bill."

Eddy: "That's what I thought. I thought you were trying to sneak one by us here. I see the wiley left-hander from Skokie is up, getting ready, loosening up a little bit. We knew at some point we... Could you explain again for the Body exactly what this does? I... I see it deals with the Park District Code."

Hatcher: "Yes."

Eddy: "How familiar are you with the Park District Code and do you think it really needs this type of change? That Code has been around a long time and here you are, you've been here eight weeks and you're wanting to change the entire Park District Code?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Hatcher: "Well, my goal, of course, is to speak on behalf of my constituents and since, for many years, I was a leisure professional, I was the first one they came to..."
- Eddy: "Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, don't... stop there. You've piqued... you have piqued my interest. A leisure professional, is that a... is that a occupation as defined in the federal registry? Let's stop there. Leisure professional. I'm not sure anyone in this hardworking Body has any understanding of what a leisure professional would do. Would you..."

Hatcher: "There are those of us who work hard at play."

Eddy: "So, is this a certified position? Is this... I'm interested. Did you get a degree in this? Is this a college certified program that requires licensure?"

Hatcher: "No, it's an attitude."

- Eddy: "It's an attitude. Well, you might want to take the… talk to the Representative Saviano about some type of licensing for leisure professionals, but anyway, I did interrupt you. I... I was just interested if perhaps at this point I might figure out how I could become also a leisure professional, but I'll look into the exact requirements later. Go ahead and tell us how you're going to change the world."
- Hatcher: "Well, actually, what I'm doing is bringing this forward because as a park district commissioner they have outreached into tens of thousands of children and I think it's probably a good idea that they not be a felon."
- Eddy: "Well, we'll be the judge of that. But I... I'm reading our analysis of the Bill and it appears as though you want

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

to make ineligible to serve as a park district commissioner a person who is in some type of indebtedness to the park district? Is that..."

Hatcher: "They just... if they're going to be elected, they shouldn't be a felon."

Eddy: "Well, what if they're a leisure professional? Would that change your mind? I mean, if they were a leisure professional who was in debt, would that make a difference or are you including leisure professionals in your exclusion as well?"

Hatcher: "No, only an elected leisure professional."

Eddy: "Ahh, okay. Well, it sounds to me like you may have a interest then in conflict of your own Representative, you know, I've never heard of leisure professional before today. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate. I have a lot of concern about this Bill only because you've attempted to, I think, deflect the Body's concentration on the Bill itself by coming up with a title that doesn't even exist and I'm concerned about that. And I'm also concerned about the possibility that this Bill will not receive the requisite number of votes because of your attempt to deflect our attention in another direction. I think... I think this merits further debate."

Hatcher: "Oh, on the contrary. I was bringing attention to the Bill, so you would listen when I talked."

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

Lang: "Well, first, a point of personal privilege. What did you say to me, Mr. Eddy?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Representative Lang, I described you as the wiley left-hander from Skokie. I have no idea if you're wiley or left-handed, but I know you're from Skokie. So, at least one of..."

Lang: "Well, I can tell you that I'm not left-handed, but I appreciate the rest of it. Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Spon..."

Lang: "Didn't she say... That or... was that a yes, Sir? Yeah, okay. It's a mistake, but you should... but thank you. So, I want to get back to this leisure professional thing. So, do you... are you... Mr. Rose... Mr. Rose. How come I pointed that way and you walked that way? All right. So, have... have you discussed your definition of this Bill with the Park District people? Do you think they appreciate that definition?"

Hatcher: "Actually, leisure professional is something that they throw around within the trade."

Lang: "In the trade? This... is it like the slave trade? What kind of... what are you talking about, Representative? Are you sure you're prepared to present this Bill? This is your first Bill. Hello?"

Hatcher: "I suspect no one is really prepared for their first Bill."

Lang: "So, let me ask you, if you are a leisure professional?"

Hatcher: "I am."

Lang: "Good. And have you been in the trade?"

Hatcher: "Some."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Okay. I may be the only one who thinks this is funny.

So... so, tell me... tell me again what this Bill does 'cause
I'm very confused."

Hatcher: "It amends the Park District Code so..."

Lang: "That much I understood, Representative."

Hatcher: "...that it will protect our children from park commissioners that are felons."

Lang: "It protects our children from park commissioners who are felons?"

Hatcher: "Yes."

Lang: "Can you run for public office in this state if you're a felon?"

Hatcher: "Only for park districts."

Lang: "Oh."

Hatcher: "That's why we're attempting to amend it."

Lang: "Oh. Oh. So, no... so, a State Representative, a State Senator or a constitutional officer, a sheriff or county official, water districts, none of those people can be felons only park commissioner?"

Hatcher: "Exactly."

Lang: "And so, I'm wondering if you have gone back into the debate on when that law was passed to determine if there was any legislative intent? Did... did that Legislature, way back then, purposely intend to allow park commissioners to be felons?"

Hatcher: "You know, I suspect they probably did, but their
microphone may have turned off at the time and they just
missed that."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Ah, we do the jokes around here, Representative. That wasn't funny. So. so, who came to you with this proposal?"

Hatcher: "The Illinois Association of Park Districts."

Lang: "And was it somebody there who was a felon?"

Hatcher: "No."

Lang: "What felonies are included?"

Hatcher: "All felonies. Examples are: infamous crimes, bribery, and perjury."

Lang: "What's an infamous crime? Does that have anything to do with the trade?"

Hatcher: "I think if you read about it in the paper, it's infamous."

Lang: "If you read about it in the paper, it's infamous? Is that what you said, really? Does it have to be in every paper or just your paper?"

Hatcher: "The park district commissioner's paper."

Lang: "They have a paper? What would that paper be called, 'The Leisure News'? What would that paper be called?"

Hatcher: "It would be called your hometown paper."

Lang: "All right. So, are there any other changes you're making in park district law or election law?"

Hatcher: "No, Sir, there are not."

Lang: "So, does this amend the Election Code?"

Hatcher: "That's my hope."

Lang: "Or does it just amend the park district law?"

Hatcher: "The park district election."

Lang: "Does not amend the Election Code?"

Hatcher: "No."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Right. So, if a person wanted to run for park commissioner but ran under the Election Code instead of under the park district ad, could they then be a felon?"

Hatcher: "They could not do that."

Lang: "Are you sure?"

Hatcher: "I'm positive."

Lang: "How do you know? You don't know."

Hatcher: "I'm... No, I'm positive."

Lang: "Oh, you're pretty sure. Okay. So, well, I... there's not much else, wait. You have a question you want me to ask?

Mr. Franks is going to be asking you some questions, as well. I'm sure he'll want to know about the ethical standards of those in the trade when he gets to you. Thank you very much."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "And our next questioner is the Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm reading the summary that we have and it makes a person eligible who has been convicted of an infamous crime, bribery, perjury or other felony just to serve on the part district board, correct?"

Hatcher: "No. That's the opposite of what it does."

Franks: "So, it makes them ineligible..."

Hatcher: "Right."

Franks: "...to serve if they have been convicted of... of a felony, correct?"

Hatcher: "Exactly."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Franks: "Are you aware that you can serve in the General Assembly if you're a felon?"

Hatcher: "Well, it makes me nervous that Linda Chapa LaVia raised her hand."

Franks: "I'm serious. Did you know that you could serve here if you're a felon?"

Hatcher: "I did not know that."

Franks: "That's true. It real... it real... we've... we've had it happen. Yeah, a couple of times. And I'm sure Mr. O'Brien could fill you in if you'd like to know. He was once in a magazine with a picture of... of... was it Bad Guy Made Good? I think that was the name. But... so, I want you to be aware of that. So, I think there is a bit of hypocrisy, that if we're able to do it... and I'm serious about this... and then the next issue is you talk about if a person is behind in their taxes or other debts that they cannot run then. Could they... My question is, if you are already a member and you get a federal or state tax lien, would this Bill then prohibit you from continuing to serve if, in fact, you would not be able to run?"

Hatcher: "The question is that you cannot run if you owe it to that taxing body only."

Franks: "But what happens if you've been elected or been appointed and then while in office you get a federal or a state tax lien, would you then be ineligible to continue holding that seat since you would have been ineligible to actually run for it?"

Hatcher: "I do not know, but we have a number of lawyers in the Legislature who probably could answer that."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Franks: "And I'm serious, I think we need to gat that answered 'cause there may be an Amendment 'cause... Here's where I'm getting at. The last administration hired a deputy director at the cost of about \$167 thousand a year and at the time of her hire, she had a 30-some thousand dollar tax lien. I think that anyone who gets tax funds, those that are being paid out of tax dollars, should at the very least pay their own taxes. And I think that if we're talking about people not being eligible to run, which I agree with, I don't think that the state should hire anyone unless they've paid their back taxes or if they are already... have already had been hired, then they would be garnished until those taxes are satisfied. But go ahead, I think you have an answer for me."

Hatcher: "The phrasing is, a person is not eligible to serve as a park commissioner."

Franks: "So, would that mean that they would have to be removed if there was a federal or state tax lien levied upon them while in office?"

Hatcher: "That would be our understanding."

Franks: "Okay. I did... And I'm not trying to trip you up here.

I know it's your first Bill. I'm not trying to cause a problem, but I'm serious. You may wish to pull it out and let's do an Amendment to makes these things clearer. I think you may want to make it bigger to talk about employees as well. And I think you'd agree with me if someone can't run or be able to serve if they get that lien, then I think what's also fair to say is that you couldn't be an employee if you had that as well. So, I

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

hope you consider that I'm saying it in all due respect and with sincerity. I like the idea. I'd like to tighten this up and I think you can go farther with it and I think it'd be a very valuable Bill that we need in this state."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hatcher."

Hatcher: "Any other questions? Oh, I'm not supposed to..."

Speaker Lyons: "The next question is from Representative Mike Bost, Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "I have a few very, very serious questions here. I'm concerned about the fact that we passed a Bill just recently that would actually give us money to felons to help them start a business, but if we're not going to let them be elected... But that being said, is this directed at any of our U.S. Congressmen or U.S. Senators?"

Hatcher: "No, it is not."

Bost: "Well, I did... after this last year of the betting process for appointments to the U.S... appointments set up by the President for different spots, it seems that there were a lot of them that if they don't pay their taxes they could go in and have those jobs. I didn't know if it was erected in that way or not. I..."

Hatcher: "This Bill has a singular focus."

Bost: "Oh, okay. All right. Well, it was just a question I had. I was a little concerned. It seems that, you know, it... the... some people don't feel that paying taxes are that important. And I was afraid that maybe it was just, you know, this was possibly a negative... just a negative thing

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

you were trying to do here. But here in the... your park districts in your area, do you have a lot of them?"

Hatcher: "Yes."

Bost: "Do you... like I know we only have, I think, one in my area. Is this a real big problem that they actually do have a lot of people who are felons trying to run for these spots?"

Hatcher: "I don't know if it's actually happened, but it's a perfect way to clear it up so that we don't have to worry about it in the future."

Bost: "Okay. Well, I'm a big believer in that, you know, if somebody has possibly had some crime that might be a, you know... obviously, these part districts employees handle money, correct? Correct? Did... did... He interrupted my question."

Hatcher: "I... someone else was whispering in my ear."

Bost: "I saw that... I saw that. So, my question is, do they handle money? And they vote on... some of these park boards deal with..."

Hatcher: "It's unlikely they handle money."

Bost: "Okay. All right. But... but some of the... this stops people from white collar crime from serving on these positions, correct?"

Hatcher: "It's just these people..."

Bost: "These people embezzling or anything that might happen that way or..."

Hatcher: "It's cleaning up the verbiage to preclude problems."

Bost: "Cleaning up the verbiage. Is that something they can do in the park districts..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Hatcher: "Sometimes."

Bost: "...cleaning up verbiage."

Hatcher: "Yes."

Bost: "Does that... Never mind, Representative. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "I would move the previous question on behalf of Representative McCarthy."

Speaker Lyons: "You and Representative McCarthy are the last two and I think you have the same reason. Representative Kay Hatcher to close."

Hatcher: "Again, this is a replication that we are bringing forward to match the Municipal Code. I thank you for your attention and we will clear up any suggestions of change that's needed when we take it to the Senate."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2295 pass?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Representative, on your first Bill. Representative Paul Froehlich, on page 55 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4051. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4051, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Do you wish to move that Bill back to Second Reading or do you want to leave it on Third? We'll move

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Thank you, Representative Froehlich. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to show that on that last Bill that I voted 'no' on, that I should have voted 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will so reflect.

 Representative Esther Golar. Is Representative Esther

 Golar on the floor? Representative? Representative Julie

 Hamos, on page 55 of the Calendar, you have House Bill

 3990. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3990, a Bill for an Act concerning local farm and food products. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Julie Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm pleased to present to you today the Local Food, Farms and Jobs Act. And those of you who were here a couple years ago, you remember that we voted in a Bill that at that time created a task force to look at local and organic foods and that task force, appointed by the Governor, has been meeting, 35 people, great group. All the stakeholders sitting around the table to ask the question, how can we, in Illinois, incentivize, encourage farmers to grow more local food and really support a rural food economy. And that's what this is really about. That's why very prominently in the title is the word Food, Farms and Jobs Act because we think

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

ultimately if we can redirect some work to grow more local food, we will also increase jobs and again, a boost to rural economy, especially the rural economy. This Bill, of course, has many other benefits because looking at the obesity problem and access to fresh, local foods and the food desert, there are issues that we have now been looking at for the past year and out of that task force work came an excellent report that is now going to be the blueprint moving forward in what we need to do over the last... in the next 10 years, I would say. This Bill sets in place a couple of the policy agendas from that report. One of them is to say that as the State of Illinois buys food in the various institutions that we buy food for, by the year 2020 we should have a goal that 20 percent be local farm or food products. In terms of the entities that we support with state funds, such as public schools afterschool programs and hospitals, again, we should set a goal that by the year 2020, 10 percent of those foods should be local food and farm products. And that we should adjust our food procurement policies to allow for a small increase, 10 percent, in... in the bids that come in for these local farm products, again, all in the course of trying to incentivize and create a market, a steady ongoing market, for farmers in Illinois. Secondly, the Bill sets in place, for longterm, a Local Food, Farms and Jobs Council. This will be spun off as a not-for-profit with the fiscal agent of the Department of Agriculture and again, the goal here is to be able to keep the stakeholders at the table, working together, taking on the obstacles one by one that have now

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

been uncovered. We're very proud of this work. It has a really excellent support statewide. I think this is going to thrust us in a new direction and really help improve the economy. I look forward to your questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Lyons: "She yields."

Stephens: "What other kind of farm products are there other than local?"

Hamos: "What are there that are local?"

Stephens: "What other kind are there other than... if they're grown locally, they're local, right?"

Hamos: "Well... well, we are... This is not my first Bill, okay?"

Stephens: "Couldn't tell... couldn't tell..."

Hamos: "Is this a trick question?"

Stephens: "...it from the substance of the Bill."

Hamos: "You know, Representative Stephens, one of the… one of the interesting statistics that the report uses and it's amit's an economic metric and it was questioned in committee, but I'm going to tell you what it is and it might be adjusted, as we look more into this, is that 95 percent of food that we eat in Illinois is actually imported from other states. So, this is an attempt to redirect that some more, food that's available here local farm food, is… is grown and processed here in Illinois."

Stephens: "Well, and if we do that, then we'll be exporting less corn and soybeans."

Hamos: "Well, I wouldn't necessarily make that assumption, no."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Stephens: "Well, we can't grow whatever these local crops are on the same acre of ground and then expect to keep our exports going. If you're going to say that we've got to raise certain products and what troubles me about this is I represent thousands of farmers, thousands of farmers. don't know how many farmers you represent, but the last thing the farmers in my district need is for government, especially the State of Illinois, to come in and say, you know what, we got a better idea. farmers have been planting and plowing those fields for They know what they're doing and trust me, generations. they know how to squeeze a nickel. And if they can make more money by selling cabbages or carrots or whatever to the local school district, they'll find a way. If there's a market, they find it. And they have refined their business many times and we've got something good in Illinois. We are a leading exporter of corn, soybeans and many other products throughout the world. I don't think the farmers that I represent want another government program that... it sounds almost like with the way they used to do it in Russia, a 35-member board of directors that's going to dictate policy in Illinois's farms. I stand in strong opposition to your legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative, will your legislation be in any way detrimental to large farming operations?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Hamos: "Well, no."

The previous speaker made some comments and I Sacia: "Okay. believe he made some good points. I also represent a large constituency of farmers and I think, where we need to be this day and age is recognizing that there is a great need not only throughout the State of Illinois but throughout the nation wherein people recognize that the small in some cases those producer, i.e., that are more naturalists and want to have a... a large garden, a large produce center, can work in concert with our producers and... I'm actually making a statement here, but I'm getting to a question... and the statement is that there are some in this state... and I have a good example in the district I represent I have a farmer wanting to bring in a large dairy operation in a dairy county which has 13 thousand less dairy cows than it had a short 20 years ago and there is opposition by some who have moved out of large urban areas and into my district which some consider in some ways a retirement area and have actually created opposition to this large dairy operation. I think what your legislation does, Representative, and the reason I support you on it and I would like your comments, it creates more of an environment for large operators to recognize that small operators are real people and vice versa, that there certainly is a need for both entities and that in the proper context they can actually compliment each other. Would you care to comment?"

Hamos: "Thank you so much, Representative Sacia. I think your point is exactly right. This Bill doesn't dictate anything

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

to anybody. There is no big board, centralized board, as some speaker suggested. This is really an attempt to foster the development of local farms... farms that want to do more local production and it is, in fact, creating an environment and supporting it in any way possible. That's really all this does. And what the group did do over the past year is it uncovered a series of obstacles that they think they can work on and overcome and that's all this is going to do. This is not going to challenge anybody out there. And what it's really doing is a very positive winwin for Illinois. There is a market, but I think the farmers want to believe that there's a steady on-going market and that's why we're getting the State of Illinois also in the act of buying local food. And that's all this does. So, I appreciate very much your understanding what we're trying to do here."

Sacia: "I do understand it, Representative, and again, I applaud you for bringing this to us because it gives us an opportunity to work together, the small farmer and the large producer at the same time, recognizing that we have some very different needs but some very similar needs at the same time. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Michael Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, this may not be your first Bill, but this may be a first. I just want to let you know I stand in support of the Bill. Standing in support of your Bill may be one of the first times I've ever done that, but this is something that many of the

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

farmers in my area have called on. They are concerned about it. They think it's a positive step and I'll be supporting your Bill and encouraging my colleagues to do the same."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

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

Davis, W.: "Representative, I just handed a slip to you to sign on as a cosponsor of your Bill. But as I'm taking... and I appreciate what your Bill is trying to do, certainly in concept, but as I'm reading through it I do have a couple of questions. The 35-member council that was created that came up with this legislation, how many of... particularly, like it says that there are number of local farmers on there. Were any of the local farmers African American?"

Hamos: "Well, I would certainly hope that some of the local farmers are African American, but it also includes four representatives from community-based organizations focusing on access to local farm food products including at least three minority members."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I think the answer to that question is probably no. And the reason that I asked the question in that manner, Representative, a community-based organization may or may not understand the plight of the black farmer. And there are some African-American farmers here in the State of Illinois that are having their difficulties in terms of getting their products to market. I know of a number of black farmer's markets that take place

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

particularly in the south suburbs and maybe a few areas of the city. So, that's why I kind of asked the question in that manner. And on the procurement side of this, if I... and maybe you can correct me on this... so, the Bill requires that state agencies that purchase food that a percentage of their purchase must come from local farmers, correct?"

Hamos: "It's a... it's a goal by the year 2020, just a goal."

Davis, W.: "It's just a... I'm sorry."

Hamos: "It's a goal."

Davis, W.: "It's a goal. Well, there's a goal that a percentage of their purchases must come from local farmers. So, when we talk about procurement opportunities here in the State of Illinois, you hear many of us, particularly in the Black and Latino Caucuses, talk about requiring or at least putting goals that of the purchases... percentages of those purchase, you know, should come... or goals... that they should come from minority-owned businesses. So, can we... you know, how does this legislation address an issue like that?"

Hamos: "Well, you know, Representative Davis, I support in every single Bill where there's a procurement possibility trying to include minority businesses with a separate goal, but I think that in this particular case we don't know what the supply will be. I mean, this is a new concept for Illinois. We're trying to encourage the development of more local farms..."

Davis, W.: "I..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Hamos: "...so I cannot positively predict that at this point in time what percent of those will be, as you point out, black farmers. I hope they will be minority farmers."
- Davis, W.: "I mean, it certain... I certainly hope so, too."
- Hamos: "But I think at this point, it would be premature. I
 think as this rolls out, over time it'll be great to watch
 that and track that."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I mean, I'm going to support your Bill because I think what you're trying to do is... is good and particularly as it relates and I... a few members of an environmental group talked to me a little earlier today about this piece of legislation and talked about the growth of farms in urban areas, brownfields. Obviously, those... those are kind... those are things in my district, so I want to support... I'm going to support your legislation, but again, when we talk about procurement opportunities, I think many of us examine procurement opportunities in that context, and like you said, you've even supported some of those efforts in the past. So... and we appreciate that, so... so there's no reason why we can't look at that in the same context even in something like this because, again, we do have African-American farmers here in the State Illinois. So, I hope, that as you said, this moves forward and rolls out, that there may be some considerations given to looking at how this legislation can support black farmers and help their farms and their businesses grow and expand as well. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Iroquois, Representative Shane Cultra."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Cultra: "To the Bill. Right now, when you think of agriculture, you think of corn and beans in Illinois. It requires a very large amount of capital and a large amount of land. The purpose of this Bill is to help small acreage farms, which would be your mom and pop farms. They don't have the resources for marketing, for distribution and this Bill would help in those areas and also helps opening up markets for their products by setting goals that state institutions would start buying locally. So, it's a winwin for everybody and it was... it was brought up, and the previous speaker, about small black farms. Well, this is going to help all... all of the small family farms with small acreage. It's going to give them all opportunities for marketing and for distribution and is also opening up markets for their products. So, it's... it's a great idea and I stand in strong support."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kankakee, Representative Lisa Dugan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Representative, did you present this Bill in the Ag Committee?"

Hamos: "Yes, and that was the only day that we got off the…
well, the stuff we do in Ag Committee and actually talked
about farms. It was a very exciting moment."

Dugan: "Well, and I certainly appreciate it when you presented it and it certainly is and I stand in strong support of this Bill. A couple of the previous speakers asked about one issue as far as African-American farmers. I think you

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

remember that the task force that was set up that traveled throughout the state included small farmers who African American. In fact, I think some of those that served on the task force were actually from part of my district. So, I think the certainly the concern of small farmers and African-American farmers is a very important aspect of what it is that we're trying to do, but I... I did want to just reiterate the fact that the task force meetings that were held and I know some of the people that did serve on that committee that have brought forth the black farmer, the small black farmers' concerns and what they need as far as help along with all the other small farmers in Illinois. Agriculture is the #1 industry, I think, as others have said and it is time that we continue as a state to make sure that... that the residents and the people of this state understand how important agriculture is and we continue in any way that we can to help the small farmer make a living, raise their family and bring to light what we have. So, I commend you for this Bill and I'm proud to be a cosponsor. And thank you for all your hard work because I know there was a lot involved in the task force to bring this legislation to fruition. And I certainly also ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Julie Hamos to close."

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm actually very proud of the diversity of response and support for this legislation. I think that's exactly what we've been trying to build and what... the hard work begins from this day forward when the Bill passes because now we have to get to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- work in eliminating the obstacles and this is all about revitalizing urban and rural communities throughout Illinois. I seek a strong 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 3990 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? Barbara Flynn. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"
- Stephens: "Is there some sort of an award for that?"
- Speaker Lyons: "I don't believe so unless you have something in mind. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 567?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 567, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Careen Gordon, do you wish to move that Bill to Third Reading? Is Careen on the House Floor? Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record. Debbie Graham. Representative Golar, on page 45 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 392. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 392, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Esther Golar."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and to my colleagues, I present to you Grow Your Own, House Bill 392. This Bill has been in effect, Grow Your Own Teacher since 2004. This Bill actually clarifies... it's a cleanup Bill that clarifies the language and the purpose of the law. It defines the different partnerships in the Bill and just to go over some things, approximately now... since 2004 we have approximately 500 candidates in the program. By the year 2016, it'll be a thousand. Eleven candidates have graduated and are teaching, one hundred candidates are in the college of education, over half of the candidates are working in schools and with students as tutors and teacher aides. This is a model. Grow Your Own has become a national model and in 2008 groups from Arizona, California, Mississippi, and New Jersey met with Grow Your Own Illinois to replicate the model. I'm prepared to take any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 392 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 Flider, Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative David Leitch, on page 53 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2687. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2687, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply clarifies the cancelations and other details in connection with renewing insurance... health insurance policies for predominantly small business. It comes to me from a constituent who had a series of problems and requested that this be clarified. I know of no opposition. And I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2687 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? Will Burns. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 288? Representative Fritchey, you have House Bill 288 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 288, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jehan Gordon, on page 30... on page 32 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3673. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3673, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Betsy Hannig, on page 54 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3606. Out of the record. Representative Greg Harris, on page 49 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 897. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 897, a Bill for an Act concerning identification cards. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "I recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greg Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a piece of legislation that lays out policies and procedures for the issuance of legal identification cards to homeless persons to assist them in establishing identity for the purpose of seeking employment, applying for benefits and helping them move back into the workforce. It has support of the Secretary of State and a number of the advocacy groups. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Eddy: "Representative, could you again just clarify the intent, the purpose of this legislation. I..."
- Harris: "Yes. It's to assist in clarifying procedures whereby persons, you know, who are homeless can obtain legal... a legal state ID card so that they can establish their identity for the purpose of applying for a job, applying for benefits, et cetera. And as you can see, this would be through attestation by an attorney, an accredited homeless

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

agency of the government, or a provider contracted to the government under criteria that are worked out by the Secretary of State to meet different homeland security requirements."

Eddy: "Can you... can you describe what type of information would be contained on the identification card that the homeless person were to be given?"

Harris: "It would be very much... and if you look at your driver's license, it's a similar form to that, if you've ever seen a basic state ID that's not a driver's license."

Eddy: "So, what requirements would be necessary for a homeless person to qualify for that type of an ID card? Would they have to present some other types of forms of identification or..."

Harris: "There would be, you know, birth certificates, et cetera, you know, to establish legally who they are. The issue becomes, you know, when you are asked to provide an apartment lease or a copy of a mortgage certificate or a utility bill to establish address which they may not have in their possession. So, therefore, you know, if they've met certain requirements as established under, I believe it's called the McKinney Act which is a Federal Act, then a state agency or a state service provider could make an attestation."

Eddy: "So, the McKinley-Vento Act (sic-McKinney-Vento Act)..."

Harris: "McKin... Thank you, yes."

Eddy: "...is what you're talking about."

Harris: "Yes."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Eddy: "And that... that determination then is made for the purposes of, for example, in school districts there are certain funds available for students that are verified as homeless through those criteria. My question is, your intent is not to attempt to provide an identification card and establish some type of residence for a homeless person in order for them to vote?"
- Harris: "That is not the intent. That's not the intent of the advocates or of mine... no."
- Eddy: "Okay. But you think that there is a need for the homeless person to have an identification card of some type to get certain services and that's why you're doing this?"

Harris: "Absolutely, yes."

- Eddy: "Are there cases where those individuals are being turned away from services because they don't have a card like that?"
- Harris: "Yes. And in the testimony that was presented and in the written testimony, there were cases that were made that, you know, presented those circumstances."
- Eddy: "Okay. Well, I appreciate the answers and I... my major concern was trying to establish for those individuals some type of voting rights through an identification card, but that's not your intent. And... and I appreciate that."

Harris: "That's... that is not the intent."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative John Fritchey. Does not seek recognition.
The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper,
Representative David Reis."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I'm still a little unclear from Representative Eddy's questions. How will you know that this person is a citizen of the State of Illinois if they don't have an address? How will this work?"

Harris: "These will be attestations made that the person is living within a certain area by... if you look through the Bill... by a state, federal, local government homeless agency, an attorney, public school homeless liaison, or a service provider authorized by the State of Illinois within guidelines that will be laid down by rule by the Secretary of State."

Reis: "So, one of those entities will have to sign off on this?"

Harris: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. What will this enable them to do? I mean, what's the reason for them needing this card?"

Harris: "In many places, they are asked to show some identity...
identification to prove, you know, who they are, just the
same way you would show a state ID card or a driver's
license as some establishment of proof of identity."

Reis: "Will there be an expiration date on this? I mean, is it a short-term thing to help them get over a hump? Will they sunset after a period of time?"

Harris: "They would rotate in and out just like regular state

IDs and driver's licenses."

Reis: "And how do those work now?"

Harris: "If you look at..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Reis: "I know a driver's license is four years, but what's a state ID?"
- Harris: "I do not know. I'm making an assumption it's on the same renewal pattern. I don't know, but I'll find out for you."
- Reis: "And what's your cost estimate on this? How many people do you think will be taking advantage of this law, if it were to become enacted?"
- Harris: "You're looking at probably the fee is, I think, 10 dollars currently for issuance of a... of an ID, so..."
- Reis: "I think it's 20 now."
- Harris: "Twenty, is it? So, okay. So, they were looking at the possibility of about a hundred thousand dollars possibly in light... which would be a revenue cost."
- Reis: "And what department would oversee this, the Secretary of State?"
- Harris: "The Secretary of State."
- Reis: "What's their... what's their opinion on it? I've tried to pass several Bills out of the Secretary of State's... that would affect their office. What's their stance on this?"
- Harris: "They were initially not in support of it because they didn't believe there'd be enough time to implement the appropriate rules and regulations. We did an Amendment to extend the effective date of the Bill into 2010, which answered that concern. So, now, I believe they are in support."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 897 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 Cultra, Mitchell, Keith Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 106 Members voting 'yes', 9 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'.
 This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Representative Jehan...
 Representative Careen Gordon, on page 8 of the Calendar, has House Bill 587... 567. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 567, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Lisa Hernandez, on page 46 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 489. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 489, a Bill for an Act concerning deferred compensation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "...recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Lisa Hernandez."
- Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 489 is an initiative of the dent... Illinois Dental Society. The Bill amends the Illinois Pension Code, the Children's Health Insurance Program Act, the Covering ALL KIDS Health Insurance Act and the Public Aid Code. The Bill allows a medical or health care provider who participates under the Children's Health Insurance Act, the Covering ALL KIDS Health Insurance Act or the Public Aid Code to elect, in

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

lieu of receiving direct payment for goods or services provided, to participate in the health care provider deferred compensation plan. Essentially, the Bill... the point of the Bill is to increase providers into the Medicaid rolls so that people are able to access dental services. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Are there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, if I understand this, this is actually a pretty drastic proposal. What we're saying is that instead of being paid by the state they can qualify their reimbursements as deferred compensation?"

Hernandez: "Yes, that's correct."

Fritchey: "Therefore tax exempt, as well, correct?"

Hernandez: "Yes, for an amount of 16,500 a year."

Fritchey: "For a cap of 16,500?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Fritchey: "So, if... if the provider is a professional corporation, how... how would that work, because deferred compensation plans are set up for individuals?"

Hernandez: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that again now, Representative?"

Fritchey: "Deferred compensation plans allow individuals to defer compensation and shelter it from tax consequences. So, what if the provider is a corporation, in this case, or a professional company?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Hernandez: "So, we're working right now with the Illinois
 Investment Board and CMS to work with the corporates in
 allowing..."
- Fritchey: "Well, but that... but that, you know, with all due respect, that doesn't answer... it doesn't answer the question of how. I mean, are... There... so, first of all, we would be creating a new... we'd be creating a new program from a scratch, correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Fritchey: "So, we'd be creating a new program, we'd be staffing a new program, and we'd be implementing a new program, publicizing a new program."

Hernandez: "Yes."

- Fritchey: "At a time that we are taking other programs and trying to pare them back, not continue to fund them, et cetera, et cetera. I mean, you were here for the budget address, as well. I mean, do you have any idea what the cost is on this?"
- Hernandez: "Representative, the administrator fees would be paid by the... the participant."
- Fritchey: "Oh, that's just... that's just the administrator fees, but to set up and create a new state program, those costs are borne by the state."
- Hernandez: "The... the Illinois Investment Board is not... they're not estimating any new headcount, so the cost is not really there."
- Fritchey: "All right. So, let's go back again to how a company would have deferred compensation."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Hernandez: "So, we're... right now, we're... Representative, we're working it out with the Illinois Investment Board and there will be a... when... There... there comes a term... when we get to some terms, that Amendment will be added in the Senate."
- Fritchey: "Well... well... well, no, it's not... well, it's not something that would be worked out. I mean, how would a corporation qualify to be a participant in a state deferred compensation plan? Is it... Do we have... Are there any present deferred compensation plans that have corporate participants?"
- Hernandez: "Representative, right now, we... we don't have that answer because we're working on the eligibility... portion of it."
- Fritchey: "Well, I mean, but that's... that's a fundamental portion of the... of the legislation. The majority of providers are not individuals. The majority of the providers are either corporations, professional corporations, limited liability companies, entities that... and I may be mistaken... but entities that I don't know are allowed to participate in a deferred compensation program of any form in the state right now."
- Hernandez: "The Investment Board along with the CM... with CMS, are working on that currently, Representative."
- Fritchey: "Let me... let me try this a different way. Where did this Bill come from?"
- Hernandez: "The State Dental Society. Representative, this is just to try to bring more of the providers on to the Medicaid rolls for the purposes of bringing health... dental care access to individual..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Fritchey: "Well, I hear it and I understand that and I, you know, and I applaud that and I support the initiatives of the Dental Society. I have time and time again. Well, here… let me… Let's see if we can do it this way. I'm truly not trying to be difficult. I'm just trying to understand. I mean, this is a very significant departure from anything I've seen done in Illinois before."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time has expired. If you can conclude your questions, we'll give you another minute."
- Fritchey: "All right. Just... just the last question will be this. Representative, so the intention then is to incentivize providers by allowing them to essentially defer \$16 thousand of state payments as deferred compensation?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

- Fritchey: "That's all you had to say. All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

 Representative, first of all, we don't pay them on time anyway and then we're going to put it into deferred compensation. So, how... how do we handle that?"
- Hernandez: "That's if they elect to participate,

 Representative."
- Mulligan: "That's if they elect to participate. And what will happen with a Medicaid match on a deferred compensation plan where they're not paying money in?"
- Hernandez: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you repeat
 yourself?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mulligan: "I'm sorry. What was the answer for that?"

Hernandez: "I asked if you could repeat your question."

Mulligan: "My question is, this should receive a Medicaid match, but you're taking the money and putting it into a deferred compensation plan that the provider is not going to pay taxes on. Are we still going to be eligible for a Medicaid match without obtaining a waiver? How can you do this?"

Hernandez: "It would be after we submit after… the Medicaid waiver. Now, Representative, there is other states that are doing this, as well, that's why we have… we're looking into to trying to do this in Illinois."

Mulligan: "What other states?"

Hernandez: "Arkansas and Mississippi."

Mulligan: "Two of our great challenges that do so well. And are they getting a Medicaid match for putting money in the deferred compensation?"

Hernandez: "Yes, yes."

Mulligan: "And will you... can you show us that? Have you had research done on that?"

Hernandez: "Yes, we will."

Mulligan: "All right. I'd be interested in seeing that research."

Hernandez: "Okay."

Mulligan: "It seems very interesting to me. Once you do it for the dentists, isn't everybody else that can afford to be able to do this want to do it, too?"

Hernandez: "It's actually for all Medicaid providers. It's the dentists who brought it to... to our attention."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mulligan: "So, pediatricians, everybody's going to be able to do this."

Hernandez: "If they choose..."

Mulligan: "And we're going to hold the funds."

Hernandez: "...state deferred comp."

Mulligan: "And they're going to trust us not to raid them."

Hernandez: "We haven't yet."

Mulligan: "You hope so."

Hernandez: "Yes."

Mulligan: "I don't know. Who's that guy in New York that's going to jail for the Ponzi scheme? It sounds like it might be a good idea to get them interested, but I don't understand why the Federal Government is going to cover and if they cover it on the accelerated match, if they're willing to do it, I guess we're willing to take advantage of it. What can I tell you?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan, do you have another question or are you concluded your..."

Mulligan: "No. I'm going to take the Lady at her word and if it's wrong, it's wrong. You know, I mean, before we set it up and before it goes through Human Service Approp I would hope that it does what it says it's going to do. And Mr. Lowder stood there and shook his head and he said he's got the research, so what I'd like him to do is pass it along to our staff, if he hasn't done so already. And I'd like to see it, but I'm willing to support it if it's a way of getting providers who we don't pay, in a reasonable way, into the plan."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Miller. Representative Hernandez to close."
- Hernandez: "I just ask all of you for a 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 489 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 Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, take the record.
 On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, in the Chair, Representative Frank Mautino."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, on page 55 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 4077. Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4077, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Third Reading, of this House Bill, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4077 sets out what is required for people voting for the first time who have registered with Motor Voter, the kinds of identification that are needed. And it specifically spells out what students would need to take... so that when they show up to vote on election day,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

they have the proper identification with them and the election judges also are aware of what is required."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 4077, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy is seeking recognition."

Eddy: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Eddy: "Very quickly, our analysis indicates that a sufficient form of identification for first-time voters would be a university ID or college-issue photo ID card. Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "Yes. A college-issued voter ID card or a state-issued identification."

Eddy: "Now, they also with that would have to show their lease or some form of a bill with the same address as that ID card or government-issued photo ID card, those together?"

Jakobsson: "Yes. Because very often students show up with their... some form of identification and judges challenge it and this spells out clearly what they need to have."

Eddy: "Okay. So, with those two things that makes it a little different than just the ID card, because the ID card itself... how do they obtain that from the university? I mean, it's not necessary... student ID cards are maybe not uniform. I mean, if they don't..."

Jakobsson: "Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I'd like to take this out of the record for now. I was working on an Amendment and I didn't note that clearly. I want to clarify what you were talking about."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record.

 Mr. Clerk, on page 53 of the Calendar, appears House Bill

 2540. Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the

 Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2540, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Bill 2540 which would amend the Downstate Police Article Pension. Any officer who is currently on disability relating to an act of duty would be eligible to receive an annual 3 percent noncompounded increase from the original pension if they are still receiving a disability pension on the effective date of the Bill, they're within 60 days of the effective date of the Bill and the... and they've been in the fund at least 7 years of active duty and they have at least 20 years of combined service between a pension and years on active duty. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and just would like to pass House Bill 2540."

Speaker Mautino: "On this, we have a question from Representative Franks on House Bill 2540."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, why are we doing this?

'Cause isn't the law stating right now that they're able...

an individual would be able to apply. Is there some reason
why we're doing this again?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McAuliffe: "No. Representative, I think about 9 years ago we did this before and since then there's been some new police officers that have... that weren't effective as of that date... like say 1999... and this would just give them the chance to give them 60 days to opt-in to get this benefit that they couldn't get right now. So, we've done this before, I think it was 1999, and we've had some... some police officers that would be eligible. I don't think the number would be that high, but they have asked for this Bill to be passed."

Franks: "What does it state in the law now?"

McAuliffe: "The state of law now?"

Franks: "Yeah. Is it now that if..."

McAuliffe: "Oh."

Franks: "...a police officer is disabled that that individual would be able to file for an annual COLA. Right now, he..."

McAuliffe: "No. Cur... current law does not provide for an annual increase on the disability pension. That's the current law now."

Franks: "So, this would be an expansion of a pension benefit to allow for COLAs if one is on disability?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

Franks: "How does that jive with the... I guess, I don't know if it's a worker's comp law or not. I'm not sure how it works. But it's one is adjudicated disabled, where is that individual... from what pot of money is that individual receiving money from?"

McAuliffe: "Okay. If a police officer gets worker's compensation, then that would be offsetted."

Franks: "So, there would be an offset?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Franks: "That's what I was trying to figure out."

McAuliffe: "Okay."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "And on House Bill 2540, Representative Mulligan is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative, I'm not sure if I understood, how many people do you think would... would... there would be that would be able to take advantage of this?"

McAuliffe: "Well, Representative, since we did this, I believe it was in 1999, so let's say in the last 9 years I would say the… the amount of policemen that have been in the Downstate Police Pension Fund that… that have been in the… they were on active duty for 7 years and were… and a participant of 20 years of a combined service, I think it would still be pretty minimal."

Mulligan: "So, I noticed in one part of your Bill that once they applied for it they'd have to receive a lump sum for the past years that they were owed to bring them up to current. Is there enough money in the fund to cover the number of people that you estimate might be eligible?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, I believe so."

Mulligan: "And do they... can they not be working at any other job?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. They couldn't work anywhere else."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you very much."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

McCarthy: "Representative, this is only prospective. It doesn't go back and pick up any COLAs from before, does it?"

McAuliffe: "No, no. It's prospective."

McCarthy: "And I heard Representative Mulligan ask the question, but did you give her an exact answer as to how many individuals this could affect?"

McAuliffe: "Again, I don't think I can give you an exact number. I don't think it would be that many."

McCarthy: "And if any of the pension funds that were... would be affected by this, have they given a position on this Bill one way or the other?"

McAuliffe: "No. There's no opponents to the Bill."

McCarthy: "Does the village that would have to pay this... I think you alluded to one officer that you know that missed this? The village that he... his fund would have to pay it out for this 3 percent, they did not oppose or support either?"

McAuliffe: "No. Because they're not sure even if that participant would still elect to get in. It would be up to him and you have 60 days to participate in this, if this became law."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McCarthy: "And this would affect all police officers in the state except for the police officers in the Chicago Police Pension, correct?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. No Chicago police officers at all."

McCarthy: "All right. Thank you."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien."

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

McAuliffe: "Sure."

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Beaubien: "My question is, I think we passed a law last year that requires COGFA to do a fiscal impact note on a matter like this? Is that... Do you... Is that the correct or incorrect or do you know?"

McAuliffe: "I believe... I believe that is correct."

Beaubien: "Have they issued that note?"

McAuliffe: "The note I have now says the commission's actuaries, when studying House Bill 2540, that updated impact note would be issued."

Beaubien: "Don't you think we should wait 'til we get that impact note before we vote on it? That's what we got criticized be... for years for not doing that."

McAuliffe: "Yeah. I'm just looking..."

Beaubien: "What happened over a period of years was, we sat there blindly approving every fire and pension, police pension without knowing what the fiscal impact is. We passed a law saying they had to make a study and issue an

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

impact note. For us to be able to vote on this, maybe we ought to get the note before we vote on it."

McAuliffe: "Well, again, I don't think it would be... I don't think it'd affect that many since we did this in 2001. So, it wasn't 1999; it was 2001."

Beaubien: "Well, again, I would request that we wait 'til we get the final fiscal impact note. It's up to you. Thank you."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Cultra."

Cultra: "Yeah. Why are we excluding Chicago?"

McAuliffe: "They're in a different pension fund."

Cultra: "And then what pension funds then are we including in this?"

McAuliffe: "This is the only... this is only the Downstate Police Pension Fund."

Cultra: "All right. And how is that funded?"

McAuliffe: "From the municipalities."

Cultra: "Okay. And where do the municipalities get their money? Is it from property tax?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Cultra: "So, the property tax line on... is not capped, right?

So, whatever... whatever... whatever the need is, that is... it's not voted on. It just can be put right on the prop... property tax bill without voter approval. Is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "Correct."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Cultra: "So, basically, what we're doing here is an unfunded mandate to local governments? We're going to tell them what they have to do and provide no money to pay for it?"
- McAuliffe: "Yes. But this is going to still be limited. This is only on... on policemen, that are on disability. I don't think every county or every municipality's going to be affected. In fact, most of them won't."

Cultra: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Nekritz."

- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I would just like to also join in with the Representative from Lake in asking that we wait until we have the fiscal note on this, because I think that's important... really important information. We're getting a lot of feedback from the municipalities back home that these pension Bills are really impacting their ability to provide basic services to residents because of the impact on their... on their levies. And so, I would really appreciate that information before we proceed it to a vote. Thank you."
- McAuliffe: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, can we please pull this Bill out of the record. I'll wait until I get something from the COGFA."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, at the request of the Sponsor, please pull House Bill 2540 from the record. Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar on page 55, appears House Bill 3986. Representative Joyce. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3986, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Joyce."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3986 will allow the Chicago Park District to do the design-build proposals for their projects. This language is taken directly from Illinois... the State of Illinois CMS design-build language. And this would make... obviously, make it a much cheaper for the Chicago Park District to build more playgrounds or facilities throughout the Chicagoland area... or throughout the Chicago Park District system. It'd be much cheaper and it'd be more timely and cost effective. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 3986, Representative Cultra is seeking recognition."

Cultra: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Cultra: "Would this be similar to a project labor agreement, this design-build?"

Joyce: "No."

Cultra: "How is it different?"

Joyce: "Well, a project labor agreement is... I think has more to do with what kind of practice or what kind of employees you're hiring, correct? This... this design-build allows them to go through the design phase and the build phase with one proposal as opposed to going to design and build separately. So, they sent along an RFP for design, then they have to wait for those to come back. There's usually a 30 to 60 day requirements required for the posting and for the receipt of those. Then the decision is made on the design. Then after the design is made, they have to go out

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

to build and then they have to wait for the proposal to come back for build. By doing design-build it saves time and costs to the Chicago Park District."

Cultra: "So, what you're saying then is you can do it all in one step. Would that... would that include... I mean, who installs these? Does the park district use its own labor?"

Joyce: "No, they... No, not in all cases they don't. The design and build team could put... there's a... there'd be a list like in CMS... there'd be a list of prequalified design-build firms and they would be invited to bid on a project which would allow the park district then to go ahead and review it in all one step as opposed to taking it and several steps and taking much more time to get the project done."

Cultra: "So... but this would be subject to competitive bidding."

Joyce: "Oh, yes, yes, absolutely."

Cultra: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no further questions, House Bill 3986, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' And all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 3986, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill shall be declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House... on page 55 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3972. Representative Jackson. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3972, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Jackson."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "All right. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 3972 amends the Election Code as it relates to absentee ballots. In the present Election Code, it requires that for a ballot to be counted it must be mailed midnight... that midnight prior to the election and for it to be counted it needs to be returned within 14 days after the election. What this Amendment will do, it would take that language and add it to the absentee ballots that are sent to those that are voting absentee so that they would know clearly when the ballot should be returned and how many days they have for it to be returned to be counted. I ask for a 'yes' vote. And I entertain any questions that you may have."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 3972, the Gentleman from Bond is seeking recognition, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry."

Stephens: "Is this the Gentleman's first Bill?"

Speaker Mautino: "I would believe... I believe that is correct."

Stephens: "Oh, you're trying to sneak one by us, weren't you?

Yeah, yeah. That's not going to work. You know, you and I share a couple of cities, Representative, that we... we each represent. Isn't that true?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

Stephens: "O'Fallon and Mascoutah, I believe."

Jackson: "Yes."

Stephens: "I don't remember anybody in O'Fallon and Mascoutah telling me they wanted to pass this Bill. What's that about?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "This... this election Bill will afford servicemen as well as handicapped as well as individuals that are going to be off working an opportunity to vote. And what it does, it provides the clarity so that they'll know when the ballot should be returned and how long they have for it to be... before it returned to the Board of Election."

Stephens: "Well, Representative, this is mu... far more substantial than my first Bill which I... as I recall and then Leader McPike and State Representative Cullerton ripped me on one day and my first Bill had to do with caves, caves. Your Bill is far too substantial for me to try to poke fun at it, but I... Representative, I welcome you to the process. I'm proud to be your district, not actual districtmate, but our districts do abut each other.

Jackson: "I appreciate that and I'm proud..."

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

And I'm... I'm sure you're off to a fine start. Thank you."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative Jackson, are you a leisure professional?"

Jackson: "Not to my knowledge, no."

Eddy: "If you were one, would you know it?"

Jackson: "That's why I started off, not to my knowledge."

Eddy: "Well, that's a good answer. What... what is your profession?"

Jackson: "I'm a retired principal. Presently, I'm a retired principal."

Eddy: "Retired..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "Principal, high school principal."

Eddy: "Wow, it's a tough job, difficult job. I have a lot of respect for principals and a lot of concern for retired principals because of their state of mind after being a principal."

Jackson: "Yes."

Eddy: "What... what prompted you to bring this piece of legislation before the esteemed House of Representatives?"

Jackson: "This is an issue of the Circuit Clerk and it was brought to my attention."

Eddy: "Well, what's the issue? The issue is that..."

Jackson: "The issue is, is that there's quite a few service individuals that are not getting the opportunity to vote because of the lack of clarity as it relates to the absentee ballot."

Eddy: "So, how will this clarify?"

Jackson: "It will clarify it because once the ballot is... they receive it, they would know the exact date or the exact time that it should be mailed and the exact number of days that is required before it could be counted."

Eddy: "What... what's missing in the notification process now, specifically, 'cause it sounds like it's something that should have probably..."

Jackson: "The language... the language that is missing is... the language that is there, all I'm asking is for that language to be a part of the absentee ballot which states clearly that it must be mailed midnight prior to the election and it has 14 days after the election to be received to be counted."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Eddy: "So, if you were to juxtapose this, how would you articulate the juxtaposition of your position regarding the change?"

Jackson: "All I'm asking is that for it to be added to the ballot, the absentee ballot."

Eddy: "Okay, Representative. Have you checked in the Senate... do you have a Senate Sponsor?"

Jackson: "No. I haven't checked in the Senate."

Eddy: "Do you know how this process works?"

Jackson: "Yes."

Eddy: "Do you understand that there's a big chute over here...
there's a... there's a door and after the Bill passes, it... it
goes down that chute and if you haven't found a Senate
Sponsor by the time the door of the chute closes, that it
goes into the top of the rotunda."

Jackson: "Well, the ideal is for it to pass down that chute.

Now, hopefully, I can get a 'yes' vote from you."

Eddy: "Well, I... I would hope that at some point or another you'd go to the Senate, you introduce yourself. Normally, what Representatives do is they go over there, they interrupt whatever's going on on the floor at the time, as soon as the Bill passes and they ask if they could find a Sponsor for the Bill."

Jackson: "Yes, I will go over and introduce myself."

Eddy: "All right. I might go over and watch that. Thank you."

Jackson: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeking recognition, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Reboletti: "Thank you, Sponsor. Thank you, Representative.

Representative, I know this is your first Bill, but I have a couple of questions."

Jackson: "Okay."

Reboletti: "You... you can vote right before the election and then mail it in?"

Jackson: "No. Well, what happens, if you receive it, you have midnight prior to the election to mail it. Now, if you... if you have it and you're returning it and you're going to be absent of the day of the election, you may turn it in personally."

Reboletti: "Well..."

Jackson: "You have 14 days after the close of the election for it to be counted."

Reboletti: "Okay. So, there's a April 7 elections coming up with townships and local elections. When would you have to have this absentee ballot in the mail for it to count?"

Jackson: "The night before election."

Reboletti: "So, April 6."

Jackson: "Midnight before the... April the 6th. That is correct."

Reboletti: "Okay. Then for that vote to count, I assume that they have go almost into a recount mode because many elections we have a pretty general idea of the outcome, unless a recount is involved. And you're saying that these ballots, if they were postmarked April 6, could then be counted as a provisional ballot if there is a need for a recount or some type of issue."

Jackson: "They'll count it in with the final tally."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Reboletti: "They have to count it in with the final tally."

Jackson: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Hello, Representative."

Jackson: "Hello."

Lang: "That's very nice tie you're wearing, Sir."

Jackson: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Jackson: "Likewise."

Lang: "It's a pleasure... Well, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to have you in the Illinois House of Representatives, Sir. This is your first Bill."

Jackson: "Yes, it is."

Lang: "Yeah. And why are you no ha... you should be happier about this, Sir, actually..."

Jackson: "I am happy."

Lang: "Oh, okay. I just wanted to check to make sure you're happy. So, as I understand this, the change you're making in the law deals with not the rules about when a ballot is sent in, but only that it be printed on the application that you have a certain period of time to send it in so the voter is aware. It's an education process more than anything else. Is that correct?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "All right. So, have you ever worked in the United States Post Office, Sir?"

Jackson: "No, I have not."

Lang: "All right. So, I note in your Bill in fact many places in your Bill it talks about it being postmarked by midnight, doesn't it?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

Lang: "Yeah. Do you ever get a letter postmarked at 11:58 p.m.?"

Jackson: "Well, if... for it to be 11:58 p.m., it has to be that prior date."

Lang: "One more time."

Jackson: "It has to be... if it's the 7th, it has to be on the 6th."

Lang: "Okay. So, let me go ask my question again, because it's like we're in two different places. So, what... they don't postmark things 11:00, 11:30 at night, do they?"

Jackson: "No, they do not."

Lang: "So, why doesn't this Bill say postmarked before 8:00?"

Jackson: "Well, it gives you a time reference for that date for it to be mailed."

Lang: "All right. And have we determined the cost to the county clerks to have this extra language printed on the ballot application?"

Jackson: "That was an issue. But they... they normally would have it already printed up so that they can have stickers attached to the ballots which would reduce the costs to the..."

Lang: "Stickers?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "Right."

Lang: "Well, what about the cost of the sticker?"

Jackson: "Well, I don't know what that cost would be."

Lang: "You know, that's..."

Jackson: "But there will be an additional cost."

Lang: "That stuff you put on the back of it, you know, that's why a Post-it costs more money than just a piece of scrap paper 'cause there's that stuff on the back. Doesn't it have a cost?"

Jackson: "Yes, Sir."

Lang: "Okay. I'm just checking. So, wouldn't it be cheaper just to print that right on the ballot application?"

Jackson: "Yes, it could be. Now, the reason why I said a sticker is because for those ballots that they presently have, they would not have to reproduce what will... which will reduce the cost."

Lang: "Well, Sir, you've handled this all very well. You're totaling throwing me off my game, so I'm done. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey is seeking recognition."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry."

Fritchey: "Speaker, I notice that you have my seatmate standing next to you and you appear to be giving him instructions. It's not a loss on me that he recently became a part of the Leadership team. You're not actually harboring thoughts of putting him in the Chair, are you? All right, Speaker, let me tell you. He's a good man; I've known him for a long

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

time and he's a good personal friend. You don't want him in the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "It's my understanding the Gentleman has many and varied interests. And so, he's looking to see how the Chair functions and I imagine sometime shortly you'll be seeing him here."

Fritchey: "Well, Speaker, let me just say. You know, I'm all for you explaining the position to him, but don't say that you weren't warned should you relinquish the microphone and the gavel to him."

Speaker Mautino: "And I thank you. I'll take that under advisement. Representative David Reis is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, have you got the opinion of the State Board of Elections on this and what their opinion is?"

Jackson: "Yes. They're in favor."

Reis: "They're in favor of it?"

Jackson: "Yes."

Reis: "We've been around an awful long time, Representative.

You... you come to this august chamber after a few months and
you find something that is missing from the election board...

the state Election Code."

Jackson: "I didn't find it. It was brought to my attention and I was glad to have it."

Reis: "Okay. Well, I think you have some drafting errors. You have the same paragraph repeated eight times. Could you tell us why that is?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "Because it deals with different individuals eight times. It deals with the..."

Reis: "So, this is really... this legislation's only brought forth for eight people?"

Jackson: "No. It tries to clarify the number of different kinds of people eight times that can vote absentee and the reasons why they can vote absentee."

Reis: "So, they can vote eight times..."

Jackson: "No. There's...

Reis: "...in the Metro East?"

Jackson: "...different people. For instance, those that work for the Board of Election cannot vote because they'd be away from the poll. Those that are in the military cannot vote because they're overseas. Those that are handicapped cannot vote because they are incapacitated. Those that are sex offenders cannot vote because they can't go into... if they're voting at a place where there's a school board... a school, they cannot go into that environment. There's a lot of different reasons why they put it in there dif... eight different times."

Reis: "So, that's not a drafting error. That's... that was purposely done?"

Jackson: "Yes, it was."

Reis: "You also have in here… my last question… that you have up to 14 days to… to do this. What if election day is on November… part of this period that you're doing after the election would fall on Veteran's Day. And what if Veteran's Day was during the week, how will you handle that?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jackson: "It states clearly that you have 14 days from the time the poll is closed for it to be counted."

Reis: "So, what if they choose to count them on November 11?"

Jackson: "Well, all I can do is draw your attention back to what the legislation states and it states clearly how many days from the time that the poll is closed that the ballot must be returned to be counted."

Reis: "Okay. Well, thank you, Representative, for bringing up this legislation. We've had a long illustrious career in Illinois of elections and you found something that we hadn't covered before. So, thank you for bringing this to our attention."

Jackson: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking recognition. On House Bill 3972, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 3972, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill is declared as passed. Congratulations on your first Bill, Representative Jackson. The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis is speaking... Reis... is seeking recognition. For what reason do you rise?"

Reis: "I don't know how I could butcher up Mautino, but I'll think of a way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Reis: "I'd like to draw the chamber's attention to the balcony.

 We have several members of the Illinois Pork Producers here today and I want to recognize them and also remind people that one of the best most delicious receptions is being held tonight at the Springfield Hilton and we certainly hope you all stop by for a great port chop."
- Speaker Mautino: "Thank you, David. Mr. Clerk, on page 45 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 442. Representative Jefferson. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 442, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. However, Floor Amendment #1 and Floor Amendment #6 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Mr. Spea... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to do adopt Amendment #6 which takes care of Floor Amendment #1 which is actually... #6, I believe. It needs some clarity."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 442 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Please return that Bill to Second Reading.

 Are there any Amendments or Motions filed?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1 and 6 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Amendment 1, Representative Jefferson."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Jefferson: "Amendment #1 adopts the Bill in its original form, but Amendment #6 becomes the Bill. So, I would move that we do adopt Amendment #6."

Speaker Mautino: "Withdr... the Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1."

Jefferson: "Yes."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, Amendment #6."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #6 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jefferson on Amendment #6."

Jefferson: "Thank you. Amendment #6 removes all the counties that had requested to be removed from the Bill. So, only the counties that asked to be part of the Bill are part of the Bill at this point in time."

Speaker Mautino: "On the Amendment, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Representative Jefferson, as I understand it, this Amendment removes Champaign, Vermilion and other counties. I want to thank you for removing us. I'm still probably not going to vote for the Bill 'cause I hate cameras, but I want to thank you for taking us out. And I really do appreciate you working with us to do this, Representative Jefferson. So, thank you."

Jefferson: "Thank you for those comments."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Amendment 6.

All in favor signify by 'aye'; opposed same sign. The
'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk,
Third Reading. Read the Bill."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 442, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jefferson."

- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a initiative of the City of Rockford that wanted to become part of this Bill. Like I said, only the people that are part of this Bill are people that requested to be. It's a Bill that's going to help us in Rockford do the things the city wants to do. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition on House Bill 442.

 The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 442, 68 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 44 of the Calendar appears House Bill 268. Representative Bill Mitchell. Out of the record. On Representative... on page 48 of the Calendar appears House Bill 773. Representative Lang. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 773, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr... And on the Bill, Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We thoroughly discussed this yesterday when we added the Amendment. It's a resolution of an issue regarding the beer distributors and some brewers. It's mostly an agreed Bill, but there's one issue they have not agreed to. Most

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

of you have heard about this for a significant period of time, so I'll simply just ask for 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 773, no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. House Bill 773, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill shall be declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 44 of the Calendar appears House Bill 202. Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 202, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 22 (sic-202) should sound somewhat House. familiar to you; it was House Bill 427 in the last Session. I do this on behalf of the Fraternal Order of Police that represent the parole officers here in the State of Illinois. Basically, what this allows is for our parole officers to carry their weapons that they normally carry during the business hours on them, on their person, when they go off hours off duty. There are conditions once a month, twice a month, three times a month where a parole officer has been, you know, confronted in different social settings, whether it be in a shopping center or the movie theatre, out with their family and for some reason it's beyond us there's a restriction on them allowing to carry their weaponry after hours for their own protection after...

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

that we as a state ask them to actually keep and monitor some of those... you know, some serious offenders that get out on parole and then not let them... potentially protect themselves in these situations. This Bill ran out of here the last time with over a hundred votes, passed out of committee unanimously. It's a good piece of legislation. We passed it two years ago. I'm asking for your support on behalf of the parole officers in the State of Illinois and the Fraternal Order of Police who lodge that initiated this... this initiative."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition. House Bill 202, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 202, 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill is... this Bill is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 54 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 3877. Representative Holbrook. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3877, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. You look good in the Chair, there. House Bill 3877 allows municipalities and Illinois to allow credit towards the 35-year age cap we have put on the hiring of new law enforcement officers. The 10 years is for active duty military. This will provide a larger pool of trained, qualified people for these positions and also help out our veterans. I'd take any questions."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. On House Bill 3877, no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, Representative Ryg. Mr. Clerk, take the record. House Bill 3877, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill shall be declared as passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 16 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1115. What's the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Read the Bill. Move this Bill to Third. Mr. Clerk, on page 45 of the Calendar appears House Bill 326. Representative Pihos. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 50 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1003. Representative Poe. Out of the record. On page 45 of the Calendar appears House Bill 349. Representative Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 349, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicles. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an issue that we've debated before and as a result of that conversation, I've amended this Bill which now is reflected in the language that you see to deal with the issue of distracted driving. It's an issue that is growing that more and more people are involved in

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

accidents and unfortunately, losing their lives as a result of distraction. And this Bill seeks to discourage people from that practice. And as we have found in other legislation where we put some penalties in place, it does affect the behavior of people. So, I would ask for your support in this effort to try to improve the safety on our highways."

Speaker Mautino: "This Bill is on Short Debate. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook arise, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, this initiative, I know, folks have tried to take on in a number of times. Let me ask you, I'm looking at our analysis and just as they know that the Bill would not be a prac… a violation of traffic laws."

Pritchard: "So, your analysis perhaps doesn't reflect the Amendment that was added to this Bill last week. What the Bill is doing now is creating the offense of distracted driving. So, that an individual who commits a moving violation can also be charged with distracted driving, if they are observed by the officer of engaged in two activities either in text messaging or in reading some types of materials."

Fritchey: "Okay. But... but it's... here. This is what I... this is what I don't get. So, the idea behind the Bill is that distracted... that distracted driving is obviously dangerous not only to the driver but to other cars, pedestrians, et cetera, correct?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Pritchard: "Correct, correct."

Fritchey: "But somebody that would be pulled over for distracted driving would not be found of having committed a moving violation."

Pritchard: "No, no. They would only be pulled over for a moving violation and in addition would receive a second charge if the officer observed them..."

Fritchey: "So... so, it can't be a primary stop?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Fritchey: "Why not?"

Pritchard: "That's the way I was advised to structure this."

Fritchey: "Well, and you know, I don't want to be the naysayer here today, but again, I just... So, you see some... you know, a police officer sees somebody driving down the street, a newspaper spread out across the steering wheel; they cannot pull them over for distracted driving."

Pritchard: "Not if that's their only offense. What this Bill acknowledges is that some people can be multitasking. That is a risky behavior and what we're saying here is if that risky behavior results in some type of moving violation, then the officer can also charge them with a second offense."

Fritchey: "But that second violation which inherently results from driving a vehicle in a distracted manner would not be a moving violation?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Fritchey: "I'm..."

Pritchard: "At least that's my understanding of what you just asked."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Fritchey: "Right. You know, obviously, my statement is not directed at you. Does this make any sense to you? I'm really... serious. I mean, just so..."
- Pritchard: "If an individual can't obey the speed limit, for example, or turns at a red light without stopping or weaves down the road because they are distracted, this puts an offense in place that allows the officer to charge them with a distracted driving."
- Fritchey: "But why then... if you... but if you... so, and if I can... if I can text on my phone and read the newspaper, but still observe the speed limit and stay within the lines, I'm okay?"
- Pritchard: "I don't say that's good behavior, but you haven't violated the moving laws of our state."
- Fritchey: "But if it's the behavior that we're trying to get at here, why wouldn't we say that distracted driving is a moving violation and you can be pulled over for that?"
- Pritchard: "You would only be pulled over if you had a moving violation."

Fritchey: "Why wouldn't that be a moving violation?"

Pritchard: "Excuse me, which?"

Fritchey: "Why would that not be a moving violation?"

Pritchard: "Which? What... what..."

Fritchey: "Distracted driving, as you've defined it. And Representative, you know..."

Pritchard: "So... so, what we're trying to do is take this one step at a time. We realize that it's a bad behavior, but we're not going to change the culture that we're in right

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

now overnight. So, this is an effort to make people aware, to put a penalty out there and hopefully change behavior."

Fritchey: "All right. Now, the Bill also says though, that distracted driving would occur if you were doing one of two things: reading a newspaper, book or magazine or sending a text message, correct?"

Pritchard: "Or text messaging, yes, reading or sending."

Fritchey: "Okay. So, if I'm reading a... if I'm reading a Bill analysis, that's not distracted driving? If I'm reading any... I could be reading anything other than a newspaper, book or magazine and it would be okay?"

Pritchard: "We're trying to get at... at the beginning again, if you will... behaviors..."

Fritchey: "But why would this just be..."

Pritchard: "...that the police department has reported are very distracting."

Fritchey: "But why... why is it any different for somebody to be reading a work document than to be reading a newspaper?"

Pritchard: "Because we're just limiting some behavior. We're, again..."

Fritchey: "Okay."

Pritchard: "...there are lots of things to distract people. We don't have all of the things that distract..."

Fritchey: "Well, under..."

Speaker Mautino: "If the Gentleman will bring his remarks to a close."

Fritchey: "I got a couple more questions. Please, Speaker, then that should be... But why not just say that if you are reading anything, it's distracted driving. Here,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

similarly, is... As well, let me tell you... say this, so you prohibit engaging in text messaging, what about e-mailing when I'm on the phone? E-mailing is okay, but text messaging isn't?"

Pritchard: "So, we're not saying what is permitted."

Fritchey: "Yes, you are. Yes, you..."

Pritchard: "We're naming..."

Fritchey: "Sure you are."

Pritchard: "...three things that are very... or two things that are very egregious."

Fritchey: "You're... you're saying that... you're saying that text messaging is not okay, but e-mailing is okay.

IMing is okay, typing on your phone is okay, but only..."

Pritchard: "No, we're not saying that."

Fritchey: "But... sure you are, because you're saying the only thing that you can be found to be guilty of distracted driving on it is text messaging. The only thing that you can be found of being distracted... fined for distracted driving is reading a newspaper, book or magazine. I could read a phonebook; I could read a map; I could read the budget analysis; I could read anything. Representative, let me... let me tell you this and I think you're a Gentleman, I do. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that should never have come out of committee. It is sure as heck in no form to be passed out of this chamber. It is well intended: it is very, very poorly drafted, unenforceable. Representative, I mean, obviously, it's your doing, your Bill and no disrespect whatsoever, but

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- this thing's just really not even close to ready for prime time. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Is that yes?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Lang: "Representative, your Bill prohibits text messaging, but it doesn't really define text messaging. So, if I send a text message, I assume that's text messaging. What if I receive one?"
- Pritchard: "That would be what the officer might observe.

 These are all going to be things that would have to be proven by the officer charging."
- Lang: "Well, how would the officer know, as I pass him at 90 miles an hour in my car while I have a phone in my hand, whether I've been texted or I have been doing the texting?"
- Pritchard: "So, if he didn't observe it, he wouldn't charge you for distracted driving."
- Lang: "But what would he observe? So, you have a cell phone, hold it in your hand, give me some idea how someone could tell whether I have sent the text or received the text?"
- Pritchard: "It would be something that the officer would observe, someone looking at or looking down that he could observe this instrument in his hands."
- Lang: "But that's not what your Bill says. Your Bill says text messaging. Your Bill doesn't say what you just said. Also, many of us have cell phones where we can get e-mail. You haven't said anything about e-mail. So, don't you think there's some flaw in this Bill?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

Lang: "I said you haven't said anything about e-mail. Most of us on this floor have a cell phone where we not only get text and send text, but we get and receive e-mail. Should that not have been included in the Bill?"

Pritchard: "That would be text messaging."

Lang: "There's no... but there's no definition of text messaging in your Bill? So, if somebody... if somebody sent me an email, which I'm sure a thousand people will now while I'm saying this, and I got it on my phone and the officer said, what were you doing? I wouldn't say I was text messaging. I was... I might say I just got an e-mail. You don't say that in the Bill. You don't define text messaging in your Bill. Now, don't get me wrong. I support your goal."

Pritchard: "Mmm mmm."

Lang: "I see too many people playing with their phone while they're driving. I'm an offender myself. But the… we have to pass Bills here that have some definition to them that an officer can understand. Let me go… And while you're mulling that one over, which I see you are…"

Pritchard: "Mmm mmm."

Lang: "...and I appreciate it. The next sent... paragraph talks about reading maps. What about..."

Pritchard: "No, it doesn't."

Lang: "It does talk about maps..."

Pritchard: "Not in the Amendment."

Lang: "...newspapers, books..."

Pritchard: "Not in the Amendment."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Oh, maps are out. So, it's just newspa... So, you can read a map. So, I can drive 90 miles an hour down I55 and I could have a map open and read it if I wish, but... and I can send an e-mail while I do that, but I can't... Is this your first Bill, Sir? But I... but I can't read a book..."

Pritchard: "Yeah."

Lang: "What if I... what if I had a Sudoku puzzle and a pen?"

Pritchard: "So… so, Representative, if you'd like to expand the things that would contribute to distracting, I would be happy to do that after we have established this offense of distraction."

Lang: "But... but the problem is I agree that we should have a law that forbids distracted driving, but I think we should have a law that's enforceable. I think we should have a law that we can all understand."

Pritchard: "Mmm mmm."

Lang: "So, it's one thing to say let's not text message, but you haven't defined what a text message is. So, my suggestion is and I'm not... honest, this is not like..."

Pritchard: "Yeah."

Lang: "...what I do to the freshmen. I really think you ought to take this back to Second Reading, again and redefine your Bill. I know you took out the personal grooming, but that's only so you'd get the votes of the personal groomers on the floor. What you need to do... what you need to do, it seems to me... I don't want to tell you what to do with your Bill... is to fix it and then give us a chance to do away with distracted driving in the State of Illinois. And if

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- you do that, I'll be glad to support you in it, but I can't vote for the Bill the way it's written."
- Pritchard: "We would certainly be willing to try to improve this, as this moves through in the Senate and I would ask for your help in doing that."
- Lang: "Oh, no. Those... those Senators are the worst at driving and reading and grooming. No, can't do that. Ladies and Gentlemen, I support the Gentleman's idea, but this Bill is not well written. All of us have cell phones, all of them text, all of them get and receive e-mail. The Bill doesn't define its own terms and therefore, it's too vague to stand up as... as a legitimate statute for the State of Illinois. And so, while I respect the Gentleman and his Bill, I think we should be voting 'present' or 'no' at this time. Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Bill is on Short Debate. Two Members having spoken in opposition, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Gordon, C.: "Representative, once again we're having this debate, but you're just using the word 'distracted' in... in... instead of the word 'negligent' and negligent is a civil standard. As much as we don't want it to be, it is a civil standard. So, I have a question for you. So, if someone is text messaging while they're driving and God forbid they cross the line which would be improper lane usage, right here, which would qualify under your Bill, but they kill

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

somebody while they do it. Are they then... is that a criminal standard? Is that reckless homicide or is that a civil case, because for... for three years Representative Black has tried to do negligent homicide and just using the word 'distracted' instead negligent. And as much as we want to change that law, we can't do it because negligence is a civil standard. are... is this what we're trying to do because your Bill, like Representative Fritchey and Representative Lang has told you, does not meet the standards that we're trying to do here."

Pritchard: "So, Representative, you obviously are a very gifted attorney..."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you."

Pritchard: "...and the Representative from Chicago is a very gifted attorney that could certainly argue these cases and prove it to the... to the extent that you feel is appropriate. What we're trying to do here, though, is to begin a process that recognizes unsafe behavior and use the commonly defined terms that are available to us."

Gordon, C.: "I understand that, but..."

Pritchard: "We chose to go this route rather than what you're saying..."

Gordon, C.: "They're not drunk..."

Pritchard: "...because it's a starting point."

Gordon, C.: "...they're not drunk, they're not stoned. So, is number four on the list going to be reaching for something on the passenger side floorboards? Is that going to be the next thing that's going to be distracted driving?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

- Gordon, C.: "Is number four going to be reaching for something on the passenger side floorboards? Is number five going to be talking to someone in the backseat? Is number six going to... going to be the mother getting the pacifier to the child who won't stop crying unless they get it? What exactly are we going to stop at with distracted driving? This is not a criminal standard and it never will be."
- Pritchard: "So, we're not trying to go to the extent of distraction. We're naming two items here of forms of reading or text messaging. There's... they're egregious according to the Illinois State Police. It's a place to start."
- Gordon, C.: "I understand that, but what you're trying to do and your intent is wonderful, but what you're trying to accomplish can't be accomplished by how your Bill is written. And so, I appreciate what you're trying to do, and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, we all want this to stop. We all know the type of technology that we now have, but this is not the way to do it and this is not the way to accomplish the goal that we wanted to accomplish. And I would respectfully request a 'no' vote until we have a better way of accomplishing this goal. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Bill is on... the matter is on Short Debate. Three have spoken in opposition. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey is seeking recognition for what purpose?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. My name was used in debate. Should this Bill not get a trophy and should this Bill somehow get the requisite votes, I would ask for a verification. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "I acknowledge that request and a verification will be granted. On this Bill, the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis is seeking recognition."
- Davis, M.: "I'm in opposition. So, I can speak? Okay. I just wanted to say, here is my phone and if I decide to text on it, it's really difficult to text with one hand. It's really difficult; I'm not that good at this yet. But even if I did and the police stopped me, as soon as I see him I click my phone and it goes all the way off. So, how does he charge me with texting?"
- Pritchard: "Well, if he doesn't observe that and he can't testify to that in court, it won't hold up."
- Davis, M.: "I think it would be really difficult for him to see that I was texting and to say in court that he saw me texting on my telephone."
- Pritchard: "If it's difficult for him to see it, he wouldn't charge you with that offense."
- Davis, M.: "How about reckless driving? Don't we have laws now that prohibit reckless driving?"
- Pritchard: "It's my understanding we do."
- Davis, M.: "Well, do you think that this Bill would reduce the significance of reckless driving?"
- Pritchard: "What we're trying to do is deal with some causes to... perhaps to that and distraction is a part of it."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Davis, M.: "Well, I agree with the other speakers on this side of the aisle that your Bill still needs a little more work. I think it may be something we want to look at. But when you start defining 'texting, reading a book', you know, it just becomes a little more difficult in my opinion for the policeman to prove and for you to go to court or have to pay a fine. It just does seem a bit unfair, so I hope you will join that club that has very few members."
- Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. No one seeking further recognition, Representative Pritchard to close."
- Pritchard: "If I could have the support of Representative Lang,
 I would move this back to Second and try to improve it to
 take into these considerations that have been brought
 forward in debate."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman requests placing the Bill on Second. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 52 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2428. Representative May. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Lake, Representative May."
- May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 House Bill 2428 amends the State Officials and Employees

 Ethics Act to prohibit appointed members of boards and

 commissions from making contributions greater than \$23

 hundred to the Executive Officer who appointed them. I'm

 pleased to have the support of about 30 of the House

 Members and I hope that you will all support this important

 measure. It's supported by the Illinois Campaign for

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Political Reform. Last year we started work on pay-to-play to stop the people who have contracts with the state from making contributions. I think we have more work to do. We need to enact meaningful campaign finance reform and I believe that this is a good start to end the clout club and pay-to-play in our state."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 2428, Representative Kosel is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Kosel: "Why did you decide on the ...that dollar threshold?"

May: "What? I'm sorry, repeat."

Kosel: "Why did you decide on that particular dollar threshold?"

May: "That is the federal campaign limit that many people who are active in campaigns are used to, sometimes referred to as the McCain-Feingold, the \$23 hundred. That's our federal limit."

Kosel: "Don't you think that it should be less than that?"

May: "Not necessarily. I think that that's a good... a good point because most of the people who are involved in campaigns."

Kosel: "I applaud your Bill; however, I don't think it goes far enough. I really think that that... that limit should be much lower than what you have listed. I understand that it's convenient to use that number, but ethics isn't always convenient and if we're going to really clean things up, I think we have to pull ourselves to a higher standard than even the federal level. So..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

May: "You know, I... I..."

Kosel: "...while I support the concept, I wish that it was at a lower level."

May: "And you know, I... I a..."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Fritchey: "Representative, just as a technical matter, you realize that the federal threshold is \$24 hundred not \$23 hundred, correct?"

May: "No. I thought it was 23."

Fritchey: "No. It was changed at the beginning of this year to 24, so should this go you may want to either put language in there tying it to the federal limit which changes over time..."

May: "Excellent suggestion. Thank you."

Fritchey: "Nothing in here would prohibit a contribution being made under the name of a spouse, would it?"

May: "That's correct."

Fritchey: "Do you see a problem with that?"

May: "No. I think that, you know, that an individual is their own person."

Fritchey: "Okay. What about... here. Unlike Federal Law, in State Law we can make corporate contributions. So, if the... if an individual, that is the head of a company, is appointed to a board, is the company precluded from making a contribution?"

May: "It's the individual."

Fritchey: "Do you see a problem with that?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- May: "You raise an interesting point, but it's not the company that's being appointed to it, you know."
- Fritchey: "Understood, but if an individual that works for a company, that heads a company, that's an officer in a company, on and on and on, there is nothing here that would prohibit the company from making a \$25 thousand contribution to that officeholder, is there?"
- May: "That is... that is correct. And I focused on individuals because I'm focusing on the... the commissions and the boards and all, which is really an individual not a corporate or not a phenomenal thing."
- Fritchey: "Understood, but the idea, obviously, is to further what we did with the pay-to-play ban and sever any ties or perception of impropriety doing campaign contributions and in this case, appointments to boards and commissions, correct?"

May: "Yes. I will..."

- Fritchey: "But we do nothing about that if we say that if the individual that's appointed to the board is allowed to make a contribution through their company."
- May: "You know, Representative, you make a good suggestion. And this was my idea, while the campaign... Illinois Campaign for Political Reform does support it, I was really sort of hoping by putting it out there that if people had ideas that the amount was too high or too low that they would reach out to me. And I am amenable to changes if... if we come up with some good ideas here."
- Fritchey: "Let... let me... let me... Here's my concern. If this Bill comes out of here now, I can see it coming out of

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

the Senate in the same form and we really put a Bill out there that doesn't do a whole lot. We've got a little bit of time. Would you be willing to take this thing out? We can have an Amendment drafted in a... by next week that would address, I think, a couple of these aspects. If you don't want to do it, obviously, you don't have to do it. But I think you've got worth... you now have a threshold that's unique unto itself. It doesn't match up anything in the state; it doesn't match the federal..."

May: "Oh, Representative, I will change the amount. I will change that amount. I think that's an excellent suggestion."

Fritchey: "But then, also, the aspect of an affiliated company, et cetera. We put a lot of work into getting language in 824 to make sure that when we were closing a loophole we were really closing a loophole. Would you be amenable to pulling this out, taking a look at the language from the pay-to-play Bill and seeing if maybe you can incorporate some of that? And I'm... and... Representative, I'm not trying to derail this. I think it's a good idea. I think it's something that maybe we could have put on the Bill last year and we didn't, so I commend you for doing it, but I'm just concerned that as Session moves on, as we get caught up in things, that it... these changes may not get done in the Senate. The easiest way to do it could be right now and try to bring the Bill back next week even."

May: "You know, I would think that if we chose language like 'could not contribute' or 'caused to be contributed', you know, if it's... you know, I would hate to say that someone

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

who was just an employee of a company and perhaps not the CEO or the CFO or on the board of the directors..."

Fritchey: "Understood, but somebody that's an officer... somebody that's on the board or is an officer or something along those lines, that has the ability to have a corporate check issued..."

May: "Uh huh."

Fritchey: "...I think you'll want to get at that, no?"

May: "Was that a question?"

Fritchey: "Yeah."

May: "Oh."

Fritchey: "Maybe if somebody's in a position to have the corporation cut a check, you don't want them to use that as a way around this Bill?"

May: "That is correct. That is correct."

Fritchey: "So, would you be... I mean, would you be willing... I mean, I'd be happy to spend time with your staff. If you could pull this out, we could probably have an Amendment done by next week."

May: "I guess I would just ask if people have ways to improve this that they get to me posthaste. You know, this has been out there and it went through committee..."

Fritchey: "Understood and I... you know, I just..."

May: "Representative, I mean..."

Fritchey: "...I just gave you a couple right now which is why I'm saying, I think that there are things that could be done relatively easily."

May: "And I would... You know what? I will do them. I would just suggest that this is a very important issue and it's

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

one that should not be avoided. I do not want to derail it. I do not want to slow it down. We need to talk about meaningful campaign finance reform. So, I will take your suggestions. If there are other people who have suggestions to make this stronger, let's do it. Let's do it within a day or two. Let's just try not to derail this for whatever reason."

Fritchey: "No. And... and here, you and I are squarely on the same page. You came... come to me with the idea before. I thought it was a good idea. I thought there were some... some... some semantic issues with it. I see no reason that we can't try to get them corrected, you know, without delay. So, I mean, I appreciate your willingness to do this. I think we have a better Bill because of it."

May: "Yes. Yes, Representative, I will do it. And I would just ask if there are other ideas that we try to get it all wrapped up into one, because this idea has been out there for awhile."

Fritchey: "I appreciate that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record."

May: "Yes. Thank you for suggestions and again, if you have anymore tweaks, let's put this Bill in a form that it can really be meaningful. There are... there might be other issues of campaign finance reform such as Representative Osterman's Bill, which I am supporting, but this is not in this Bill. This is an important component to clean up the... the corruption and the ethics in our state. So, thank you very much."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, would you take this Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, on page 55 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3909. Representative Ramey. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3909, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Ramey."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3909 is providing for minimum terms for people that commits for a second time domestic battery and aggravated domestic battery. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the question is...

 Excuse me. The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Gordon, C.: "I'm sorry, Representative. Does it stay a misdemeanor? I'm sorry. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Gordon, C.: "You said for a second or subsequent violation.

 So, is that violation or conviction, because sometimes they get knocked down to battery? So, does it..."
- Ramey: "It's conviction."
- Gordon, C.: "And I guess I should look at the text, but... So, for a conviction it's a minimum mandatory one year?"
- Ramey: "For... for agg... for domestic battery, yes, a second... a second conviction."
- Gordon, C.: "For a second conviction, it's a mandatory one year."
- Ramey: "Correct."
- Gordon, C.: "But it stays a misdemeanor."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Ramey: "I'm not clear on that, Representative. Is that your understanding of it?"
- Gordon, C.: "Well, that would be problematic because I think that Representative Zalewski has another Bill that might be in conflict with that about minimum mandatory and truth in sentencing laws. So, you might want to check that out."

Ramey: "I will do that."

- Gordon, C.: "And then secondly, on the… the extended term of 7 to 14 years is disproportionate on the aggravated domestic battery for what else is in the Criminal Code. If… if you could… if you could pull this from the record and I could talk to you about it, if you wouldn't mind?"
- Ramey: "I'll pull it from the record. I'll be happy to discuss that with you, Representative."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, at the request of the Sponsor, please remove this Bill from the record. On page 45 of the Calendar... Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, on page 52 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2370. Representative McAsey. Read the Bill. Read the first Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2370, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you. This is a Bill that I bring before this Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your recognition. What this Bill seeks to do is to make a very simple technical change to a Public Act, Public Act 95-0019. It passed in the 95th General Assembly. There's... was a error in that legislation relating to the legal description of some property that was declared surplus property. This

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

legislation seeks to correct that legal description, makes a change in the Section number of the legal description from Section 19 to Section 29. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. I'm also willing to take any questions from the Body."

Speaker Mautino: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, seek recognition?"

Bost: "Representative is this your first Bill?"

McAsey: "In fact it is."

Bost: "It is, okay. However, you have had many points of personal privilege. I've never had... I've never seen anybody have... I mean, you do that very well, the points of personal privilege."

McAsey: "Well, thank you. Thank you for recognizing that.

You're correct. I have exercised a number of points of
personal privilege. Many folks from my district have been
down here and other great things to recognize including
March, Women's History Month."

Bost: "I can tell you have a... I can tell. I was looking for questions while she was doing that, yeah. This deals with, did you say, Public Act 95-0019?"

McAsey: "That's correct. That was a Public Act in 95th General Assembly."

Bost: "And it did which? It did what, again, I'm sorry."

McAsey: "It was legislation carried by my predecessor and there was a drafting error… a scrivener's error."

Bost: "Your predecessor... who was your predecessor?"

McAsey: "Representative Brent Hassert."

Bost: "Oh, okay."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McAsey: "And yes, there was an error in the drafting and this seeks to correct that scrivener's error, correcting the legal description of the property, making a change so that, in fact, the property owned by the State of Illinois is accurately described."

Bost: "So, this only deals with Will County. Is that correct?"

McAsey: "This particular piece of property, parcel of property, is located in Will County."

Bost: "So, is this special legislation?"

McAsey: "This particular piece of property is located in Will County. It is adjacent to the Stateville Correctional Center."

Bost: "So, is this spe… this special legislation?"

McAsey: "Well, this is a technical change to a Public Act that was previously moved out of this Body."

Bost: "But is it a special legislation?"

McAsey: "I... I... This is just merely a technical change. It is not a special legislation."

Bost: "You haven't been at this very long, but you don't answer questions straight out, do you? Is this special legislation?"

McAsey: "This... this is correcting something that was previously incorrect. It's not special legislation. It's cleanup of a scrivener's error."

Bost: "Okay. Then our analysis says in Will County, so the actual language..."

McAsey: "Ahhh."

Bost: "...and I don't have that in front of me. Hold on, here."

McAsey: "The actual language?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Bost: "Yeah, I'm getting that..."

McAsey: "With regard to the actual language of the Bill, the only changes made from Public Act 95-0019 is correcting the Section number in the legal description, changing that number from the number 19, which was in error..."

Bost: "So, this is a Section increase, right?"

McAsey: "A Section increase?"

Bost: "Yeah."

McAsey: "No."

Bost: "I noticed right here that the Bill actually says is located in Section... and 19 is marked out and 29 is put in. It's a Section increase."

McAsey: "Sir... Representative, it is a..."

Bost: "It... it... Now, is that like a tax increase?"

McAsey: "No. This is..."

Bost: "But... but it is. It's a Section increase."

McAsey: "There is no increase. This is correcting..."

Bost: "Well, you know, now if you..."

McAsey: "...an error..."

Speaker Mautino: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Bost: "Yeah, I will. Representative, I... you know, if you're going to have... if you can't realize that if you're moving it from 19 to 29 and that's an incre... not an increase, then you're going to do very well around here because that's the way this place works. They tell you that that's really not an increase, but if at any time we go from 19 to 29, even if we're dealing with a Section, that's an increase. I'll

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

have to study this a little closer to see if I'm going to support it."

McAsey: "Well, with regards to this..."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I'm the Representative from Cook. Is that correct, Sir? I just... just wanted to correct you from yesterday."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Lang: "Gentleman from Cook. I thank you. I was called wiley earlier. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? So, I'm guessing yes. So... Hello, Representative. I can't say nice tie..."

McAsey: "Hi."

Lang: "...you know. So, what... whose property is it that the wrong citation affects?"

McAsey: "Who... who is the ... "

Lang: "Well, you know..."

McAsey: "...owner of the misnamed property?"

Lang: "Yeah, yeah. Whose... whose property did we cite accidently in here?"

McAsey: "Well, Representative Lang, I actually cannot speak to who owned that property, but I know that it is not the State of... or to the best of my knowledge, it is not the State of Illinois and it is certainly not this property located adjacent to Stateville Correctional Center. And that's why this legislation is being brought forward because that's a change that needs to be made."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "So, this was supposed to have said, when we passed the Bill previously, Section 19, Township 36 North, Range 10 East, right?"

McAsey: "When you have..."

Lang: "That... that's what it should have said."

McAsey: "The original Public Act reads Section 19..."

Lang: "Right."

McAsey: "...Township 36."

Lang: "Right. So, I'm just simply asking who owns the property in Section 19?"

McAsey: "Well, Representative, I do not have that information, but the State of Illinois does not, to the best of my knowledge."

Lang: "As far as you know..."

McAsev: "The State of Illinois owns the land at Section 29."

Lang: "As far as you know, it's not a relative of anybody in the Illinois General Assembly, right?"

McAsey: "To the best of my knowledge..."

Lang: "Yeah."

McAsey: "...this..."

Lang: "So, you don't think you should have checked that out first because maybe that person likes the law the way it was?"

McAsey: "You're suggesting that a private owner of property likes the State of Illinois having the authority to declare their property surplus and sell it?"

Lang: "You know, it's your Bill, Representative. I think you should have checked with everybody. You checked with lobbyists, I'm sure, people came to you to discuss it.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- This is... this is a Bill that came to you because somebody suggested it to you. Perhaps, you should have checked with the person who's affected by this."
- McAsey: "Well, I think the people that are affected by this would be those property owners whose property is inadvertently described and this seeks to correct that."
- Lang: "All right. So, I have another question. So, this talks about Range 10 East of the Third Principal Meridian. Now, I see that all the time. So, where does the Third Principal Meridian start and end? Do you have any idea? Do you know where the Second Principal Meridian is?"
- McAsey: "The Internet's a wonderful thing. I could find that information for you."
- Lang: "You want to like bring this Bill back to Second Reading while you check? Don't look at her. You want to check out for me, hold on. You want to... you want to... Don't be listening to her, Representative, I'm asking the questions. So, if you could at some point, would... when you take this Bill back to Second Reading, tell us where all the Principal Meridians start and end going all the way from here to, let's say, New..."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman brings his remarks to a close."
- Lang: "I'll finish now. We'd appreciate all of that information and no using the Internet. You've got to figure it out yourself."
- McAsey: "And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote today, so that we clean up the public action that was passed in the 95th General Assembly."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "Well, we'll consider that. We don't usually correct mistakes around here."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I'm going to follow up on Representative Lang's question 'cause I'm interested in whether or not most of the time if a Representative is going to try and change this type of Bill, they have... they have visited the sites involved. Have you driven to both of the parcels of land in question? Have you personally driven out to see the land itself?"

McAsey: "As to the land that is, in fact, owned by the State of Illinois under the Department of Corrections, I am very familiar with the location of that property. It is very near the location of my service office, in fact."

Eddy: "So, you don't own the property?"

McAsey: "I do not. The State of Illinois..."

Eddy: "Well, that's good, that's good."

McAsey: "...owns the property that we're attempting to change the legal description."

Eddy: "Okay. So... but... but... but you personally have not visited the site. You have not gone out there; you have not gone the extra mile or however far it is from your home, to visit the site to verify that it is indeed... because obviously there's a mistake that's been made."

McAsey: "That's correct and it speaks to correct that."

Eddy: "You don't want to make another mistake. You don't want to make the same mistake twice. I would suggest that

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

before you pass this that you drive out to the site to make sure that we don't make the same mistake again because you only get two chances at this, this is it. If we do this wrong this time, there's no other chance. We can't fix it."

McAsey: "This legislation would correct the scrivener's error that was made in a prior Public Act."

Eddy: "Does the department want to part with the land? Is this something that you've checked out with the department?"

McAsey: "The Department of Corrections..."

Eddy: "Yes."

McAsey: "...who owns... who is the agency, right, that owns the property for the State of Illinois, yes. In their inventory, in comparing the Public Act with what they own this correction needs to be made."

Eddy: "Were they okay with the original land that was conveyed that wasn't supposed to be?"

McAsey: "Well, seeing as that was legislation and a Public Act that was in the 95th General Assembly at a time that I was not here, I could not speak to what the Department of Corrections believed or did not believe."

Eddy: "Well, they said they were then, the say they are now, why should we trust them. They made a mistake, too. My point is that unless and until you drive to this location and verify it, you really... this is all hearsay. This is all people that have told you that this mistake was made. You have no firsthand knowledge that this parcel even exists, do you really? I mean, if you haven't been there, how do know there is such a parcel?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McAsey: "I do know that this parcel exists. I have been to the location."

Eddy: "Have you been on Google Earth to look at this? One final question for you."

McAsey: "Mmm mmm."

Eddy: "I think this is the most important question of the day.

Are you a leisure professional?"

McAsey: "I am a full-time State Legislator."

Eddy: "All right. Well, good luck with this. I don't think anybody ought to vote for it, 'til you've been there."

Speaker Mautino: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, rise?"

McCarthy: "Mr. McCarthy raises to raise the... or move the previous question."

Speaker Mautino: "The previous question has been put. On House Bill 2370, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the Bill... And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 2370 is declared passed. Congratulations, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar on page 50 appears House Bill 1099. Representative McCarthy. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House Bill 1099 is an initiative of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District and the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Pension It cleans up some technical errors in the funds legislation. And it also increases the child annuity for annuitants who die while they're getting the retirement benefit for children under 18 years old or up to 23 years old if they are in college. The annuity is currently 500 for the first child and then 350 for each additional child up to a total of \$25 hundred per month maximum. This will make it \$500 per child up... if you have 10 children, it would be a \$5 thousand per month maximum. As I said, it's... there's very little cost. Earlier there... on a pension Bill they asked about the COGFA response. They said as much as \$20 thousand a year and the pension fund representative said that they thought it was much less than that, but they were willing to go with that 20 thousand estimate that COGFA came up with. So, I'd appreciate passage of House Bill 1099."
- Speaker Mautino: "And on that Bill, Representative Jerry Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on before you called this Bill. I just have a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, would it be okay if we just go ahead and adjourn so we could go home and thaw out, 'cause it's freezing in here."
- Speaker Mautino: "I'll take your first question under advisement and I will talk to the maintenance folks."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Frankie."

Speaker Mautino: "You bet. And on House Bill 1099, no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flider. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1099, 94 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill is declared passed. On page 45 of the Calendar appears House Bill 303. Representative David Reis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 303, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 303 as amended provides a sales tax exemption for the sale of monuments and monument components purchased by nonprofit and veteran organizations for the purpose of honoring military veterans. Many times the component costs for these memorials can be tens of thousands of dollars. And it just didn't seem right that they were paying sales tax which added to the project's cost. I want to thank the Majority Leader for allowing this Bill to go through the Revenue Committee. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "On House Bill 303, questions? Representative Brady.

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Brady: "David, I couldn't hear. Did you say you're removing the sales tax portion of monuments and markers? Is that what you said?"
- Reis: "No. The sales tax on the cost of monuments honoring our veterans that are going up in our courthouse lawns in our small communities throughout the state."
- Brady: "So, this would affect just those type of monuments that are memorial tributes on..."

Reis: "To veterans."

- Brady: "I understand that, but at courthouses and veteran areas where they're putting up a marker of some sort."
- Reis: "Yes. And the Amendment limited it out to \$2 thousand per project and it also more clearly defined what exactly a monument and components are."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "House Bill 303, and no one else seeking recognition, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. House Bill 303, receiving 115 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar page 53 appears House Bill 2680. Representative Rose. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2680, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. This Bill is simply to address the cuts that task forces and many groups have taken from federal cuts.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

We had over 800 pounds of marijuana taken just a few weeks ago in my district by the East Central Illinois Task Force and without the task force that would not have happened. My local sheriff, Sheriff McGrew, reports that they would not have the ability, the opportunity to have investigated that that led to that... that massive bust. This would simply help provide enough earned source of revenue in response to the federal funding cuts. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 2680, having received 108 'yes', 5 'no' and 2 voting 'present', this Bill is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar on page 55 appears House Bill 3957. Representative Sacia. Out of the record. On page 51 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1291. Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1291, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1291 simply allows firemen to buy up to two years military service. We thought it was appropriate this time to offer that to them since a lot of our firefighters have been serving over the years in Iraq and Afghanistan. And

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

the least we could do is let them buy... buy that time. And I would ask for its approval."

Speaker Mautino: "On this Bill, Representative Moffitt is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Moffitt: "Representative, on this does the... I haven't had a chance to read it in the detail that I want to... is the firefighter required to pay their portion plus employers?"

Saviano: "And this is only... yeah, this is only for the City of Chicago and they were required to pay 100 percent of the cost, the fire... the Chicago firefighters."

Moffitt: "So, employee and employer?"

Saviano: "Correct."

Moffitt: "Do they pay interest?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Moffitt: "And what's the interest rate or who determines that?"

Saviano: "The fund would determine that."

Moffitt: "And that's the same for everyone then as far as that interest rate?"

Saviano: "Correct."

Moffitt: "I certainly agree with what you want to do here.

Thank you and I intend to support your Bill."

Saviano: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On House Bill 1291, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

'present'. This Bill is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 51 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1335. Representative Schmitz. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1335, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Schmitz, the Gentleman from Kane."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1335 is correcting a situation that's been happening in my district and I'm sure that if it hasn't happened in yours yet it will soon. It results from press boxes that are built at high school stadiums. And we have a code here that says if it's over... a thousand square feet or under that it's got to be accessible with it... for people with disabilities, but the code has been... it hasn't been administered and enforced as uniformly as we would imagine. We've had many school districts build these since 1997 when the code was first enacted. And I had a situation in my district where they built their new stadium, they built their new high school, they built their new press box all according to code and they couldn't open up the press box because of all... I believe it's about 800 square feet of it was not accessible. Well, if you know press boxes from your high school stadiums, the press boxes are at the top of the bleachers. So, this particular district, School District 300, had to enact a pad and then they'll have a crane lift people up to the press box, if they so desire. What this is doing is saying if you have a press box and it's a thousand square feet or under, you do not have to

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

apply... comply with the School Code. We drafted it this way because there is an exemption in the School Code that says if the press box is privately owned and it's a thousand square feet or under, you don't have to comply with it. So, with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Fritchey: "You know, a quick question, I think. Is there a provision in the Bill that if the press box is not handicap accessible then that al... that alternative arrangements would be provided for somebody that would otherwise be entitled to the press box? I did... I mean, I see what you're saying and Representative Joyce was explaining to me, as you did during your introduction, why it may not be feasible for some of these press boxes to be accessible. But it would seem that we would then say if we are going to do something which we don't usually do here which is limit accessibility for people with disabilities, that we would at least provide that in a case where the box is not accessible that an alternative area would be made available. Do you see what I'm saying?"

Schmitz: "I do see what you're saying and unfortunately, as I'm reading through the analysis right now, we drafted it through the School Code and the waiver that that school district that, I'm referring to in my district, they received was that if somebody with a disability and wants to be in the press box called them up on Monday and said,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

hey, I want to be there at Friday night's game. The school was able to order the lift to show up there for the Friday So, that was... night game. that was what recommendations that they did. I did work with the Capital Development Board on drafting this language to... to make sure that we tried to make every reasonable accommodation. The Press Association approached me on this. We talked about it in the office and the last of our discussion they said they were going to review it and they hadn't come back. So, I guess the short answer to your question, I'm not seeing any provision that says, you should make a provision or you should make for accommodations."

Fritchey: "Okay. You know, well, let me..."

Schmitz: "It may already be in the statute. I'm not... I'm not changing that."

Fritchey: "Okay. Let me... let me ask you another question. Do we have the authority being a state statute to circumvent the Americans with Disabilities Act?"

Schmitz: "We're not going there with the ADA Act. This is amending the School Code of Illinois."

Fritchey: "Understood, but the ADA Act applies in a situation like this as well."

Schmitz: "We went through this to avoid going through the ADA Act and it dealed directly with the School Code because that's where it's cited. And the interesting provision in the School Code that says, if this press box is privately owned... and what we're having to happen is... some schools were turning it over to the Jaycees or turning it over to the sports boosters and saying, you have it, now you carry

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

the liability of this facility and you're under a thousand square feet. Now, it's privately owned and you don't have to... you don't have to comply."

Fritchey: "All right."

- Schmitz: "But I don't believe we're going a wrong with the ADA Code and as I said, as we're working with the Capital Development Board they assisted with the language on this to make sure that we were..."
- Fritchey: "Well, here, and candidly, I don't know enough about this area of law, but I mean, I just... I don't understand why the ADA wouldn't apply. I am, well, you know, one of the premises that you're going to have in the Act is obviously accessibility, people with disabilities."
- Schmitz: "As I... as I'm reading in my analysis here, it says that according... the ADA does not contain provisions that specifically address the construction of press boxes."
- Fritchey: "Okay. Well, then, there you go. That answers that question."
- Schmitz: "So, that's... as my memory, we started working this back in August, so as we were going through it that's why we went through the avenue of the School Code."
- Fritchey: "Okay. I get what you're trying to do. I guess it just shows there's not a perfect solution here. You don't want the school district to be at a disadvantage, but I can't recall another instance where we... basic change statutes to limit accessibility for people with disabilities. Thank you, though."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Joyce."

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

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Joyce: "Thank you. Tim, I guess my question is, the press box you're talking about in particular is it a stand-alone that sits on top of the stands?"

Schmitz: "That's correct."

Joyce: "So, basically, someone climbs a ladder from the existing stands to get into the press box. Is that correct?"

Schmitz: "Well, they would walk up the bleachers to get to the press box."

Joyce: "Yeah. They'd walk up the bleachers... they'd get to the bleachers and then the entrance to the press box is another set of stairs or something, correct?"

Schmitz: "Correct."

Joyce: "Yeah. So..."

Schmitz: "Generally, I mean, I'm sure there's other designs."

Joyce: "And... and just help me out. I know you just talked about it in the beginning. This was built prior to the Act. Is that correct?"

Schmitz: "No. This... this was recently built and we've had problems with the fall season. As I said... stated in my intro, is that this was not being applied uniformly, so we had school districts that didn't know anything about this, built it, opened them, had no problem. And then you had school districts that are saying, well, you can't do that and the school districts are pointing to their neighboring districts saying, well, they did. And we found out in researching this that it's just not being applied uniformly and that's where we found out there's an exemption if it's

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

a thousand square feet or less and privately owned they do not need to comply with the School Code. So, that was what some of the districts, I guess, were working around."

Joyce: "So, they're just saying, here, boosters, take this over or you know, the local pizzeria, you're going to own this and..."

Schmitz: "That's correct and then..."

Joyce: "...therefore, you can circumvent this... this problem we have."

Schmitz: "And this district that I've been working with, School District 300, that was one of their options. They had the attorneys looking that. And they had the architect look to see if they could build an elevator and you can imagine what that cost would have been, an outside elevator to a press box that's used 12 times a year, you know, for the football games."

Joyce: "If you're lucky."

Schmitz: "Correct. And... or I'd throw in the soccer too, but you know what I'm saying."

Joyce: "Sure."

Schmitz: "I mean, it's at minimal use during the season."

Joyce: "Sure. Okay. Well, to the Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand the Representative's dilemma. I think it's very difficult and the nature of press boxes in sporting activities, when you're talking about high schools, it's not what you envision at a college or a pro stadium where there's a whole ramp that leads up to where coaches and where officials can gather or TV cameras or press officials. Basically, you're talking

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

about small little rectangular, sometimes not very well constructed booths, so that film cameras and coaches of opposing teams can go up to and it... and it's usually, in most cases in most high schools in the State of Illinois placed upon a set of butch bleachers that I think create a special exemption. And I think I understand the Representative's intentions and I don't think it harms any of the existing Illinois Accessibility Code by passing this exception."

- Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May. Mr. Clerk, take the record. House Bill 1335, having received 109 'yes', 2 'no' and 4 voting 'present', is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 255. What's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 255, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Nekritz. Do you wish to move this Bill to Third Reading? Call the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 255, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of the House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 39 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4039. Representative Stephens. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4039, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 32 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3666. Representative Sullivan. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3666, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 33 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3716. Representative Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3716, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Out of the rec... Mr. Clerk, please take that Bill out of the record. Returning to Third Readings. On page 51 of the Calendar... I'd like to thank the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for reminding me it's three bells for three Readings. On page 51 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1327. Representative Senger. For what reason does Representative Reboletti seek recognition?"
- Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, it seems like we've had quite a lot of first Bills today. Is this the last one?"
- Speaker Mautino: "No, I believe we have a couple more Bills remaining."
- Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you for reminding us that it is the Lady's first Bill and I'm sure she appreciates that. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1327, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Will..."

Senger: "Mr..."

Speaker Mautino: "...on her first Bill."

Senger: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for your recognition. House Bill 1327 simply allows for the licensure of a Freestanding Emergency Center which has received its Certificate of Need by June 30, it should be 2009. Basically, the law today says that the facilities would have to be fully operational. So, this has given them the chance to get their license before what is written in the code which is the end of June. So, I ask for your support and I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "And on this Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Lang: "Hello, Representative."

Senger: "Hey."

Lang: "Having a good day?"

Senger: "A long one, so far, 'til now."

Lang: "Well, that could end any time. So, tell me again what this Bill does? My understanding it's for Edward Hospital which is in your area. Is that correct?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Senger: "This Bill actually is for four hospitals that have the same stipulations that are required, which is a population in the area and the freestanding pieces written in the code."

Lang: "So, why does this law have to be changed?"

Senger: "This law has to be changed because they would not receive their licenses by the end of June, if it wasn't changed."

Lang: "But why? Why won't... why won't they be able to meet the current statutory deadline?"

Senger: "Some... some are very close to making it happen, but they haven't gone through all the inspections and the rest. So, there's things beyond their control that would most likely cause a delay beyond the June."

Lang: "Well..."

Senger: "So, we're asking not to have to resubmit."

Lang: "But you're still not telling me why. Why did they not meet the deadlines? Why are they not ready? This law's been in place for some time and tons of hospitals have been able to comply with this law, why not these hospitals?"

Senger: "These hospitals, again, have had various situations and the majority of them are due to much of the inclement weather over the winter months where, again, they're behind schedule and the why is, they would have to resubmit and they want to get their license. So, it's an insurance policy to make sure that they can get their license."

Lang: "Well... so, the... are you making changes in the law regarding the Health Facilities Planning Board?"

Senger: "No."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "But it does impact permits that are awarded by the Health Facilities Planning Board. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Lang: "And so, would it be a situation where the Health Facilities Planning Board won't even get a chance to look at these applications unless this deadline is changed so these hospitals can attempt to comply with the rules. Is that correct?"

Senger: "They have... they have the permits already in hand."

Lang: "Well, so now I'm confused. So, they've already been to the Health Facilities Planning Board... Is that 'yes'."

Senger: "Correct."

Lang: "And they already have the permits?"

Senger: "Correct."

Lang: "What is it they can't do by the date that's currently in the statute?"

Senger: "They can't be up and operational and running unless they have their license."

Lang: "And what's standing in the way of getting the license?"

Senger: "There's criteria that means they have to be operational and part of it is the inspection codes that they..."

Lang: "All right."

Senger: "...have to require."

Lang: "And so, what do these four hospitals have in common that puts them in a different place than any other hospital in the State of Illinois? Why should they be granted this special relief?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Senger: "They are asking to be granted this special relief because they have everything in place right now to operate except their license to open. And they're asking for the insurance basically to say if they couldn't get through the inspections and everything by the end of June, they'll still get their license."
- Lang: "Well, I... I have to tell you, I'm still confused. So, it seems to me we're talking in a circle. I know this is your first Bill. I know usually, you know, toy around with the freshmen, but I'm actually asking a question that I can't figure out by your Bill. I... I would rather not be voting for special legislation; I would rather not be voting for legislation that allows these hospitals to skirt the current rules, to change the current rules just to accommodate them unless there's a good reason to do so. If the reason is economic, let's hear it. If the reason is strategic, let's hear it. I don't know the reason that these four hospitals with permits in hand are not ready to get their licenses."
- Senger: "I don't know where every single hospital is at this moment. Some will actually be ready, that I do know, by June 30. So, again, this is just to give them the ability, if by chance there's an act of God that they can't open up, that they can still receive their license."
- Lang: "So, would you consider this special legislation for these hospitals?"
- Senger: "This is legislation in order to get them to open. I wouldn't consider it special."
- Lang: "All right. You would consider it special legislation?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Senger: No."

Lang: "You would not consider it special legislation?"

Senger: "Right."

Lang: "But it only impacts four hospitals."

Senger: "At this moment, correct."

Lang: "Did you make any effort to go around and find out if there's any other hospitals in the same boat other than these four?"

Senger: "I've... Yeah. I've been around to four, but I haven't been around to any others."

Lang: "So, you don't know of any other of the 117 of us have any hospitals in their districts that could use the same relief, you didn't check?"

Senger: "I don't know who else is asking for… who is to defer the permit process…"

Speaker Mautino: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Lang: "I will. So, who came to you with this legislation?"

Senger: "Edward Hospital."

Lang: "And did they ask you to include the other three hospitals?"

Senger: "Through the process of putting the Bill together, the other three hospitals were included."

Lang: "Okay. So, these are the only ones that came to you?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Lang: "And what are the names of the other three hospitals and where are they located?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Senger: "The other… there was Provena, Rush… the one in Chicago, Copley, yeah and what was… yeah. There was one in Cook County."
- Lang: "All right. And was there any opposition to this Bill in committee?"
- Senger: "No, it went through unanimously."
- Lang: "All right. I will tell you, with all due respect, and not talking to you like you're a freshman like we've been playing around here today, I have some concerns about the way the Bill is written, some concern that it only affects a few hospitals, some concerns about why we're doing this and why they need this relief. And I'm not yet convinced, based on your comments, that they need any relief at all. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Will the Sponsor vield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."
- Pritchard: "Representative, I have some serious concerns with the merits of this Bill and not being your first Bill. So, I'm trying not to be difficult just as Representative Lang didn't try to be difficult. You indicated that there are four hospitals here and that you received no opposition in committee. Were all four of these hospitals a part of your Bill at that time?"
- Senger: "As of... to answer the question, I want to make sure you have your question right. You're asking is it... were all

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

four of the hospitals part of the Bill when it was in committee?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Senger: "No, they weren't. One was added to an Amendment."

Pritchard: "And the one that was added yesterday, I believe, is the Copley Hospital addition. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That is correct."

Pritchard: "And where are they in this whole CON permitting process?"

Senger: "They have this Certificate of... Certificate of Need determined and issued and they have their permit and they have their application in hand."

Pritchard: "So, they have their application in and is it true that the staff of the CON process, the Health Facilities Planning Board has rejected their application?"

Senger: "Not from my understanding."

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

Senger: "That's not what I understand."

Pritchard: "Well, that's been what was reported in our area and I've been paying attention because there is a hospital that is affected by the Copley application. And it... when we talk about this Bill only affecting four hospitals, they obviously have effects on other hospitals that are serving this geographic area. So, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think we need to be cautious..."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

Pritchard: "...about this. We have expanded it and allowed hospitals to be included here that have not gone through the rigorous process that the Certificate of Need is

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

supposed to guarantee. And we have not proven that this is not a duplication of service and unnecessarily increasing the cost for citizens and users of the hospital in this particular area. I wish the speaker (sic-Sponsor) would have taken out this latest addition, because I think there might be merit to some of the ones that have already applied, have already started construction and... but for some delays will not be able to complete by June, but others, as in the case of Copley, have not started anything. So, I would respectfully ask that we not support all of these hospitals, ask the speaker (sic-Sponsor) to perhaps take this out of the record and remove the latest addition. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "For what reason does the Lady from Will, Representative Kosel, seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Kosel: "You were asked several questions by Representative Lang and I sat in that committee and I'm also very familiar with the… with several of these. This has nothing to do with the application for CON. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's correct. All the CONs have been issued."

Kosel: "The CONs have been issued already for these hospitals.

This has to do with the construction timeline and delays that could occur in the construction timeline and also delays that could occur with the inspection process that the state does to issue the license. And because of a lack of staffing and because of the workload that is upon these

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

people, these timelines could be extended and it's a very close proximity. They don't want to lose the work they've done; they don't want to build a hospital and then have a technicality... or emergency room rather... excuse me... and then have a technicality that they can't open it. Is that correct?"

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

Kosel: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I want to just make sure I clear up an issue related to this because, although this is your first Bill, there is some concern and I think some of the concern surrounds the Amendment that was added. Now, it's unfortunate that Representative Chapa LaVia is not present on the House Floor because I think what you... what you attempted to do with your Amendment was to help someone else on the floor on the other side of the aisle, in fact, that had a similar situation that... as you."

Senger: "This was basically looking at not just this one, but how this compared to fit in with everything else. And that is true, Linda came up to me and said, we would like to add this, too, were in the same position the other hospitals are."

Eddy: "So, it's not unlike what happens often here when a particular Bill comes along that addresses an issue for whether it's... whether... whether it has to do with a bond issue or whatever type of local issue. If somebody else

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

has a Bill that or a similar situation, they'll come and request that the Sponsor add their Bill so that we can consolidate those concerns into one Bill. We don't have... instead of 4 or 5 thousand Bills, we don't have 10 thousand Bills. So, you're trying to help her?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, I appreciate that and I think that the Body should reward that. The only thing... aside from that, the only thing about this legislation that concerns me and I want to go back to the date you filed this legislation just so you know. You know when this was filed?"

Senger: "This was filed three..."

Eddy: "Well, let me tell you when it was filed because I would just be careful in the future. You filed a piece of legislation on Friday the 13th."

Senger: "Okay."

Eddy: "You filed this on the Friday, February 13. Now, everything you hear about Friday the 13th, don't you think that was a little bit... well, I don't know how to describe it, but you took a risk in filing this legislation on Friday the 13th."

Senger: "That's something I'll take into consideration when I work with Senator Hultgren in the Senate."

Eddy: "Yeah. Because around here you can use all the luck that you can get, if I were you when I walked out of here, I'd watch for black cats and ladders just to make sure you don't push the envelope here. But I think what you've done overall is a good piece of legislation and I, again, wish that... I wish Representative Chapa LaVia was here to explain

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

her addition, but I think you have done what we often do here and that's help with colleague's issues across the aisle. Thank you."

Senger: "Thanks."

- Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. House Bill 1327, having received 104 'yes', 11 'no' and 0 voting 'present', is declared passed. Representative, congratulations on your first Bill. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 3987?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3987 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "At the request of the Sponsor, would you return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 666?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 666 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "You can take that Bill out of the record, please. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 2409?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2409 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Would you move that... at the request of the Sponsor, would you read that Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2409, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 1322?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1322 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "At the request of the Sponsor, would you return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 51 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2270. Representative McGuire. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2270, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McGuire."

- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me. I have House Bill 2270 and House Bill 2270 appropriates \$750 thousand from the General Revenue Fund to the Department of Human Services for a grant to the Joliet Region Easter Seals for programs and for expansion and rehabilitation of facilities. It's a very short Bill and succinct and at the... is an approp Bill. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote. And I'll try to answer any questions, if you have any. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no one... Excuse me. The Gentleman from... from Bond, Representative Stephens, is seeking recognition."

Stephens: "The Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Stephens: "Representative, is this in addition to what the Governor proposed spending already today?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

McGuire: "I'm not sure of that, whether it's in addition or in the Governor's proposal. Is that what you're asking?"

Stephens: "Was it in his proposal?"

McGuire: "I don't know that it's in the Governor's proposal."

Stephens: "Okay. Well, regrettably, Representative, I would suggest that as we've just heard the Governor's proposed budget, which is calling for the biggest tax increase in the history of the state, that before we add almost another million dollars to that spending column that maybe we ought to get a handle on what he's proposed first. That..."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no one is seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' And all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gordon, Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 75 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', this Bill is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 866?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 866 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 866, a Bill for an Act concerning labor. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. And are we ready for the last Bill of the day? Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 3962. Representative Mell."

28th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3962, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mell on your first Bill as the last Bill."
- Mell: "Okay. House Bill 3962 amends the Criminal Code by adding to the offenses that when committed makes any building used in that commission a public nuisance. The new offenses will be aggravated child pornography, aggravated criminal housing management, dog fighting, the illegal sale or consumption of alcohol by those under the age of 21."
- Speaker Mautino: "And on this first Bill and last Bill, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."
- Reboletti: "Representative, this is adding to the maintaining a public nuisance?"
- Mell: "Correct."
- Reboletti: "What would a public nuisance be considered be...
 besides the offenses you're going to add, what else would
 be there?"
- Mell: "There are many other offenses that are in the Public Nuisance Act."
- Reboletti: "If Mr. Curtis wants to present the Bill, maybe he might want to... he may want to talk in the microphone. I mean, Representative Sacia talked earlier today for Connelly, so... But what... what type of public nuisances are we looking at?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

- Mell: "Dog fighting, aggravated criminal housing management, aggravated child pornography and sale or consumption of alcohol of those under the age of 21."
- Reboletti: "What is the penalty for aggravated criminal housing management? I don't think I've ever heard of that one before."
- Mell: "Oh, yeah, that's... that's when you knowingly ignore violations in Code and structure problems."
- Reboletti: "Is that a criminal offense? You can be arrested for that?"

Mell: "It's a Class I misdemeanor."

Reboletti: "It's a Class I misdemeanor?"

Mell: "Class A misdemeanor."

Reboletti: "It's a Class A. Do you know what the sentencing guidelines are on a Class A misdemeanor? What did Jay say it was?"

Mell: "Just under one year, I... just under one year."

Reboletti: "Just under a year? Would that be in the Department of Corrections or that'd be in the county jail?"

Mell: "That'd be in the county jail."

Reboletti: "What's the maximum fine on a Class A misdemeanor?"

Mell: "I believe it's a thousand dollars. It's 250 now."

Reboletti: "Twenty-five hundred dollars. That's aggravated housing management that's a Class A misdemeanor?"

Mell: "Correct. If knowingly, yes."

Reboletti: "Is that... is that... Can you get an I-bond for that?"

Mell: "I... I suppose."

Reboletti: "Have you ever heard of anybody being arrested for aggravated criminal housing management?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mell: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Reboletti: "Have you ever seen or heard of anybody getting arrested for that?"

Mell: "No."

Reboletti: "You haven't? But it was that... that you thought it was important to add that into this... this operation here? You know, the Criminal Code's pretty loaded up with... with legislation and I know I do my part to add to it. But do you think this is really necessary to become the law of Illinois by adding this in?"

Mell: "Yes, I do."

Reboletti: "And how will this make Illinois a safer place?"

Mell: "Well, I... you know, I like it when they came to me with this because people in my neighborhood care about what buildings are used for. And if someone is knowingly operating a building that is, you know, using... like for criminal purposes, people in my district want to know about it and they want action taken."

Reboletti: "Well, I do appreciate your knowledge of criminal law. I don't know..."

Mell: "Yeah."

Reboletti: "...if you're a criminal lawyer by trade or not."

Mell: "No."

Reboletti: "Are you a full-time Legislator?"

Mell: "I am."

Reboletti: "You are. That seems to be a very common occupation down here. Can you please tell your staff member he does a tremendous job for you..."

Mell: "Thank you."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Reboletti: "...in our Criminal Law Committee and I'll reserve my vote on this one."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

Mell: "Yes."

Lang: "Hello, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "She will."

Lang: "So, how come you don't have a difficult Bill like Representative McAsey did on her first Bill where she changed just a number on a statute?"

Mell: "Well, this... you know, this is something that was brought to me and I like it and I think it's good for my community and I'm... you know, I'm happy to carry it."

Lang: "So, I note in the Bill that, aside from what you added, you deleted a couple of Section numbers."

Mell: "Right."

Lang: "What did you delete?"

Mell: "We deleted abortions and I think it was bootlegging. It was... it was a... juice racketeering."

Lang: "What kind of racketeering?"

Mell: "Juice."

Lang: "Jews?"

Mell: "Juice."

Lang: "Oh, juice. I... I thought you were saying something about my people. Juice, that's what you said. Oh, wow. I was... I was wondering what kind of Bill this was. Are you... you're sure it was juice?"

Mell: "I'm positive. It was juice."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Lang: "What kind of juice, orange?"

Mell: "I believe it was grape juice."

Lang: "Grape juice."

Mell: "Yeah."

Lang: "Okay. I'll do the jokes here, Representative."

Mell: "Okay, sorry."

Lang: "That's okay. So, all right. So, this is not about religious preferences in your district, correct?"

Mell: "Absolutely not. No..."

Lang: "So, don't..."

Mell: "...everyone's accepted in my district."

Lang: "All religions."

Mell: "Absolutely."

Lang: "All ethnic groups. All..."

Mell: "Absolutely."

Lang: "...sorts of things."

Mell: "A lot of things."

Lang: "A lot of things in your district. Okay. That's kind of what I thought. So, you've got something on here about the Humane Care for Animals Act. Is that correct?"

Mell: "Correct."

Lang: "Yeah. So, does this check with the Humane Society? Are they okay on this?"

Mell: "Yeah. There's no opponents of this Bill right now that I know of."

Lang: "So... so, there's nothing about puppy mills in here?"

Mell: "No."

Lang: "So, I have gotten... I don't know about you... but I've gotten about 750 thousand e-mails about puppy mills."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mell: "Right, right."

Lang: "On both sides."

Mell: "Right."

Lang: "But that would have nothing to do with this?"

Mell: "No. This is knowingly operating a dog fighting operation."

Lang: "A dog fighting operation?"

Mell: "Right."

Lang: "Is this where dogs fight with each other or people fight with dogs?"

Mell: "Fighting with each other or it could be both."

Lang: "You had to check that with staff?"

Mell: "I did have to check, yes."

Lang: "Yeah, okay. So, you enjoying this process so far, Representative?"

Mell: "I... you know, I am."

Lang: "Yeah."

Mell: "I'm really happy to be here."

Lang: "Okay. And so, what are the penalties that this Bill brings about? Does it change any penalties?"

Mell: "It... it doesn't change any penalties, no. It just adds to the... the Code."

Lang: "Now, I'm interested in the second part of this that deals with... for a subsecond or subsequent offense the Class A misdemeanor becomes Class IV felony. What is the public policy reason for that particular upgrading of a penalty?"

Mell: "Well, I think it's to deter any... any kind of activity like this from, you know, continuingly... to happen."

Lang: "And so, you think that a person that could..."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Lang: "I will. You think a person that wouldn't mind going to jail for a year for raising dogs to do this would mind if they went for three years?"

Mell: "I think it just sets a good tone that if... you know, if you keep doing this kind of activity, you're going to... the penalties are going to get a little more difficult."

Lang: "Yeah. Well, I agree with you that we need to do something about this."

Mell: "Thank you."

Lang: "Just as long as it's not about my people..."

Mell: "Thank you."

Lang: "...I appreciate it. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Riley."

Riley: "Speaker (sic-Sponsor) yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Riley: "Representative, I... I just want to let you know I'm going to give you a break because I guess inquiring minds think a lot. Lou Lang stole my thunder on the... the inquiry about the dog fighting, but let me just ask you a question. I see you have many proponents here on this Bill. Why isn't PETA a proponent of this Bill? Did you see... did you seek... did you seek PETA's guidance on this Bill?"

Mell: "No, I haven't seeked their guidance, but I... I think they're an organization that keeps up with, you know, legislation and I think they would have said something, I think..."

Riley: "Especially, you know, humane treatment of animals, right?"

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Mell: "Right."

Riley: "I mean, I think that... I think that there's some severe issues the reason why you don't have PETA as part of this Bill. And I just want to tell you that I probably will be voting 'no' for it."

Mell: "Voting..."

Riley: "I probably will be voting 'no' for it because PETA's not a proponent of this Bill."

Mell: "Okay. I hope you change your mind."

Speaker Mautino: "For a final question, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "No question. I was going to move the previous question."

Speaker Mautino: "And the previous question has been put. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 3962 is declared passed. Congratulations, Representative Mell. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook seek recognition, Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Mr. Speaker, I was running too many buttons here. I didn't get a chance to push my own. On the last Bill, I'd like to be recorded in the Journal as a 'yes' vote. Sorry, Deb."

Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will so requet... will so reflect your intentions. Another announcement, Representative Lyons."

28th Legislative Day

- Lyons: "I have another announcement, not that anybody's going to be listening to me, but I announced the same thing last week. The corned beef sandwiches... the corned beef sandwiches, everybody hear me, they'll be here next Tuesday. Next Tuesday, corned beef sandwiches."
- Speaker Mautino: "For what reason does the Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos seek recognition?"
- Hamos: "Thank you. On that last vote, I cannot blame it on my switch. Representative Mike Tryon was distracting me. And therefore..."
- Speaker Mautino: "And you know, he does that with a lot of us."
- Hamos: "...and therefore, I wish to be recorded 'aye', please."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will so reflect. What... For what reason does the Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock seek recognition?"
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to announce that the COWL dinner will still be tonight at 7:00, but the creative meeting for Capitol Capers has been canceled. Thanks."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Golar, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to announce to all of the Black Caucus members that our meeting this evening will be canceled."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 2664?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2664 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take this Bill back to Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. What is the status of House Bill 1322? That Bill is..."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill..."

Speaker Mautino: "Go ahead."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1322 is on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. Keep that Bill on Second Reading.

For what reason does the Gentleman from Jackson,

Representative Bost rise?"

Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got several Members asking about committees. Is that announcement going to be made? Is there any committee cancelations or anything?"

Speaker Mautino: "We'll get to that in just a moment, Sir.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber, we're about to do a...

at the request of a Member, a moment of silence. So, I

would ask that all Members and staff remove themselves from

the back of the chamber and close the doors, Mr. Doorman.

And on this, I would... I would like to recognize

Representative Cole for a moment of silence."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As word of the death of U.S. Army Specialist Robert Weinger spread through Round Lake Beach today his family and friends remembered him with glowing terms such as 'true friend', 'loyal family member'. Sergeant Weinger who was posthumously named a sergeant today was a lifelong resident of Round Lake Beach and a 2002 graduate from Round Lake High School who enlisted in the Army National Guard in January 2006. He was 24 years old. It was Robert's second overseas deployment after

28th Legislative Day

- having served in Iraq from September 2006 through October 2007. Proceeding a formal Resolution honoring him, I would just ask for a moment of silence."
- Speaker Mautino: "On the same order, I would like to now go to Representative Rita."
- Rita: "The Sergeant Christopher Abeyta of Midlothian was also with the gentleman that she just spoke with at... and he was killed in action. He was 23 years old and this was his second deployment. He was first in Iraq and then later went to Afghanistan. The Sergeant was with the gentleman there also."
- Speaker Mautino: "Would ask a moment of silence. Clerk, committee announcements."
- "Three committees have been canceled; they were Clerk Bolin: scheduled to meet upon adjournment. The Homeland Security Committee has been canceled. The Transportation, Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee has been canceled. And the Agriculture & Conservation Committee has been canceled. The following committees will meet adjournment: Higher Education will meet in Room C-1, Mass meet 114, Transit will in Room State Government Administration will meet in Room 118, and Tollway Oversight will meet in Room 122B."
- Speaker Mautino: "For what reason does the Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos, rise?"
- Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker. The Committee on Mass Transit will be canceled."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

28th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 191, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 192, offered by Representative McAuliffe. And House Joint Resolution 15, offered by Representative Arroyo. Correction. House Joint Resolution 15, offered by Representative Arroyo."
- Speaker Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Majority Leader Currie now moves adoption... Representative Currie now moves do pass of the... passage of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by 'aye'; opposed same sign. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie now moves the House stand adjourned until Thursday, March 19 at the hour of 10 a.m. All in favor signify by 'aye'; opposed same sign. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned... 'til the hour of 10 a.m., yes. The House stands adjourned 'til the hour of 10:00 tomorrow morning."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 18, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Resolution is 81, House Resolution 88, House Resolution 99, 100, House 122, Resolution Resolution Resolution 126, House Resolution 140, House Resolution 156, House Resolution 175, House Resolution 176, HJR20; 'recommends be adopted as amended' is House Resolution 177. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Committee on Tollway Oversight, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 18, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Resolution 123 and House Joint Resolution 30. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 189, offered by Representative Stephens; House Resolution 190, offered by Representative Reis; House Joint Resolution 37, offered by Representative Lyons and then Senate Joint 32, offered by Resolution Representative Golar. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 325, offered by Representative Miller, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4341, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4342, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4343, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4344, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4345, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4346, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4347, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4348, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4349, offered by Representative

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4350, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4351, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4352, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4353, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4354, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4355, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4356, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4357, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4358, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4359, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4360, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4361, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4362, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4363, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4364, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4365, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations.

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

House Bill 4366, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4367, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4368, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4369, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4370, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4371, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4372, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4373, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4374, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4375, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4376, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4377, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4378, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4379, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4380, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4381, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4382, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4383, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4384, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4385, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4386, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4387, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4388, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4389, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4390, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4391, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4392, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4393, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4394, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4395, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4396, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4397, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4398, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4399,

28th Legislative Day

3/18/2009

offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4400, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4401, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4402, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4403, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4404, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4405, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4406, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4407, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4408, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4409, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4410, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. And House Bill 4411, offered by Representative Rose, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations and reappropriations. Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 2016, a Bill for an Act concerning the Olympic Games. Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."