58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. The House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at their desks. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are truly blessed today. We have ... we'll have two invocations being made, so if the Holy Spirit will really come upon us... We'll be led in prayer by Mother Regina Pashe (sic-Pacis), who is the ... Pacis ... Mother Regina Pacis, who is a Provincial Superior of the Sisters of St. Francis of the Martyr St. George with St. Francis Convent in Alton, Illinois. Mother Pacis is the guest of... of Representative Beiser. Father invocation with the Jack Clair will also give us an Misericordia Heart of Mercy. He's in Chicago and will lead us in a prayer after Sister is finished. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and guests are asked to also rise with us and join us for the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance. Sister Regina Pacis."

Sister Pacis: "Let us quiet ourselves and bring our minds and hearts into the presence of God. Heavenly Father, You are the source of all life, truth, and goodness. As we come before You today, we ask that Your love be present, that Your wisdom be known, and that Your goodness be instilled in the hearts of each person here. Transform this moment into an hour of vision, action, and fidelity to the values of Your heart. We pray that You will draw our attention today to those who are most in need: the vulnerable, the unborn, the sick, the poor, the neglected, and those without jobs. Inspire us to use the blessings we receive

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

from Your hand to lighten the burdens of others and help them to live a prosperous and holy life. May Your truth and charity be the guiding forces behind each decision, and may the fruit of the work done here today, return to Your glory, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "Father Clair."

"Lord, our God, as we come together, we are all Father Clair: people of great passion. We care deeply about many things. Help us in our passion to recognize that it is not only about us, but about those whom we serve. Help us always to recognize that there are so many within our environment that need our help, that need our encouragement, that need our strength. We thank You this day for all who have been elected in the State of Illinois. We ask that You continue to bless their work as they serve Your people. Help them to continue to be not only people of passion, but of great compassion, to recognize in their hearts the need to serve those most vulnerable in our society. We thank You this day for all the blessings we have as a state, as a nation, as a people. We ask Your blessing on our families and our friends, and we thank You for all that will be good this day. We lift up to You those who are suffering, those who are filled with concern or worry, and we pray especially for those who cannot care for themselves. And we ask Your blessing on all who are gathered here this day, in Your name we pray, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dennis Reboletti, would you lead us in the Pledge?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Reboletti et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have no excused Democrats to report today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Michael Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no Republicans absent today. All here and ready... ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Lyons: "We are at full strength today, Ladies and Gentlemen. Take the Roll, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 118 Members, all 118 Members are here, and we're here... there's a quorum present to do the people's work. Committee Reports, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Rules Report. Representative Currie, Chairper... Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2090; and approval of Motions to Concur for House Bill 164, Senate Amendment #1; House Bill 404, Senate Amendment #1; and House Bill 567, Senate Amendment #1. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 423, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 424, offered by Representative Brauer. House Resolution 425, offered by Representative Dunkin. House

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Resolution 428, offered by Representative Bellock, and House Resolution 431, offered by Representative Rose. These Resolutions are referred to Rules Committee."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to start on Third Readings, where we left off yesterday on page 5. So, we'll be starting in the middle of page 5, under Senate Bills-Third Readings, and the first Bill that we'll be calling will be Senate Bill 1513, Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1512. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1512, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from White, Representative Brandon Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1512 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. This allows the Secretary of State's Office to issue confidential plates and ID cards to assist undercover law enforcement, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Question, Mr. Reis?"

Reis: "Well, yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Yeah. Representative Phelps is ready for your question."

Reis: "Is that really Representative Phelps or is he under cover?"

Speaker Lyons: "That's... that's him. That's the real thing."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Reis: "Okay. We wanted to make sure you were really presenting your Bill."

Phelps: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1512 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, you have Senate Bill 1544. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1544, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Champaign, Representative Naomi Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the... this Bill would create the Hunger Relief Fund. And the Hunger Relief Fund is created as a special fund in the State Treasury, and from appropriations to the department of the fund, the department shall make grants to members of the Illinois Food Bank Association for the purpose of making capital improvements, purchasing food, or acquiring other asse... assets. And this does have a... a revenue stream, a hunger relief checkoff for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 2009. The department shall print, on a standard individual income tax form, a

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

provision for indicating a tax checkoff. I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1544 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 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jack Franks, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1555. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1555, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1555 deals with a modification of procedures for governing special service areas, hearings, and objection petitions. It... we're trying to make this more user-friendly so there won't be as many objections as we've seen. Recently, in my community of Johhsburg, there's... they've been mired in litigation for 2 years on a special service area for a... a wastewater treatment plant. We believe by shifting the burden of proof would be the most economical way to go forward. I know there'll be more work done in the Senate. I've talked to the City of Chicago who had looked for some Amendments. I'd like to move it over there, so we can continue to work on it. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this will come back, then, to the House?"

Franks: "Yes, because it... we're going to try to get it amended in the Senate again. They're working on some language, but I wanted to keep it moving so we could keep going on this. They haven't got it done yet, and we can bring it back on concurrence."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this... why wasn't it just shelled?"

Franks: "I don't know, because I... I don't like to run shell Bills, quite frankly, and if it's not going to pass, then it won't pass ultimately, because they'll hold it in the Senate. But I just... I just think it's important to keep the process going on this."

Eddy: "Well, I understand, but I'm trying to… and… and maybe other Members can… can help. Is it even possible for the Senate to change this and send it back at this point?"

Franks: "Sure, on a concurrence."

Eddy: "I... Representative, our staff is fairly well convinced that that... that's not possible as far as process is concerned at this point. Let me... let me ask you, we could come back to this. Would you just take it out of the record for a minute. We'll confer with staff to make sure that that's possible. That it can come back and... and, obviously, if it is, your word is good. But we just want to make sure process wise, we're not..."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Franks: "Sure."

Eddy: "...not in a situation."

Franks: "No problem."

Eddy: "Would you mind doing that?"

Franks: "No problem."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record on the request of Representative Franks. Representative Hernandez, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1559. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1559, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicle identification. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Lisa Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1559 amends the Illinois Municipal Code and the School Code by requiring vehicles purchased or leased to use by... to be used by municipalities or for driver's education classes offered by school districts, to be American made. I ask for a favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I... I need to ask a few questions about this. I... I think this has a potential to be somewhat confusing because, for example, there are many vehicles that as far as the production is concerned, may have

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

component parts or final... final manufacturing phase in Canada... Mr. Speaker, if... Mr. Speaker, could we get..."

Speaker Lyons: "A little loud in here, Representative?"

Eddy: "Just getting a little bit."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, as usually is the case in the morning, we... the noise level in here is awfully loud. It's hard to have a discussion. Representative Eddy is asking Representative Hernandez questions. Could we bring the noise level down, please. Could we, please, bring the noise level down. Thank you. Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, my concern is that in many cases, the car process, the manufacturing process, includes certain component parts that may... may be done in Canada or... I... the other day, actually, I... we were test driving... my wife and I were test driving a car, and it was a Lincoln SUV type vehicle, and the final manufacturing of that vehicle took place in Canada. But it... But it's... for everyone... I... I mean most of the vehicle was made and manufactured in the United States. Similarly, down in my area, just across the river in Indiana, there's a Toyota plant, and that Toyota plant produces vehicles that are 100 percent produced and manufactured in the United States. So, a school district, a municipality would be purchasing Toyotas, and for all the public, their perception or understanding of this, they think we're... we're buying foreign vehicles. Where we couldn't purchase a Crown Victoria, for example, for the State Police vehicle fleet because it's finished in Canada. Don't... don't you find that to be a bit problematic?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hernandez: "Representative, there is a list that I have requested of what would be considered under this... this Bill, American made, and I guess it's defining what American made would mean. It... based on this language, it's... it means the final destination where the assembly takes place. So, the... the whole point, of course, is... is obvious, is to try to keep our business within the country, and in times as we are in right now, this would be a way to try to contribute to our economic situation."

Eddy: "Well, I understand the intent. I... I just... I'm very, very concerned with the unintended consequence here, because if you read the Bill, there will be situations where 90 percent of a vehicle is made in America, supporting American jobs, and the final destination if the VIN number happens to begin with a 1, a 4, or... or 5, then we can't purchase it for... even schools can't purchase it for... for use. So, the problem is, the unintended consequences, those jobs aren't being supported when a great deal of the manufacturing process and labor has taken place in the United States, and maybe just the finishing is done in another country. I... I just think your... your effort here, while well-intentioned, can cause severe, unintended consequences, even to those who you're trying to protect."

Hernandez: "And, Representative, I do want you to know that there has been a continued conversation to address those concerns regarding parts made here in the United States, but we're looking to do that in a separate Bill, and not tie it into this... this Bill."

Eddy: "Well..."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hernandez: "But that conversation is... we... we're working on it, and I..."

Eddy: "Well, I... I would suggest that this is too important of an issue for us not to have the final finished product at the time we vote on the Bill. And it... we would be well served to vote against this particular Bill, and wait for the final version that takes care of those concerns, rather than to vote this out, and possibly, have those unintended consequences begin to occur, and... and later try to fix something. Why don't we just do it right the first time, take the time necessary, take the Bill out of the record, work on it if you need to, even over the summer, to make sure we get this right. We cannot afford the possibility of losing more jobs in this state or nation, and this Bill could do that."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Repre... Representative, you by your own admission says... say that there may be a problem, is that correct, with the fact that, you know, for instance, if we're... we're making sure that we're purchasing what... what is considered American made cars, but you say it must be... the numbers that are in the actual language now, say that the car must be assembled in the United States. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "I... I'm sorry, Representative."

Bost: "I... I know. Mr. Speaker, can we get some..."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Bost: "...quiet, and kind of get... if we could get people to move out of the way so I can speak with the..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please, keep the noise level down. I know it's early in the morning. We tend to be a little loud, but it's hard to have the discussion. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Re... And, Mr. Speaker, if the people will please pay attention to this. The Lady is asking for us to force the purchase of American made, but we're not really clear on what this American made is. It... the numbers that... the description that is in this Bill says that we must purchase vehicles assembled in the United States. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct. Yes."

Bost: "Okay. The problem I have is, for years I drove a Chevy pickup truck. Now, Chevy is, you know, Chevrolet, apple pie, all of that. And now, all of a sudden... but see, that pickup truck was actually assembled in Canada. Now, by your own admission, the problem that we're facing, and you might have to have a trailer Bill... now... now, there's no guarantee the trailer Bill will pass if this passes. Many of those parts that were used in that assembly in Canada were made in our own districts. For instance, Penn Aluminum, in my own hometown, manufactures many Ford parts, and they are stamped, and used and made right there by my own local people. They may be sent to another country, and then added to Ford, Chevrolet, all of those things that are claiming to be American made, but yet, under your Bill, the problem that the way the language reads says that it must be assembled in the United States. It doesn't, also,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

require anything at all, that the parts that are assembled in the United States, must be made in the United States. So, what you're trying to do, though good intentioned, is... is that you're trying to make sure that our American people continue to work, and the State of Illinois continues to work, you could actually be putting people out of work, and that is a problem and concern that I have. And you admitted to that just a while ago. And if we have to wait on a secondary Bill, then... then what we're looking at is... is... you know how this place works, maybe this Bill will pass and the other one won't. Now, how tragic is that to the people, and what's your answer to that?"

Hernandez: "Well, Representative, I... I hope that I have demonstrated in the past that when I do try to work on a Bill, and work with... with my colleagues on the other side, I... my..."

Bost: "And... and I understand that, but you're still moving forward with the Bill, and if you move forward with the Bill without these large things being corrected on the Bill, you could inadvertently put people out of work in a state where we're already losing so many jobs. It's a great political pop, and I don't think that's your intent, but... but just in the title alone, buy American, you're going to go out and you're going to say, yes, I want to vote for this. But the reality is that you're actually hurting American jobs by putting this in place by... by the fact that many of these vehicles that are assembled, maybe in another place, the parts are created right here in Illinois. Specifically, as I just quoted, my own hometown,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

and... and because of that, I ask you to pull this Bill from the record or... and, if you can't do that... Mr. Speaker, I do ask for a verification on this Bill, and... and I would ask that the... the Body be very aware of what we're doing here, and the concerns. The Sponsor's a wonderful Sponsor. She's very good intentioned. She has wonderful intentions, but... but I don't think by just making... okay, all numbers that begin with, and... and those are ones that are actually assembled in the United States. Are you understanding the larger process? So, Ladies and Gentlemen, please, I would encourage if the Sponsor will not take this out of the record, vote 'no'. Let's stop this. We can come back and work on this another time. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Bost, and your request for verification is so noted. Representative Suzie Bassi."

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

Bassi: "Representative, I do appreciate very much the work that you have done on this, but there are still some really serious problems with the Bill, above and beyond the fact that it is a mandate on school districts. For example, my colleague next to me has a Buick Enclave. It was put together in Mexico. You could buy a BMW, but not a Chrysler and... on many of these things. We've got Chrysler plants and GM plants that are closing down. They are already admitting that they will be importing parts from overseas, from China and India. So, when you say buy American, it is really problematic. You are putting

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

municipalities and school districts in the position where they need to... to really, perhaps, not be able to get the best deal from dealerships within their own communities to keep their tax dollars within their own communities. really problematic when you're looking at a situation where... where Illinois has been bleeding jobs for the last several years, to do this in this climate, at this point in time, is really, really serious. The... and, in fact, the Toyota Prius, which is one of the... the most energy efficient cars on the road, is not on your list of favorite cars that people could buy. So, your excluding a factor that would be energy efficient for folks to be able to purchase... for school districts and/or municipalities. find this really problematic, and I would a... I would echo my colleagues in asking you to pull the Bill, and continue to work on it until the... the problems that have been posed have been cleared up. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Elaine Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a quick question for the Sponsor. Do other states have this, Representative?"

Hernandez: "Pardon me?"

Nekritz: "Are there other states that... that have this requirement?"

Hernandez: "Not... not that I'm aware of. Wait, ask the question again, Representative."

Nekritz: "Do other... do... do other states have this mandate of municipalities and school districts?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hernandez: "Representative, I'm... I believe there is, but I don't... I can get that back to you on... on which one... which states."

Nekritz: "That's all right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, turn the timer off. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Black: "This Bill clearly restricts the use of Home Rule. This tells any municipality in the State of Illinois that has Home Rule, including the City of Chicago, what they will spend their money on, and how they will spend it. That is, in my opinion, an extreme limitation upon the Home Rule statute, and I would ask that the Chair illuminate whether or not this takes 71 votes, because to me, there's no doubt. There's no… no confusion. This absolutely takes away the power of Home Rule cities to run their own affairs. I believe it would take 71 votes."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, and if you will give me a minute or two, we will get a ruling..."

Black: "I... I would be..."

Speaker Lyons: "...on that from the parliamentarian."

Black: "...more than happy to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "We will get back to you. Do you want to address the Bill prior to that... Mr. Black, did you have any... do you have questions of the Sponsor?"

Black: "I... I would, Mr. Speaker, but... Look, I... I know that the noise level in this chamber means that everybody's already made up their mind how they're going to vote. It doesn't

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

make any difference what we say, or how we say it, but you know, at my age, I'm tired of talking over this din. Couldn't we have the same kind of courtesy that we extend to Speaker Madigan when you have an important Bill before this? I'm not going to talk over this din. People's minds are already made up. Why do I have to strain my vocal cords? You have the gavel. Why don't you just tell people to sit down, and utilize a little common courtesy on a Bill that, I think, has ramifications far beyond what anybody has thought, up to this point."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, if... you're aware, three or four times I've tried to bring order to the chamber. It's early in the morning, we tend to be very loud. I'll ask again. You I already did it, but... Ladies and Gentlemen, we must bring the noise level down, please. Let's just... Ladies and Gentlemen, please."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. This Bill looks very good on paper. I'm no going to embarrass you. I've been through the parking lots the last three days. I had my license plate number and I went through all the parking lots. I know every car that every Member in this Body drives. I have your license plate number, and the make of your car. I'm not about to release it. I'm not about to talk about it, but 63 of you do not drive an American made car. Sixty-three of you in this chamber. And if you know how to read a VIN number, the vehicle identification number on your car, if you know how to read it, the first number in your VIN will tell you where the car was assembled. And look at this Bill. It says that a

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

municipality must buy a car, its VIN number begins with a 1, or a 4, or a 5. Representative, what VIN number is the first number in the biggest selling police car in the United State? What does it begin with?"

- Hernandez: "I... I don't know. I mean, maybe you can tell me, Representative."
- Black: "I will tell you, and... and if you're sponsoring this Bill, and you really believe in this Bill, then you should know this. The Ford Crown Victoria and the Chevrolet Impala, the two most popular municipally-owned cars in the country. The two most popularly owned cars in the country for driver education do not qualify under this Bill because the VIN #2 means it was assembled in Canada. You tell me, if you can't get the Ford Crown Vic, or the Chevrolet Impala that has a police interceptor engine, what police car do you want them to buy? A Toyota? A Toyota has the right VIN number."
- Hernandez: "Well, Representative, I do have a list of three pages long that you can..."
- Black: "I have a book of 250 pages long. I'll let you read it, it's called <u>Made in the USA</u>. What... what police car are they going to buy? The Ford Crown Vic and the Chevrolet Impala doesn't qualify, under your Bill."
- Hernandez: "Well, I... I believe there is a choice here. Whether what I would want to buy, I don't think matters."
- Black: "No, no, no, no, no. Representative, let's be really honest. You're an honest person."
- Hernandez: "Thank you. I try to be."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Black: "Your Bill clearly says, if the VIN number begins with a 2, you can't buy it. It's not what's your choice, or what you want. You've just taken the Crown Vic and the Chevrolet Impala off the table 'cause they're assembled in Canada. So, what police car is the City of Chicago going to buy?"
- Hernandez: "Well, I would think that during our day... our times that we live in, that we're looking at economical vehicles, perhaps, green veh... vehicles. There is a list here that can be selected from."
- Black: "Well, I don't know what your list says, but cities will be free to buy a Toyota. You know, your... your Bill would be better, Representative, if you really wanted to help the union worker, and I even have questions whether we can do that, the UAW's going to own 40 percent of General Motors by the end of the week. They'll be bankrupt. Chrysler's already bankrupt. You're asking municipalities and school districts to buy cars because the Federal Government has mandated they shed thousands of dealerships. They may not even be able to buy parts for some of the cars that they have, or that we're going to force them to buy. The... but the real issue here, beyond the confusion on the VIN number, why are we mandating what cities and school districts..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, your time has expired. If you can conclude your remarks, we'd appreciate it."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, you didn't count the time against me on my inquiry of the Chair, did you?"

Speaker Lyons: "I did not."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Black: "All right. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, who is the closest to the voter? If a city buys 50 Volkswagens, or 100 Tatas made in New Delhi, or 1000 Red Star Motor cars that'll be for sale in the states in a year, made in China. Those city officials will pay for The voters will know that. They'll see that car every day. Why are we mandating the State of Illinois? don't mandate this for State of Illinois cars. mandate this for IDOT trucks. We don't mandate this for State Police cars. Don't you see a little bit of hypocrisy Let's work on our... We're one of the largest purchasers of vehicles of all the governments combined. Let's make sure that we do it. Wouldn't hurt that if we But now you're telling made Legislators do it, too. cities... in my district, you're telling cities of 750 people what kind of car they're going to buy for a police car, and you've taken the Ford Crown Vic and the Chevy Impala off the list. And you're telling schools... When I was a young lad, dealers gave cars to schools for driver ed. don't do that anymore. Now you're taking the two most popular cars, the Impala and the Crown Vic, off of their list. Why are we imposing, by State Law, a rule on local units of government? Let them make the decision. If they make the wrong decision, that's why you run for city council. That's why you run for the school board. That's why you run for the county board. Let them make the decision, and if they make the wrong decision that's unpopular with the voters, if they buy a Chinese Red Star car, you don't think they're going to pay for that at the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

polls? But we don't have the rules on our own purchasing requirements. We should start with the State of Illinois first, Legislator cars second; then if you want to do this, I might even support it, but this Bill has some serious problems. Let's start with our own house. let those people that are elected by the local taxpayers figure out what they want to do. Do you think the chairman of the... of the Cook County Board isn't going to pay a price for his highest sales tax in the country. The voters remember that. He'll pay the price. He did that, and his board did that. We don't need to mandate this on local units of government. They are capable of making up their own decision, taking the responsibility for what they do, and they will answer to the local voters. I'd vote for this, but I'm not going to be a hypocrite and stand up here and say, I want you to do something, but the state doesn't do it, and Legislators don't do it. That's just wrong, and this Bill is not very well drafted. The most popular car, and one that I'm looking at to buy, a Ford product, the only one that isn't bankrupt, would not qualify under this It... this Bill needs additional work. The concept Bill. needs additional work. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Your inquiry from the parliamentarian, Mr. Ellis, is here."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker, in response to your inquiry, the Bill does preempt Home Rule, but it permits concurrent local regulation, and so it falls under 6(i) of the Illinois Constitution, and requires a simple majority for passage. Yes, Sir?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Black: "Inquiry of the parliamentarian. I... I see no way, the way this Bill is drafted, that there is any concurrent way that a municipality can escape this mandate. I... I see no way. They... they can't go under this regulation. To go over it, would be impossible. This is an absolute mandate on a purchasing power on a municipality. They have no recourse. We're telling them what to do. You're telling me there's a concurrent way that they can still have some regulatory authority. How? I mean how... what... what regulatory authority could remedy this mandate that strips their Home Rule power?"
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative, I'm simply telling you that the Bill permits concurrent regulation no less restrictive. I'm not going to try to predict what a... what a ordinance would do, but the Constitution provides for this exact form of preemption, and it's found in Section 6-I, and the Constitution says it's a 60-vote requirement."
- Black: "I have little choice under House Rules to accept your rule, but my parting comment to my colleagues; you pass this, you restrict the City of Chicago in their ability to purchase vehicles, or a lot of cities in the State of Illinois, you're going to hear about it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

Reis: "Inquiry of the Chair before I start my time. Is there...
the only thing that's under Home Rule requirement of 71
votes a gun Bill? I really believe that. That is the only
Bill that requires 71 votes is a gun Bill. How can this
not overrule Home Rule? We are forcing something on a city
that they may not want to have, and... I, along with

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Representative Black will… well, adhere to the parliamentarian's ruling, but I… I really think that the only thing that requires 71 votes in this chamber is a gun Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, just real quick, again. Who is required to purchase American manufactured cars under your Bill? Municipalities and school districts, and what else?"

Hernandez: "That's it."

Reis: "What about Legislators?"

Hernandez: "No."

Reis: "So, the two Leaders in our chamber that own cars that weren't made in the United States, they wouldn't have to."

Hernandez: "No."

Reis: "Why... why is this Bill needed?"

Hernandez: "It... I believe it... it creates jobs, keeps jobs here in the country, and during our times that in need right now, I think this... this is a way to encourage that."

Reis: "This is where the fundamental problem with this Bill is, aside from the drafting errors that we think are in it. This does nothing, nothing to solve the unfriendly business climate that we have here in Illinois, and here in the United States, absolutely nothing. And then, I quite honestly came unglued when I got a letter from one of the union groups saying that we should pass this when they have advocated for every job killing Bill there is in here. That's why our jobs are leaving, folks. You can't tell someone to buy something because we've got a crummy place to own a business. Why don't we fix that? The letter says

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

we had a 100 thousand automaker jobs in Illinois in 2008. Why is it that that's all we have? Alabama's been kicking our rear ends for the last 12 years because businesses want to go to Alabama. They don't want to come here. We're down to 60 thousand now. Why is that? They're leaving Illinois 'cause it's a crummy place to do business. can't we just come to that conclusion, sit down around the table, and fix what's really wrong, and not mandate that our municipalities and schools buy a Toyota because it was manufactured here and they can't buy a Crown Victoria, which sounds American because it wasn't manufactured here. This Bill does nothing to fix the problem that is causing automotive dealers to go somewhere else. Nothing at all, and for that reason alone, we should kill this Bill, sit down and figure out how we're going to make Illinois and the United States more business friendly so our jobs stay here, and we don't have to pass silly laws like this that falsely thinks that we're going to keep jobs here, puts the profits back in Japan. That's where the profits are going. They're not going to Princeton, Indiana, where they're making cars. The profits are going to Japan. And here we got GM and Chrysler going broke, and we're sending our money overseas. This Bill should die for that reason if nothing else. Let's sit down and fix the real problem at hand."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Debbie Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I have some... some problems with the Bill, also. I have a few companies

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

in my district who manufacture car parts, and a lot of times those car parts are shipped to, you know, Canada, or Mexico, or various countries to... you know, to be assembled and under this Bill, this... this doesn't help constituents, or companies in my district. I, also... I, also, have a problem with... when the Speaker came around ... when the Sponsor came around to talk to me about this Bill, I said that I think it would be strengthened if we said 'American owned companies' and you know, and/or American, you know, assembled in America... cars. I thought that would strengthen the Bill, and I would be more comfortable with it, but right now, I, you know, I just can't vote for it. I mean, I... like Representative Black was saying, you know, the Crown Royal (sic-Vic) is... isn't on the list. whatever it's worth, I don't want to be, you know, driving behind a Chicago Police car with, you know, that's Mitsubishi or Toyota. I don't know. There's... I just... there just seems a problem. Like, I feel like it should be a Ford, an American owned car... or American... Yeah, American owned company. So, with that, I just, I have problems with the Bill, and I can't vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lou Lang."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I heard some commentary from some on the floor regarding the fact that local communities cannot opt out of this, but as I read my analysis, there is an option for communities to have a public hearing and

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

decide that, for whatever reason they have, they can purchase foreign vehicles. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "Yes, it is."

Lang: "And could you tell us what that mechanism is?"

Hernandez: "School districts... If school districts are experiencing a hardship, they are... they are able to waive the American made requirement."

Lang: "And is 'hardship' defined in the Bill?"

Hernandez: "Yes. It's on... on the fin... financial watch list."

Lang: "All right. And so, let me see if I understand your theory for this Bill. Your theory is that our local governments ought to be buying American. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Lang: "And can you discuss with us the opponent who would say that for some reason, it should be all right to allow people, communities, to go out and buy foreign vehicles at a time where the American auto industry is in trouble?"

Hernandez: "Representative, right now, there is not one car that exists that is completely American made. So, you know, at one point or another, you know, we... we have to come to some criteria, but wh... which would best benefit jobs and... and business to stay here in the United States."

Lang: "Well, so, last I heard, the American auto industry was in big trouble. Are they not?"

Hernandez: "Yes, they are."

Lang: "And the Federal Government's been trying to figure out a way to help that industry, and some of the people from that industry live in the State of Illinois. Is that also correct?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Lang: "And some of the dealers for some of the American-made vehicles are also in the State of Illinois. Isn't that correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Lang: "And I have seen that some of these auto dealerships are closing. Have you seen the same thing?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Lang: "And so, I assume, and would you agree with my assumption, that when a... when an auto dealer closes... when a dealership closes that sells any car, American or otherwise, but let's talk about the American-made vehicles, when they close, jobs disappear. Is that right?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Lang: "And so, these would be jobs of people who are in the sales department, and the accounting department, and the service department, and the body shop. Any idea how many people work at a typical auto dealership?"

Hernandez: "I wouldn't know, but I imagine it would be many."

Lang: "It would be many, I think. And so, your... your goal here, as I understand it, is to keep American workers working. Is that correct?"

Hernandez: "Yes. That's correct."

Lang: "Right. So, what would you say to the opponents that say, for some reason, it's not okay to keep American workers working?"

Hernandez: "I'm sorry, Representative, repeat that."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Lang: "Yeah. What would you say to the opponents, who, on this floor have... seem to indicate that other ideas trump the notion that American workers should continue to work?"

Hernandez: "The most important thing right now, Representative, is to keep jobs here."

Lang: "In fact, we're in the process of putting a big capital Bill together to put people to work in Illinois. Right?"

Hernandez: "Yes, that's correct."

Lang: "Right. So, thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'm...

I'm really unsure why anyone would oppose this Bill. I

don't understand the logic that says... brings up all these
red herrings, all kinds of hooks, all kinds of reasons to

vote against the Bill that would keep the American auto
industry afloat. Imagine... imagine if 50 states proposed
this Bill, and 50 states rejected it. Or imagine if 50

states passed this Bill. It would mean the sale of more
American vehicles. It would more American workers. It

would mean more workers right here in the State of
Illinois. This is a good Bill. You should be voting for
it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is a Chevy Impala an American car?

Is it an American vehicle?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

Reboletti: "I bought one last year in Elmhurst from a local dealer. So, you're saying that, that isn't American enough for this Bill. Is that fair to say? Because the car was

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

produced in... or it was assembled in Canada? Is that an American car? It doesn't affect American workers?"

Hernandez: "Representative, based on this language here, we have a list here. There is a list here that you can look up... look at, three pages long, that based on, because of the assembly taking place in this country, are American... are designated as American-..."

Reboletti: "I assume..."

Hernandez: "...made cars."

Reboletti: "...that the folks that are working at the Elmhurst Chevy dealer are American workers. I assume the folks in Addison, at SWD Manufacturing, who produce quite a bit of materials for vehicles are American workers, and they've laid off 40 percent of their staff because of the auto industry's collapse. If we keep doing this... now, I'm not going to be the one to explain to them that this Bill will simply put the rest of the folks on the unemployment line. But somebody else, in some other state that's producing these cars, we'll get them from there. Is that what you're trying to say?"

Hernandez: "Representative, you know, I'm not done. There... I'm continuing discussion. I know that there is concerns, and as I had mentioned before, we are looking at a... at another Bill to address the concerns regarding the parts. So, I'm looking to continue working with this."

Reboletti: "Why do we want to tell police departments all across the state that the… the two cars that they rely on aren't good enough? Why are we doing that? What necessitates that?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hernandez: "Well, we're not saying it's not good enough, but now they may have a choice. Maybe it's... it's... in these times that we're looking to be more economical and looking towards green... a green approach, maybe it's a matter of looking in another direction. And there is options here available. We're not... we're opening more options here."

Reboletti: "So, when the Elmhurst Police Department buys cars from the Elmhurst Chevy dealer, that's not good enough? I... I don't know, really, what we're... where we're going with this. They buy in fleet discounts. They buy 10, 15 vehicles. The City of Elmhurst buys from the local Ford dealer. I'm not sure what... what part of that is... is wrong, and why we need to then take control away from local government to tell them what they should do. As Representative Black has said, we're not making the Illinois State Police do it. We're not making IDOT do it. Why are we skipping us?"

Hernandez: "Well, I don't think we're taking that away, I think that we're stimulating it. It's just a matter of looking. I think that that is what has been disregarded, that there is a list to look from, and it's... it's a pretty sizable list. So, I think it's just giving it the chance to take a look. I mean, I understand that the... the cars that have been... has been... it's been a normal. I mean, it's been consistent on the... on the regular purchasing of some vehicles, but what may close up, may open up other options, and it... it could be effective, cost wise, or environmentally."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Reboletti: "I... I just don't think it's that simple to say that since a car was assembled in Canada that it's not an American car, that all the... a majority of the parts come from America or come from Illinois. I don't think that that's where we should be going here. To the Bill. I... I'm a little surprised that the previous speaker said it's un-American if you vote against this Bill. I'm not going to vote against my constituents, and my businesses that are trying to produce parts, that are giving good jobs with good benefits to folks that are in the manufacturing industry. Why are we chasing manufacturing jobs out of this state? I cannot understand it, since the day I've been here. I think this Bill's going to continue to do that until we don't have a manufacturing base. I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "I would like to delegate my time to Representative Bassi."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Representative, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to read the list, but this is definitely a serious, serious mandate, not only on school districts but on... but on municipalities. The school district in my area, High School District 211, is the largest high school district in the state. Through the state bid process, which is prescribed by the Procurement Code, they buy Tauruses and Impalas. They would no longer be able to do this under

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

this Bill, should it pass and in fact, we would need to… to change the State Procurement Code, if it were to pass. So, not only does this Bill have implications that would really, seriously impact jobs for American workers, who do deal with American cars and cars with foreign names, and it, again, excluding things like the… the Prius, which is such an energy efficient car, this is… this is really problematic all the way around. And I just… one of the previous speakers thought it was… it was anti-American, I totally disagree. I think this is anti-Illinois. This particular Bill is going to cost us additional jobs, additional good working… jobs for Illinois workers. And I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I... I voted for this in committee, and when we were in committee, I thought there might be some additional work done on the Bill. Was there any discussion about doing any further Amendments on this Bill?"

Hernandez: "Not on the Bill, but there is discussion to do a trailer Bill."

Franks: "And what would the trailer Bill have?"

Hernandez: "Well, they would address the issue concerning the parts. So, the… the issue with the parts is… is a big concern. So, that… I mean, that's what the… the trailer Bill was trying to do."

Franks: "Do we need the trailer Bill, or could we just amend it here? 'Cause here's my concern. Our American

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

manufacturers for our auto industry is just in shambles. Two of them have gone bankrupt, and the third, Ford, is doing better than the others, but certainly, their stock, I think, is trading at four and a half, where a couple years ago it was over 80. And... but they have not accepted any further bailout funds. Least they said they're not going to need those, correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct."

Franks: "But when I'm looking at how the Bill is written now, there are only three Ford vehicles which would be eligible for purchase by the municipalities and the schools, correct?"

Hernandez: "That's true, yes."

Franks: "So, what I'm concerned is is that we would be limiting the... the amount of Ford vehicles that our municipalities and our schools could purchase at a time when we should not be limiting those vehicles, but in fact, should be encouraging our schools and our municipalities to buy American, and to keep Americans employed. And the way the Bill is written, it would exclude many of the vehicles that are popular sellers for Ford, and actually, I think it could really hurt the American car company instead of helping the car company. Do you have a... a response to that?"

Hernandez: "Representative, I think right now, currently, it's...
it's really resistance to change, and opening up yourselves
to alternatives."

Franks: "But we're not... we're not changing... the only thing we're changing is we're limiting. What we're saying is,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

for a struggling car company, if you don't like these three choices, you can't buy a Ford. Why would we do that when we have the highest unemployment rate that we've had in years in this state?"

Hernandez: "Well, that's what I'm looking for the trailer Bill to address."

Franks: "But why wait for a trailer Bill? Why don't we fix it on this Bill? I... I need a good answer on why we would pass a Bill that we know is flawed, when we have time to fix it and to send it over to the Senate?"

Hernandez: "Representative, you know what I'm going to do, I'm going to pull the Bill."

Franks: "Thank you."

Hernandez: "Okay."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk,..."

Hernandez: "I'm going to pull the Bill..."

Speaker Lyons: "...mercifully pull this Bill out of the record on request of the Sponsor. Representative Rich Myers on a point of personal privilege."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct your attention in this Body to the gallery, where we are joined today by Miss Macomb 2009, Miss Erin O'Connor. Next fall, she will be a senior at Western Illinois University, majoring in theater and dance. She is from Evergreen Park, Illinois, and her Representative is Representative Jim Brosnahan, who I saw visiting with her earlier, and he knows their family very well. Her platform is skin cancer education. She lost her mother to skin cancer, and she

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

feels that's a very important cause to be using as a platform. The Miss Macomb Pageant has the highest scholarship dollars awarded of any pageant in the State of Illinois, and she is joined by the directors of the Miss Macomb Pageant, Robert and Nancy Foote. Let's give Miss Macomb 2009 a big round of applause."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to the Capitol, Erin O'Connor.

Congratulations, Miss Macomb. The Chair recognizes the

Gentleman from Cook on the point of personal privilege,

Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Resolution 425, offered by Representative Dunkin, designates May 20, 2009, as the second annual Phi Beta Sigma and Zeta Phi Beta day in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Members of the House, Mr. Speaker. Today is the second annual Phi Beta Sigma and Zeta Phi Beta Sorority day here in Springfield. If you all can stand while I tell them about these wonderful sororities that I'm a member of, Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, and our good Zetas. Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated was founded by... in Howard University, in Washington, D.C., January 9, in 1914, by three young, African-American male students, celebrated as the Honorable A. Langston Taylor, the Honorable Leonard F. Morse, and the Honorable Charles I. Brown. Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Incorporated was founded on January 16, 1920, by five young women, celebrated as the Honorable Arizona Cleaver Stemons, the Honorable Pearl A.

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Neal, the Honorable Myrtle Taylor (sic-Tyler) Faithful, the Honorable Viola Tyler Goings, and the Honorable Fannie Pettie Watts. The five women respectfully known as the Five Pearls, founded the sorority at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, Zeta Phi Beta are the only historically organizations in the National Panhellenic Council to be constitutionally bound. From its inception, Phi Beta Sigma was conceived by its founders as a mechanism to deliver the services to the general community rather than gaining skills to be utilized exclusively for themselves, or their immediate families. This deep conviction is mirrored in the fraternity's motto, 'Culture For Service and Service For Humanity'. Zeta Phi Beta has chronicled a number of firsts. Zeta Phi Beta was the first Greek letter organization to charter a chapter in Africa in 1948. sorority was also the first to form adult and youth auxiliary groups, and to centralize its operations in a national headquarters. Both the Phi Beta... the Phi Beta Sigma, Incorporated, and the Zeta Phi Beta sorority are honored to have formed many wonderful community-based partnerships, such as the March of Dimes, the American Cancer Society, American Diabetes Research, NAACP, the National Panhellenic Council, and the Urban League. today is the day of history as our second visit here, in the Capitol. Some of the famous Zeta Phi Beta members are Zora Neale Hurston, Sarah Vaughan, Dione Warwick, Sheryl Underwood, Minnie Ripperton, Esther from Good Times, Congresswoman Julia Carson, and Yvonne Miller. Some of the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

famous members of the Phi Beta Sigma, Fraternity, Incorporated was Brother James Weldon Johnson, George Washington Carver, the first President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, Harold Washington, who also served here in this Body, Huey P. Newton, the cofounder of the Black Panther Party here in America, A. Philip Randolph, Chavis Mohammed, first director of NAACP, Ken Dunkin, your State Representative. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, put your hands together for the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated, and the Zeta Phi Beta."

- Speaker Lyons: "Phi Beta Sigma, Zeta Phi Beta, have a great day in the Capitol. Welcome to Springfield. Glad to have you. Proud to have you here. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1267?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1267's on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading on the request of Sponsor Burke. Representative JoAnn Osmond, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."
- Osmond: "I would... like to ask the men and women of this Assembly to recognize a visitor that we have here. Representative Steve Olson is from Iowa and he's visiting us today."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Olson, Hawkeye, glad to have you here in Springfield. Representative Patti Bellock, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

"Thank you very much. Along with Representative Ryg and myself, we would like to invite all the Members of the General Assembly to join us tomorrow on Disability Day, when we think we're going to have over a thousand people come to the Capitol to raise the awareness of disabilities in Illinois. And at 10:00, the Freedom Quest Ride is going to have 60 riders in wheelchairs who have come for a twoday run from different cities throughout the State of Illinois. They're going to be arriving by police escort to the Lincoln statue, and as many of you that could come out and welcome them to the Capitol for the rally inside the Capitol, we'd love to have you all there at 10:00 to welcome the Freedom Riders for Freedom Ouest for disabilities in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Bellock.

Representative Franks, on Third Readings, you have Senate
Bill 1555. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack
Franks. Mr. Clerk, on page 5 of the Calendar, we have
Senate Bill 1560. Representative Jehan Gordon, are you on
the floor? Out of the record. Representative Bradley. Is
John Bradley on the floor? Out of the record. On top of
page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Mike Tryon, you have
Senate Bill 1592. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1592, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Bill, Senate Bill 1592, makes a change to the filing requirements for economic interest states... interest statements that is filed by all Members of government that are required to file them. And what happened in McHenry County, is we had a fire chief who was required to file an economic interest statement, and he was in a coma because he had a lung infection, and it was a drug-induced coma. He was in a coma for two months, and there was discussion at that time about waking him up so that he could, in fact, file his economic interest statement. We've also had situations where people are in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and members of our military that aren't in our state, aren't in a position to actually file their economic interest statement. So, this simply says, if you are incapacitated for medical reasons, or other reasons of incapacitation, or you are serving in our military and you are not able to file, you are not subject to the penalties, and you can file when you so duly are able to file. So, if there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer them, but I think this is a commonsense fix to our economic interest statement law."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1592 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mell, Representative Dunkin, Representative Washington. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Frank Mautino, you have Senate Bill 1611. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1611, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Frank Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The... this is identical to legislation that passed out of the House unanimously and it amends the IMRF article of the Pension Code to add regional councils of government to the list of entities permitted to participate in the fund, as participating instrumentalities. That's what the Bill does. Appreciate your consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1611 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? Art Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Mautino, you also have Senate Bill 1936. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1936, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment reinserts the provision as passed by the Senate for special service area bonds, and under the current law, municipalities and counties can establish special service areas, and that's an area within the local government's boundaries. It's smaller than a local government's territory. This Bill has been negotiated. I know of no opposition to it, and it is very similar to... excuse me. Mr. Clerk, can you give me the status of the Amendment? Has that been placed on the Bill yet?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor
 Amendment #2 remains in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "So, your Amendment is pending, Representative.

 We'll put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading."
- Mautino: "Correct. Could you, please, take this Bill out of the record?"
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll take that Bill out of the… we'll put that Bill on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of the Amendment, and then we'll take it out of the record. Representative Julie Hamos, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1698. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Julie Hamos."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies Gentlemen, this is a Bill that creates a task force on higher education private student And you know, I think that we know some of these legislative findings all too well, that private loans constitute 20 percent of total education loan money. Tuition at public universities has risen 57 percent in the past five years. Private loan volume grew at pretty high numbers, and the task force, which is made up of the key stakeholders, would investigate rates, fees, and terms associated with private student loans. Ιt would investigate how rates, fees, and terms impact accessibility of private student loans and various other duties that are spelled out in the Bill. The work that we did and the Amendment that we put on was that, originally, this was going to be a function of the State Treasurer, but they were very cooperative with the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, and ISAC agreed to really do the staff support for this task force. It has a short-term response, and it's supposed to submit a report by December 31 of next year, and then go out of existence. I seek an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1698 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 Dunkin, you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hamos, don't sit down. You also have Senate Bill 1729. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1729, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill provides that the Department of Transportation, on behalf of the state, may enter into public/private partnerships for the acquisition of equipment for intercity passenger rail service. This is really the new approach. In California, they're trying this even outside the Amtrak system. Certainly, we've made a real commitment to Amtrak here, in Illinois, and the question about equipment, and who purchases it, who owns it, and who maintains it, has become an issue, and as we've deliberated this to our Passenger Rail Caucus, these public/private partnerships are, in fact, the new trend. And I seek an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I don't... I'm not sure I know why this
Bill is necessary, as IDOT says they already have full
legal authority to do this."

Hamos: "Well, I don't know why it's necessary either except it's a Senate Bill that came over, and... and I picked it up.

And it really is just a may Bill, and that maybe they were...

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

somebody felt that they needed the authority. This is my... my own Senator's Bill."

Black: "And... and who is your Senator?"

Hamos: "Representative Schoenberg."

Black: "Senator Schoenberg..."

Hamos: "Senator Schoenberg."

Black: "...should know that IDOT says clearly they already have the authority to do this, and in fact, are doing it, but your honest answer deserves a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the questions is, 'Should Senate Bill 1729 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? Chapin Rose. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sara Feigenholtz, you have Senate Bill 1738. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1738, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1738 amends the Code of Civil Procedure to prohibit an interpreter for the deaf and hard of hearing to voluntary... from having to voluntary testify. Last year, we passed the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Licensure Act, and this is

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- essentially a department-driven initiative. It's a cleanup Bill. Be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1738 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? Art Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative DeLuca, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Deluca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like that moved back to Rules... Second Reading. I'm sorry. Second Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Clerk, the status of Senate Bill 1783. We'll move that Bill from Third Reading back to the Order of Second Reading on the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Sid Mathias has... Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, on... is Senate Bill 1866, Representative Will Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1866, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1866 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code by adding a section defining low-speed vehicles, and making several changes regulating the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- licensing, registration, and use of such vehicles. Be more than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Representative, it's a lot quieter in here. Where is everybody?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Enjoy the quiet, Representative. We can hear each other."
- Eddy: "Don't ask questions, right? Okay."
- Davis, W.: "I think they're... I think they're eating, Representative."
- Eddy: "Winner, winner, chicken dinner."
- Davis, W.: "Which means they'll be asleep in a minute, too."
- Eddy: "Yeah, okay. Hey... just real quick, a question regarding a low-speed vehicle. What... define a low-speed vehicle in the Bill. What... what does it define?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, the origin of the Bill is simply trying to address the ability of police officers that drive golf cart-like vehicles to be able to perform their functions on roadways. So, we're talking about smaller vehicles, like golf carts, that do not go very fast, obviously. So, that's essentially what we mean by a low-speed vehicle."
- Eddy: "So, under the Bill, the owner of a low-speed vehicle...

 are they defined by the speed at which the veh... the vehicle
 can travel at a maximum rate? I mean, I understand the
 intention for golf carts, but..."
- Davis, W.: "Well, how about this, Representative. According to the legislation, a low-speed vehicle is defined as 'any four-wheel vehicle with a maximum speed of greater than 20

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

miles per hour, but not greater than 25 miles per hour, that conforms with the federal motor vehicle safety standards set forth in 49 C.F.R. Part 571.500'."

Eddy: "Okay. So... so, they... they travel between 20 and 25 miles an hour and meet other federal regulations. And if you have one of those, then you, under this Bill, would register that, or is registration already required?"

Davis, W.: "No, I think this Bill is setting forth regis... being able to register that vehicle."

Eddy: "And... and is there then, like there would be for other motorized vehicles, a licensure, and a plate, and a annual registration fee?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct."

Eddy: "And that... at this time, they're just used and there
 isn't a way to register or fee them. What's the annual fee
 that this creates?"

Davis, W.: "The annual fee?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "According to what I'm reading says, Senate Bill 1866 specifies that the fee for a certificate of title for a low-speed vehicle will be \$30, and the registration fee will be 18."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if you have one of these golf carts that you're using, and you're going to have licensed, it's going to cost you 30 bucks to register the title, and then \$18 a year, just like a license or... or a fee for a car, this is on the slow-moving vehicle. Is there an estimate of how much revenue this new fee will produce?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Davis, W.: "Representative, I have no estimates on that in any of the information that I have."
- Eddy: "Is... does the legislation simply then, the fees that are collected go into general revenue, or are they put in a dedicated fund? I mean, this isn't like..."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I... I... I think they're treated just the same way in which the vehicle and registration fees for the cars that we drive are treated. So, whatever ever the funds that are designated that those fees go into, this is treated the same way."
- Eddy: "I been... I've been hearing a lot about a capital Bill and... and revenue for a capital Bill. This isn't part of the... the revenue for a capital Bill is it, or could it be, or is this..."
- Davis, W.: "That... that's not my intent, Sir."
- Eddy: "It's not your..."
- Davis, W.: "And just to maybe clarify your previous question, I have here, it says, the title and registration flee... fees, including those set forth in Senate Bill 1866, are distributed to various funds pursuant to Section 2-119 of the Vehicle Code."
- Eddy: "That clears it up. Absolutely clears it up for me.

 One... one final question, is there any stipulation in this regarding whether these slow-moving vehicles to be titled are... have to be American made?"
- Davis, W.: "There is no stipulation in this legislation in reference to that."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Eddy: "Okay. So, you're not promoting the purchase of foreign golf carts, but under this Bill, that would be possible and we wouldn't… we wouldn't be restricting the purchase."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I... I guess that would be up to the purchaser."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate your... your answers, and it would be interesting to know if there is a projection on revenue for this type of a vehicle, what... what that might produce, and if..."
- Davis, W.: "Well, ironically enough, even though I don't have a projection for you as I'm continuing to read, the largest portion of those fees that are collected, will go into the Road Fund. That should make you extremely happy."
- Eddy: "Well, as long as we... we cease and desist the raid of that fund, you're right, it would make me happy. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patti Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Davis, W.: "Absolutely."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."
- Bellock: "I know that this Bill, right here, is just regarding...
 regarding the license, but I've had a lot of requests for
 this over the last two or three years for the low-speed
 motor vehicles within my district, because it's a commuting
 district, and they would like to take these just to train
 stations. It..."

Davis, W.: "(Inaudible)"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Bellock: "Yeah. In all cases, they were told that they could not use these vehicles within the different towns in my district. So, I'm wondering, in this here it says, proposed rules..."

Davis, W.: "Well, I mean, I guess..."

Bellock: "Are you familiar with that?"

Davis, W.: "...I guess, relative to that, for instance, because these vehicles don't travel fast, there has to be specific speed limit postings for them, maybe specific placards that designate that these roads can be used by low-speed vehicles. I mean, I think it's... I think the legislation is trying to figure out a way in which the Secretary of State can provide for the use of these type of vehicles on various roadways. Now, how that interacts with local municipalities, I'm not sure. But I'm sure it'll be in a manner done so that they're safe, and that the individuals that... that drive these vehicles will be deemed as part of the... you know, the motoring... the motoring public, if you will, so they... they will be..."

Bellock: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...safe."

Bellock: "So, does the Secretary of State monitor the rules for that, or is the municipality allowed to do that? Is that in your Bill anywhere? I'm wondering is this opening up the use of these to more individuals within towns."

Davis, W.: "Well, it says here, as I'm being told, it's at the discretion of the municipality."

Bellock: "Oh, it is. Okay. All right. Thank you very much."
Davis, W.: "Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, does the Illinois Vehicle Code kick in when you take... when an individual takes one of these vehicles out on the road, or when you're un... anywhere under operation? 'Cause the point is, I mean, you obviously are not going to be charged with speeding, but when you get behind the wheel of one of these vehicles, are you subject to the same prohibitions and penalties as anybody else would on the... with their cars..."

Davis, W.: "I'm..."

Durkin: "...that they drive on a daily basis?"

Davis, W.: "I'm told, yes."

Durkin: "So, you can be charged with driving under the influence if you're behind one of these low-speed vehicles?"

Davis, W.: "I'm going to say, yes."

Durkin: "Of... well, are we... are you sure, or is that just a..."

Davis, W.: "Well, we're... we're searching."

Durkin: "Okay... and, you know, the... if you are driving on a suspended license, and you are... had a suspended license, and you're driving one of these low... one of these auto... one of these vehicles, would you be subject to the Class A, driving under a suspended license section of the Code?"

Davis, W.: "Well, part... part of my analysis, Representative, and maybe this somewhat answers your question, it says, Senate Bill 1866 provides that the operators of low-speed vehicles operated on streets, must have a driver's license,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

presumably valid driver's license, and are subject to the mandatory insurance provisions of the Illinois Vehicle Code."

Durkin: "But are they subject to the other penalties, prohibitions, and restrictions under the Illinois Vehicle Code?"

Davis, W.: "The operation of a low-speed vehicle upon any street is subject to the provisions of Chapter 11, of this Code, concerning the rules of the road and applicable local ordinances."

Durkin: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Representative, a couple of questions that were already asked that I was looking at here, but I do have a concern 'cause I did receive a letter from a constituent of mine who has the EV plates, electric vehicle plate already, and they get a special fee, why are you removing that fee?"

Davis, W.: "Why are we removing which fee?"

Ramey: "You know, you're actually raising it for the electric vehicle plate."

Davis, W.: "Is an electric vehicle a low-speed vehicle by this definition, Sir?"

Ramey: "Correct. Because in your... in the comments that we have here it says, removes the requirement of the Secretary of State issue distinctive license plates for electric vehicles and adds requirement... issued distinctive license plates for low-speed vehicles. They already have a

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

distinction. They already have a reduced-fee plate, so why are you changing that?"

Davis, W.: "Honestly, Representative, I don't know. This is a set..."

Ramey: "What's a head weigh, Representative?"

Davis, W.: "About eight pounds."

Ramey: "There you go. Good answer."

Davis, W.: "Yeah, thank you."

Ramey: "Well, there... that's one of my concerns. I, obviously, have a constituent with this. Secondly, are these vehicles going to be required to have a slow-moving vehicle sign on the back of it?"

Davis, W.: "I'm told, yes."

Ramey: "So, in... they're going to insure... incur extra charges for that sign and the sign that says... what was the other one they were requiring to put on the back of it, not to exceed... be in roads of 30 miles an hour or faster."

Davis, W.: "Repeat that, Sir."

Ramey: "I believe in the Bill, it states they have to also have another sign on the back of the vehicle that says they can't on roads with speed limits higher than 30 miles an hour. I'm sorry, 25 miles an hour."

Davis, W.: "Yes, they do need that designation. They do need a sticker..."

Ramey: "How many fees..."

Davis, W.: "...that says so."

Ramey: "...are we putting on these vehicles now, then?"

Davis, W.: "I'm... I'm sorry."

Ramey: "How many fees are we putting on this vehicle?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Davis, W.: "How many fees are we putting on them?"

Ramey: "Yeah. You got a fee for the plate, fee for the two signs. I mean, what... how many fees is... what's that... I think the question was asked of you before. What's the revenue income on this now?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I don't know what the revenue will generate...

what revenue will be generated from this, Representative.

I don't know."

Ramey: "Who... whose Bill is this in the Senate?"

Davis, W.: "Senator Sullivan."

Ramey: "Is he your Senator?"

Davis, W.: "Excuse me?"

Ramey: "Is he your Senator?"

Davis, W.: "No, he's not."

Ramey: "Okay. Well, we had that question earlier, too, and I...
and we had an honest answer about why she didn't know why
that Senator was having this Bill. So, do you know why
this Senator's doing this Bill?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I believe this Bill was an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office."

Ramey: "Okay. So, he's just carrying it for the Secretary of State?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

Ramey: "All right. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I have a few issues on this. I... I find it odd that we're trying to use vehicles that use less energy, use less gasoline. We use them in... in the colleges and in other forms, and now we're going to add more fees for just

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

another revenue source. So, I think this needs to be better thought out. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I don't know that we necessarily disagree on this. I just want to make sure that everyone in this chamber knows what they're voting on. This is just golf carts, right?"

Davis, W.: "Well, low-speed... I won't classify it as just a golf cart, but it is a low-speed vehicle, as designated by this definition."

Reis: "But it does not apply to 4-wheel all-terrain vehicles?"

Davis, W.: "Well, it applies for a vehicle... does it apply to an all-terrain vehicle?"

Reis: "Yes, 4-wheel all-terrain vehicle."

Davis, W.: "I believe that was asked in committee, and I don't think that this does."

Reis: "What about these small, motorized wheelchair carts? Some of them have three wheels, some of them have four wheels, and we seen them driving around town a lot with disabled people that go out to supermarkets and... and quite honestly, they're going very slow, a lot of times on busy highways."

Davis, W.: "Well, I don't... I don't think so, and the reason I say that, Representative, is that... is that the vehicle must conform with the federal motor vehicle safety standards, and I don't think that they're... they conform to that."

Reis: "But a golf cart does?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry."

Reis: "But a golf cart does?"

Davis, W.: "Well, with... again, that's why I didn't want to classify it as a golf cart. It's a vehicle that conforms to that federal standard, which means I... I think it has to have seat belts, has to have a odometer, or speedometer on it, but based on the federal standards."

Reis: "So, if I'm..."

Davis, W.: "Turn signals..."

Reis: "...hearing you correctly, this will not apply to golf carts, where..."

Davis, W.: "I didn't... again, I didn't say golf carts."

Reis: "No, I know that, but I'm trying to clarify it so that everybody knows what they're voting for, and I don't think that they do."

Davis, W.: "Oh, I... I guess it does not apply to a golf cart."

Reis: "So... I guess I'm having trouble with what we need this for. We have golf carts that cities are having problems with, with safety. We have, as I said, the motorized wheelchairs that... that from a safety standpoint, I think, needs some attention given to, but none of those apply, but yet, you're bringing a Bill forward..."

Davis, W.: "Well, again, you... you say..."

Reis: "...and we're not quite sure what vehicle it applies to."

Davis, W.: "Well, it applies to a vehicle with a maximum speed of 20 miles per hour..."

Reis: "What is that vehicle? I'm sorry, Representative."

Davis, W.: "...and that conforms with a... with the federal motor...
motor vehicle safety standards."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Reis: "I'm looking for a way to have... to support your Bill. I just don't know of any vehicle that goes 20 to 25 miles an hour that's not a golf cart, that's not an all-terrain vehicle, and I'm just wondering what this statute would apply to."

Davis, W.: "Well, one thing that was mentioned in committee, Representative, were the types of vehicles that police departments use on the roadways for meter maids and things of that nature. That was one thing that was mentioned in committee. That... that could be a type of vehicle that this applies to."

Reis: "I'm going to continue to listen to the debate, Representative. I'm not quite sure most the people in this chamber know what they're voting for, or against, or what here, and we're trying to help you out, but I'll continue to listen to the debate."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Will the Sponsor yield briefly?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor's ready for you questions, Sir."

Rose: "Thank you. Will, Representative Myers and myself had a Bill earlier this year, House Bill 2455, which is already on the Governor's desk that does, I think, exactly this, already. Now, it deals with the change of the definition 'of non highway vehicle' to include... let me look here... allterain vehicles, golf carts, neighborhood vehicles, off way... off-highway motorcycle. I'm not exactly sure what this does that that already doesn't do. The interesting thing here is, I believe, Senator Sullivan was the Sponsor of both Bills, and my only thought here is, maybe we could...

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

and, I'm not telling you what to do with your Bill, but maybe we could pull this from the record and figure out exactly what's going on, because 2455 is already on the Governor's desk. And it's the exact same concept that you're talking about, which is allowing municipalities and local units of government to permit, you know, something less than a car to get around town. And I just don't know what the distinction is here."

- Davis, W.: "Well, I can only assume that if you say that Senator Sul… Senator Sullivan is the Sponsor of both Bills, that apparently he knows or says that there is a distinction to be made between the two, which is why he decided to move and push both Bills."
- Rose: "Yeah, well, that... that's actually a pretty good point.

 I mean, I would assume he would know the difference, too, I guess. I... I just... I can't figure what the difference is.

 I... I mean, I don't know... I don't know what the difference between your Bill is, which is a low-speed, right, vehicle?"
- Davis, W.: "Low-speed... low-speed vehicle."
- Rose: "And a neighborhood vehicle, because that's the same... I mean, that's sort of the same thing."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I'm... I'm not familiar with the first Bill that you mentioned, so I don't know if it's about licensing and registration. I'm... I'm not sure if that's what that Bill did or..."
- Rose: "Well, I... I guess I just..."
- Davis, W.: "But then again, we could also say if this Bill passes and it does get to the Governor's desk that,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

obviously, the Governor has the ability to keep one and veto the other. That's... you know."

Rose: "Well, I know. That's... I think what I'd like to do. But I'd like to make sure that both our Bills pass. At the end of the day, Representative Davis, I mean, I would, I... I guess as a Gentleman, I'd ask you if you'd pull the Bill just so we can get an answer and clarification. I'm not asking you to not do it today, or come back in five minutes. Just give us some time to figure out what the difference is here."

Davis, W.: "Well, the ability to come back with this Bill is dependent upon the Speaker, and I don't know what else is on our Calendar for today..."

Rose: "Not much."

Davis, W.: "...whether or not... well... whether or not we'll be able to come back to this one or not, that I'm not sure about.

And again, because I have been asked to carry this for someone, I don't want to risk the opportunity of not being able to move this Member's Bill."

Rose: "Okay. Well, there really, quite frankly, is not much on the Calendar. We have something like nine days left, but I... you're the Sponsor. I respect you. So, that's your decision. I just... I, quite frankly, don't know what the difference between the Bill that's already on the Governor's desk is and this one. So, I..."

Davis, W.: "Well..."

Rose: "...probably will vote 'no', but... but thank you for your consideration."

Davis, W.: "Absolutely."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Yes. I sit on this committee, and I wanted to... I... I stand in support of this Bill. I... perhaps Representative Rose has a good point. I'm not familiar with the other Bill that he's speaking of, but these are not golf carts. They're specialized vehicles, and I think the description of a golf cart kind of describes the size of it, the look of it. They're a specialized all... not an all-terrain vehicle, but a utility vehicle that the City of Chicago for meter maids, and also maintenance workers. They're lower cost and they... for the purchase of these, and they are energy efficient. So, this was a specific need that was brought forward to the Secretary of State. It was an initiative of the Secretary of State, and I thought in committee we addressed all the concerns about that these are roadworthy and that they meet the federal highway standards, and that was why we passed the Bill out of committee unanimously, I believe. So, as I said, I... I rise in support of it. I think it... it, perhaps, is a very small need, but yet, it is a need that was addressed committee, and that was why I would support the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "I had asked for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1866 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?

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 76 Members voting 'yes', 41 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Mathias has Senate Bill 1801. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sid Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1801 clarifies the hours of operation of a... a polling place, which is established for early voting, including hours when they have to be open for a holiday. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1801 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 David Miller in the Chair."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe seeks recognition."

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

McAuliffe: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today is Skip Saviano's birthday. So, that's why it's been a little

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

quiet. You always know there's going to be food back there. So, if you haven't anything to eat, feel free to have some food, and take it back in the appropriate areas, but happy birthday, Skip Saviano. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Happy birthday to Represen... Representative Saviano. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black seeks recognition."

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

Speaker Miller: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Since you have just taken the Chair, and the hour of noon has just hit, could we take a five minute recess for brushing and flossing since you know the importance of that?"

Speaker Miller: "That's an excellent question. I do believe we have facilities that will accommodate your flossing and... and brushing needs in the back of the room."

Black: "I plan to use that. I just didn't want you to call any really important Bill while I was back there."

Speaker Miller: "Well, if there's a really important Bill and you have food in between your teeth, I will make sure that..."

Black: "And I do."

Speaker Miller: "...that..."

Black: "So, thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Okay. Thank you. The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Rich Myers seeks recognition."

Myers: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Miller: "State you point."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Myers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, when I was introducing Miss Macomb a little while ago, I failed to mention that Representative Renée Kosel was a judge of that contest, and so she had very familiar... with the... Miss Macomb. And so, there's a three-way connection here to Miss Macomb from Macomb, Evergreen Park, and the judge from Will County."
- Speaker Miller: "I would add she's still a beauty queen, too.

 Representative... the Lady from Will, Representative Kosel seeks recognition."
- Kosel: "Well, thank you very much for the kind compliments. I will tell you that this is a very talented young lady, and I expect to see her go far in the Illinois, and, hopefully, the Miss America Pageant, too. She was very, very impressive."
- Speaker Miller: "On page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1877, Representative Mathias. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1877, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had this Bill before, last year, actually, where it got hung up on the rulemaking procedure, passed out of this... of the House unanimously. This is a great Bill where all parties are in agreement both business community and labor. It's a wellness Bill. It... it provides coverage in insurance policies for wellness, and I think today where we're trying to find a way to cut costs, it's always better to try to insure someone for trying to keep well, than having to pay later

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- when they're sick. So, I think this is a... a great Bill, and I urge everyone in this chamber to vote for it."
- Speaker Miller: "No one seeking recognition. The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1877. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cultra. Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On a vote of 116 'yeas', 0 'nays', 0 'presents', Senate Bill 1877 is... is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1917, Representative Dunkin. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1922, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, read... read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act concerning information referral. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1922 is creating a 211 system statewide for... it'll allow our residents for public accessed to information, and referral to health and human services information if we're going to have a natural/non-natural disaster in the state. Currently, right now, we do have a pilot program of 3... or 211 in three cities. That pilot has gone very well. And the... it's our opinion that this should be extended statewide. We would join numerous other states in our nation that also have this system. I would ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1922. Seeing no one seeking recognition. For... for all

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

those who... for all those in favor vote 'aye'; for all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. For all voted who wish. For all voted who wish. For all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the count of 116 'yeas', 0 'nays', 0 'presents', Senate Bill 1922 passes. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Miller: "...your inquiry."

Black: "When you need help, I would suggest that you dial 211.

We'll be... I... I don't know who answers, but I know they'll be glad to help you, if they can. Now, if you're lucky, it'll be somebody on our side of the aisle that answers. If you're unlucky, it'll probably be Lou Lang who will not be of that much help, quite frankly."

Speaker Miller: "On page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1932. Representative... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1932, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1932 addresses the Solid Waste Management Act. And what it does is it asks... it takes out wording to where it... it states that state agencies responsible for the maintenance of public lands shall, to the maximum extent feasible, use compost materials. It was in committee, there was a couple of questions about IDOT, and the cost to IDOT would this be additional. And... and I checked with IDOT, and IDOT has said that there would not be additional. If it was, it would be minimal, if any at all. So, that's not an issue,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

at least, it was brought up in committee and certainly, we're looking to go green. Using compost, of course, is... keeps the yard waste out of the landfills. It's... it increases erosion resistance, and... and it's really something that we need to continue to look at as we look at environmentally friendly. So, I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Miller: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 1932. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy seeks recognition."

Eddy: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative, I'm pretty sure you answered the committee concerns, but I'm still a little puzzled as to how IDOT can escape additional costs. Where will they... it says, whenever possible, and maybe that's the escape clause there for additional costs. In situations where they don't have compost, then they don't have to apply this... this statute?"

Dugan: "Correct. Correct. It's to the maximum extent feasible, is the way I understand it. And I... I do know, Representative, too, they had talked about, you know, when... when you do use compost, too, it also lowers the input cost because the fertility needs are not there, you know, for fertilization, and that type of thing. The... it increases the organic matter in the soil. It enhances weed growth suppression. So, I think, the use of this type of materials also saves money on additional costs that may be in place if you use a different type of material."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Eddy: "Well, that... that would be... that would be exciting if we..."

Dugan: "Yes."

Eddy: "...actually saved money on something in the state agencies. Well, I appreciate the answer to the question.

As long as it's that permissive, I can see where the costs would not be there. Thank you."

Dugan: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from... Lady from Cook, Representative Currie seeks recognition."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Just for a housekeeping matter, Representative Careen Gordon should be excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Miller: "Thank you. Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulli... Mulligan seeks recognition."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, I notice our analysis says that the current law requires agencies to give consideration and preference now. Is that not working? Why would you lock them into doing something that has a lot of different areas that might be contentious?"

Dugan: "Well, and again, what we're doing in the existing says to give due consideration and preference to the use of compost, and we're just taking out the, give due consideration and preference, and we're just saying, 'to the maximum extent feasible to... to use the compost material."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Mulligan: "So, what if you cut down trees that are infected with something that would be, you know, if you move it to a different area, you're opening up the possibility of those areas getting infected? I mean, there's a lot of reasons why you do things..."

Dugan: "Right."

Mulligan: "...that aren't necessarily conducive to what you're trying to legislate."

Dugan: "Well, and... and I agree with you, Representative, and I, again, it's not... I think as the previous Representative had said, it's not that we're saying they have to. We're saying that to the maximum, you know, to the maximum extent feasible. If there's something that's not going to work, and it's not the best use in that particular area, then we're not saying they have to. We're just saying to the maximum extent feasible."

Mulligan: "So, what was the genesis of this Bill? Did you decide that the agencies weren't abiding by give due consideration, or did somebody come with you and say, gee, we ought to do this? And so, to appear environmental, we're doing it because, I mean, at some point, it seems that we over legislate everything."

Dugan: "Well, and I was just asked by Senator Wilhelmi, was the one that carried this in the Senate, and then he asked me to carry it in the House. It certainly is an environmental friendly Bill. As we continue to look forward to looking at green and how we can help in the State of Illinois, this is something that, again, you know, yard waste prior to 1991 occupied 18 percent of Illinois landfill space, and

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

composting turns this waste into a... a viable source for gardening, cropping, and soil enhancement. So, I think it... it was something, again, Senator Wilhelmi carried it in the Senate and asked me to carry it here, and I said I would be happy to do so."

Mulligan: "Well, I notice even things have changed with the current economy. One of the things as far as recycling has changed is that recyclers have no place to put things. They don't get paid for them anymore, then sometimes they have to pay people to take the recycled goods, and I think that when you keep on legislating, you're opening yourself up to different issues, particularly, with the current economy. So, I thought the current law was pretty good, and I'm not quite sure what to do about this one, but I think it over legislates."

Dugan: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "...Bill."

Black: "The Lady is certainly well-intentioned. I had no idea where I got... will get this mulch. We only mow the grass along our state highways twice. We used to it four times. We only do it twice now, and that's if you're lucky. We don't pick up the grass clippings, we just leave them lay. If we do landscaping along the highways, the branches and trees are usually left there. People will come pick them up, in some cases, otherwise they just decompose on their

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

One year ago this month, IDOT did not have enough money to pick up dead animals along the roadway. One year ago this month, the IDOT personnel and trucks were ordered to stay in the garage. They didn't have enough money to buy gasoline, nor diesel fuel, to go out and pick up dead animals on the roadside, or do any roadside maintenance. One year ago this month. This past winter we had to pass a multimillion dollar supplemental appropriation because IDOT didn't have enough money to buy rock salt. It may be a good idea to use mulch, but in my travels back and forth, I don't know how IDOT, or other state agencies would do it. I... I don't think IDOT has a mulch yard. My municipality does. We pick up yard waste. They turn it into mulch. Those who live in that municipality can go pick it up and use it if they want to do so. I don't know how IDOT's going to get in the mulch business without additional cost, or additional personnel, or additional vehicles. You have to have equipment to turn the lawn waste over, and over, and over, or you don't get mulch. So, I don't think the Bill's necessary. I'm... I'm sure it's a... a fine piece of environmental legislation. It certainly will look good on your environmental resume, but in the bottom line, as Representative Mulligan has already said, they can do this It's... they have the permission to do it if that's what they want to do. I think this kind of takes it into a... a mandate situation, and I don't know why we'd want to put anymore mandates on... on IDOT when, in the last year, we've had to do two supplementals just to keep trucks on the road, and rock salt in the garages. So, I may be the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

only 'no' vote, and probably will be, but this is just an added duty, responsibility, or job description that IDOT will do in... in some point in the future, that they are not now, in my opinion, equipped to do, staffed to... staffed to do, and I don't think it's their job, quite frankly, to do it. So, I intend to vote 'no'."

- Speaker Miller: "Seeing furth... Seeing no further discussion,

 Representative Dugan to close."
- Dugan: "Yes, again, and... and all this Bill does is just ask them, IDOT, to use. It's not to make compost, it's to use compost whenever it's feasible to do. It's something that is environmentally friendly, and I think it... it's something that would be good to move in that direction in the State of Illinois. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House... shall the House pass Senate Bill 1932?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On a count of 83 'yeas', 29 'nays', 3 'presents', Senate Bill 1932 passes. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Mo... Moffitt, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Miller: "...point."
- Moffitt: "In the gallery, on the west side over here, I'd like to recognize a school group from my district. It's the Williamsfield fifth grade, with parents, and sponsors, and

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- teacher. Would you make them welcome, if they'd stand, please?"
- Speaker Miller: "Welcome to Springfield. On page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2214, Representative Pritchard. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on the Calendar appear... on page... Oh. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson for the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for consideration' is House Amendment #2 to House Bill 2132, House Amendment #2 to House Bill 2145, House Amendment #2 to House Bill 2206, and House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1923."
- Speaker Miller: "On page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2022, Representative Jakob... Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 2022 eliminates the requirement of a voter to state a necessity when applying for an absentee ballot, and it creates a uniform application for absentee ballot to be used by anyone who does not wish to vote in person, regardless of reason. Right now, if we look at the statutes, a person wishing to vote by absentee, must state a reason why he or she will be outside of the county, or his or her residence on election day, and separate

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

applications are available for those who are away from home, those who are working at election judges, those serving in the military. There are several reasons, and this just eliminates all of those... makes it a uniform application for absentee ballot."

Speaker Miller: "The Lady moves for... The Lady moves for... for the passage of Senate Bill 2022. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, in your comments you mentioned that today, under current law, you have to give reason to obtain an absentee ballot. Is that correct?"

Jakobsson: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And you mentioned a couple of those reasons. Could...
could you be a little bit more descriptive as to what... what
reasons are... suffice today? You mentioned military..."

Jakobsson: "Those who are away from home, those who working as election judges, those who serve in the military, or might be away attending school, or facing a number of other obstacles preventing them from reaching the polling place."

Eddy: "So... so, currently, the intent is to allow people who, for whatever reason on voting day, which... which is a, in our democracy, obviously, a very, very important day. One that we should all revere as... as something dear to... to our democ... Election Day, and you have to... you have to have good reason as the current law stands, not to participate on Election Day, and... and those reasons are enumerated. So,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

what you're attempting to do is... is to allow folks just simply, for whatever reason they want to, if their... if it's just inconvenient, if it... they... they're going to be shopping, if... if they... no reason, whatsoever. Is that... is that the intent of your legislation?"

Jakobsson: "This Bill makes it... eliminates the requirement for a voter to state the necessity to vote absentee."

Eddy: "Well, then it's just as I stated. This... this allows any individual, for whatever reason they want to, to... to vote early, no good cause, just... It's kind of a... a total... a total neglect of the idea that we have an Election Day."

Jakobsson: "This..."

Eddy: "Why... why is this necessary, when today individuals with a legitimate reason can obtain an absentee ballot... has there been a... in your... in your area, in your district, has there been an outcry from the public regarding the fact that the current statutory allowances for absentee voting aren't good enough? Representative, have you had a lot of calls? Is your phone ringing off the hook? Have you got all kinds of people who haven't been able to get an absentee ballot at this point?"

Jakobsson: "We have a number of people who are often... knowing that they might be away during... on Election Day. Perhaps their travel plans are infirmed. There are students, there are snowbirds, there are a number of people who are not able to vote on Election Day, or... and they want to be able to vote absentee. This doesn't extend the voting period. We can already vote during early voting. And this just

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

helps people be able to go in, get their ap... application to vote absentee."

Eddy: "You know, Representative, I... I cannot think of in, and I haven't been here as long as some folks have been here, obviously, but in seven years that I've been in the General Assembly, I don't believe I've received one single phone call, one concern at a town meeting, one example of this being a major problem for people to be able to be at the polls on Election Day, unless they have some type of reason. Do you have any concern at all that... that you're beginning to deteriorate the... the real importance of the Election Day by... by having... having no reason whatsoever? Do you have any concern about that at all?"

Jakobsson: "This is still part of the election process. It gives more people the opportunity to be able to vote."

Eddy: "I... I don't know how it expands the voting pool. I don't think there's anything in here that changes who can vote, or expands that. I don't understand the answer that you gave me. It absolutely makes no sense to... to the question that I asked you. This... this isn't about expanding the eligibility of voters, is it? I mean, you're not changing the age. You're not changing who can vote. You're just changing how they obtain..."

Jakobsson: "We're..."

Eddy: "...an absentee ballot."

Jakobsson: "...we're making it easier for people to obtain their absentee ballot."

Eddy: "Okay. Which is different than astn... expanding eligibility. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

it's important that you pay particular attention to the intent of this legislation. Election Day is Election Day. We have statutes that allow for legitimate purpose, absentee ballots. To change the statute will reduce the number of people who may wait to hear to the last minute, public comments, issues related. It... it takes away from Election Day and the importance of that day as the day that we exercise one of the most sacred rights we have in our democracy. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's quite a few folks who want to talk on this Bill. The timer will be on. Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Oh, first of all, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Miller: "State your inquiry."

Black: "The timer wasn't on for Roger Eddy, why is it on for me?"

Speaker Miller: "It was on for Representative Eddy."

Black: "It was on? I was watching. It wasn't on. He talked for eight minutes. I mean if this Bill is a good Bill, then I shouldn't have to have any excuse for how long I can talk, I can just talk, but you're going to cut me off, right?"

Speaker Miller: "We will allow five minutes, and courtesy as we get… extend them to you."

Black: "That's one thing I like about you, Mr. Speaker, you're a fair man. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

understand why some of you will support this Bill, and it certainly doesn't diminish my respect for those of you who In 1997, in November, my wife and I flew to Paris, France. We rented a car, and we drove from Paris, France to Normandy. And on Veteran's Day of 1997, when my wife and I drove to Normandy, we went through St. Mere Eglise and some of the places that we've all read about during the invasion of France in World War II. We visited the American cemetery above Omaha Beach. I would give you the name, but I can't pronounce the French pronunciation. you ever get an opportunity to visit that, I would suggest that you do that, and Veteran's Day, there's no better day than to visit that cemetery, and look upon rows hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of white crosses, and Stars of David. Several thousand Americans buried in that cemetery in France, above Omaha Beach, and there are a number of those cemeteries around the world. But on June 6, 1944, my father's generation landed in France, and eventually, liberated the world from one of the worst, Godawful dictators the world, I hope, will ever see, and many of them didn't come back home. And as I stood in that cemetery, all I could think of as I stood there many, many years later, and I've been able to enjoy a life that they, who are buried there, gave me and one of the most precious heritages they gave and protected for me was my right to I've never taken that right to vote lightly. vote. never missed an election, and I'm bothered by what's happened in this country. Stand in that cemetery and think with me, imagine in your mind, if you will, look at those

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

crosses. Look at those thousands, and thousands of young men who died that day on June 6, and then explain to me why in the subsequent years we have to stand here on this floor, year after year, and figure out a way to make it easier to vote. Don't put yourself out. Don't make any effort. If it's too cold, or too wet, or too hot, don't worry about voting. Vote by mail, vote by Internet. Vote however you want, but don't make any effort. That's what they sacrificed for? That's what American history is all about? So that you could just vote however is the easiest way for you to vote? I don't understand it. American history is being demeaned, and diminished, and ignored, when all we worry about is how we can make it easier to vote. Well, one way is to say, if you want to vote absentee, you don't need a reason. Just do it, whatever makes you feel good. Visit that cemetery. Look it up on Google. Try and have some remembrance and semblance of American history from the Revolutionary War That right to vote was not given to you easily. on. People sacrificed their lives, their fortune, gave up their sacred honor so that we can vote, and here I stand on the House Floor in 2009, and out of all I hear is, well, let's make it easier to vote. Let's just do whatever we can. This should be no sacrifice, this should be no effort. it the easiest way you want. That is an insult to the memory of my father's generation, and I won't support that insult."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey. What... for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Fritchey: "What's up, Doc? To the ... to the Bill, and ... and I don't know that I could express myself more eloquently than the previous speaker just did. As... as the son and grandson of a veteran, as... as a father of a young girl, you... you learn and you appreciate the... the importance of voting, and the fact that, you know, the importance that you want people to make an effort to exercise their right to vote. Like most of you in this chamber, you know, I often speak to school groups, and I talk to them, and not just grammar school, but high school and college even, about the importance of voting, and the importance of making their voices heard. And we see in other countries, people waiting hours in line, risking their lives for the privilege to vote. Here we see people that won't take five minutes out of their day to do the same. They're already able to vote absentee if that's what they choose. All we ask them to do is say why are you not going to make yourself available to participate on one of the most important days in the year of our country, and that... that is Election Day. I understand the idea, and I support the principle of doing what we can to try to increase voter turnout, but this doesn't do anything to increase voter turnout, necessarily. It simply says, you know what, Election Day, itself, isn't that important, and maybe one day if we go to Internet voting, maybe one day if we go to mail-in ballots, the importance of Election Day will be

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

diminished because of procedural reasons. But I think it sends, albeit, a well-intentioned message, the wrong message right now, that it's not important to exercise your civic duty with your neighbors, with your fellow citizens on Election Day, and let your voice be heard. I understand what this Sponsor's trying to do. I understand what the Bill is trying to do. It's very straightforward. I just think as Representative Black had indicated, Representative Eddy before him, Election Day, especially in a country that is seen as the bastian and hallmark of democracy, Election Day should be an important day. It should be a day that requires you to take effort to think about what you're doing and why you're doing it. I respectfully request a... a 'present' or 'no' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Nekritz. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. With all due respect for the… to the previous speakers, there is nothing sacrosanct about Election Day. We moved away from that a couple of years ago when we instituted early voting, which has been very successful, and very popular with the… with the electorate. We could increase the value of… of Election Day and voting by putting a poll tax on, but I don't think any of us would support that. This is about making… making it easier for people to vote, and some of the peop… some of those people need that kind of ease of access. They might be homebound. They might have a whole bunch of reasons as to why they can't get out, and they may

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

not... we may not have the doctor's excuse, or whatever we need to... for them to accurately fill out the form right for that absentee ballot. So, and... acknowledges the fact that all you have to do is say you're going to be out of the county that day. Well, I... I live a mile from the... from the county line. I can drive over border, spend a couple of hours shopping, like one of the pra... prior speakers mentioned, and then come home and say, oops, I was out of the county, I can get an absentee ballot. It... I think we just need to acknowledge here that there... there is no real reason that we requirements anyway, and we can make this easier for... for folks to ... to get up ... to get up to get a ballot. We'll be helping students. We'll be helping seniors. We'll be helping snowbirds. This Bill came out of the Senate unanimously, and... and I think that's the statement about the view that, again, we want... we want people to have it, to make it easy for them to vote and participate in our democracy. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Rose: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that as well-intentioned as this may be, the… the historical position on this is crocked. If you're infirmed, disabled, you're going to be out of town for a verified absence, absolutely, we want you to participate. The problem with this is, it opens the door… it opens the door to fraud. Our state doesn't exactly have the best track record in this area, I

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

might add, but you talk about handing an open... you know, just to hand over the election to a precinct captains to go walk out, walk in your home and go ahead and execute that ballot while you're sitting there, I don't know why anybody would support this. The protections are in place if you're infirmed, you're disabled, you're legitimately out of town. We want you to participate. This doesn't make any sense. The only... I don't understand why... why we would open this door, given the history of this state. I have zero comfort level with it, and I... I agree with virtually all the people just spoke on the matter. I mean, Representative Fritchey was eloquent. Representative Black was eloquent. Representative Eddy was eloquent. This is a bad idea. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what purpose do you..."

Osterman: "Thank you..."

Speaker Miller: "...seek recognition?"

Osterman: "...Speaker Miller. And for the record, I don't know that Representative Fritchey was too eloquent on this, friend as he is. But you know, I'm listening to the debate and, you know, I'm... I'm confused about where the importance that we are putting things. Election Days have evolved over the last couple of years. We have early voting now. We've seen historic voter turnout in the last Presidential Election, people that have never voted before. I'm someone who went to other states to campaign for our President in poor areas that people had disinterest in government, but felt empowered. So today, when I'm hearing about how the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

history of our country, and how people have fought and died for Election Day, you know, where I stand, I think those people have fought and died for the ability for someone to vote. And every person on this floor, every person in this state, every person in this country, how they look at how they vote, and that precious right that we have as American citizens, they view that differently. And I think that everyone should have an interest in fighting, preserving, and encouraging, and doing everything we can to empower people to vote. So, that should be what we're fighting for, the ability for someone to vote. Representative's trying to do is not to create fraud. There's laws on the books that will prevent that, and if they don't, people will be found guilty, and they'll go to jail. What the Representative is simply trying to do is try to enable more people to vote in our state, and that's something I think all of us should do. I think it's something that is a patriotic thing to do. We should embrace this, and we should fight for the right to vote, not for the right for... to celebrate Election Day. All of us view that differently. People go there with their families, and vote with their neighbors. Other people embracing early voting, but we should empower people to This is another mechanism to do that, and I ask for a strong 'aye' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Lake,

Representative Cole, for what purpose do you seek

recognition?"

Cole: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "The Sponsor indicates she will."

Cole: "Representative, currently, we have laws in the state… in the United States, to allow people to vote 30 days prior to the election, and certainly, if I want to go shopping on Election Day, I can choose to also vote the 29 days before Election Day. But I have a question for you, I voted early the last two elections, and I've gone with my daughter, or I've gone with my son, and I'm wondering if you could tell me why I'm not allowed, as a mother, to assist my daughter in voting?"

Jakobsson: "Why are you not allowed to assist your daughter in voting? That's your question..."

Cole: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "...you're asking me?"

Cole: "I've gone with her for the last two elections to vote early, prior to Election Day, and the election judges won't allow me to help her vote. I'm wondering why that is, and..."

Jakobsson: "Is there..."

Cole: "...might there be a reason for an election judge to say to a mother or father, no, you're not going to walk up to that voting booth and help your child vote."

Jakobsson: "Is your child old enough to vote?"

Cole: "Yes, she is. You know, we have laws in this state that say as... as a parent, I really... am... am not allowed to have undue influence over taking my mother, or my aunt, or my sister, and my son to go vote, and when you allow absentee ballots to go into the home without any kind of reason for why someone wants a ballot delivered to their home, there's

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

going to be undue influence. We're trying to avoid that, and I think we've done a really good job here in the last couple of elections by saying, 30 days prior to an election you can go vote early. You may be in the hospital. You may have other things to do on Election Day, but you have the ability for... for three weeks to go vote early, at your convenience, all throughout the State of Illinois. I don't understand why it's so difficult to understand why, when the ballots are sent to someone's home, there could be undue influence by a parent, by a child over an invalid... mother or father, over a child that just doesn't want to There... there is a.m. there is a perception that there may be fraud at that point. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. think we've solved a lot of the issues in this country by allowing for early voting, and I think we... we've come to a point where that early voting is very important in this country, but to not have a reason... if you haven't voted in the 20... in the 23, or 24, or 5... 25 days prior to the election, on Election Day, to not have a reason, I think, we're opening up the door for undue influence by a family member or a... or a union, or a... or a precinct captain, or a precinct committeeman to influence people who... who may be in a position of needing to be influenced. I have two more questions, Representative Jakobsson. Is this... is this ethics reform?"

Jakobsson: "This has to do with the election law." Cole: "Is this... is this a Bill about transparency?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Jakobsson: "This is a Bill about absentee voting and eliminating the necessity when applying... for saying what the reason is."

Cole: "I think this Bill opens up the door for, not transparency, it opens up the door for a backwards step on ethics. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "... ill."

Watson: "You know, I wasn't sure if I was going to speak on the Bill or not, and... and I do greatly respect two people on the other side of the aisle, and the divergence, or their... the difference in their opinion. But I thought about where I was this time last year, and as we try to prepare to help the Iraqis roll up for elections. We define success as the peaceful transition of power via elections, and our number on challenge was how to ensure ballot integrity, how to ensure that the... that the Iraqi citizens would say, yes, we voted, we spoke, and we accept these... this ballot turnout because we know it's legitimate. And... and my concern is, as I look at this, is we would never have went to them and said, here's how to do it. Let people vote any way they want with whatever reasons. There had to be a system and a structure, and if we would never go to them and say, do it this way, then why would we roll back to this point. And... and for those who say, and this is a valid... valid, valid point, for those who say, well, it's too hard to vote.

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Those individuals risked life and death, and had a 70 percent voter turnout. So, don't tell me it can't be done, and please, think about the consequences here. We would not go to a... a merging democracy and institute these practices. Why in the world would we institute them here? Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Lake,

Representative May, for what purpose do you seek

recognition?"

"Yes, Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. May: When we're talking about history, I... I have to admit that I was a voter's service chair for the League of Women Voters, and my first involvement with government was to hold candidates' meetings, to do voters' guides, to encourage people to vote, to make it easier, and I think that we are providing better access for the people who would like to vote, for seniors, for whatever reason. That... the ballot access is why people fought and died for democracy in this country. I'm just... I'm surprised that people are afraid of this, and when someone asks if there's a clamoring from this, I do hear from my constituents who really do believe in opening up and making it easier for people to vote, anything to encourage people to vote. That's what we are doing among the other... the Illinois Association of County These are the people who are in touch with constituents and deal with voting every day, they support I... I think that we should encourage this legislation. people to vote, make it easier for people to vote, and that is what democracy is all about. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Boland: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. As I listen to the debate, I think that one of the things that we forget is the whole lesson of America has been to widen the opportunities economically, socially, and politically within our great And one of the drives that's been throughout history has been to open up the process, the election process, to more and more people. At one time, we only had white males over the age of 21 who owned a certain amount of land. Obviously, we moved away from that. It took a long time, but we moved to what they called free white male suffrage. We then opened it up later to women, to African Americans. People died for this, not only on battlefield, but people died in the streets of some of our southern states for this right to vote. As we've moved into history, we move into the modern era where we've done away with those overt discriminations, but we still have had obstacles that have kept people from voting. instituted early voting, and it's a great institution, really. My wife and I for the very first time, we've always been the type of people that like to go to the polls on Election Day and cast our ballot, but due to some family obligations, we ended up having to early vote. It was a great convenience. That's what this is. This is just adding a little bit of convenience for our modern society that has become extremely mobile, that has all kinds of things to distract them, and unfortunately or fortunately,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

some of them may not be able to place what we, who are more traditionalists, like to do and go to the ballot box on Election Day. This is just one further step in that great march of democracy of opening up the process to more and more people. Hopefully, it will show those folks in other countries that we are a vibrant democracy continuing to look for improvement. That's the great sign of America. We are constantly trying to improve. We are not satisfied with what has happened in the past, and so we want to try to improve in whatever way we can. This is one small step that our state, the Land of Lincoln, which we always brag about, gets to take. We can help to lead the way and be a forerunner in this regard. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Durkin: "To the Bill. You know, I've been around for the motor voter legislation, the early voting, and everybody said, these are good, transparent ways to encourage... get more people on the voting rolls, and that's fine, but I think what we've seen over... since those laws has been a greater incident of fraud that's happened in our electoral process. We had... yes, we had historic turnout last election with the also seeing an early voting, but we are investigations of voter fraud that are being conducted in every state in the Union. And we've basically, every time we loosen these requirements, we're creating a cottage industry for a lot of these public interest groups, ACORN

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

for one, to perpetuate this type of fraud. So, I can't in good conscience vote for this, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I won't berate the issue, but somebody on your side of the aisle as they are wont to do say, well, some... well, we must be afraid of democracy over here. Well, how could you possibly oppose this? Someone else said, well, this will Someone else said, this opens up boost voter turnout. democracy. I didn't know it was closed. I had no idea it was closed. But none of you mentioned one thing. You really want to... you really want to increase voter turnout? You really want to do that? I've got a Bill on the Calendar. Have a Bill on the Calendar that says we'll have an open Primary in the State of Illinois. Want... if you want to increase turnout, tell a Representative on your side of the aisle, withdraw a hostile Amendment, let's vote on it. You really want to open up voting in the State of Illinois? Let's go to an open Primary. Why in the world do we have to... we're one of the few states left where you have to declare your Party to vote in a Primary Election. Now, I've heard a lot of good reasons for that, but you and I know what the real reason is. The Party bosses get in the file and see if you voted Republican or Democrat. You don't believe me? I'll bet in the federal trial, it comes

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

the Blagojevich administration... how many 011t. Republicans do you figure they hired? You really want to do this, Representative, amend your Bill and go to an open Primary. A Bill I've carried for six years that your side of the aisle kills every single year. It got out of committee thanks to a couple of Democrat votes. Amendment filed on it to make sure that you wouldn't get the right to vote on an open Primary. You want to take democracy into the 21st century? Vote for an open Primary. Most of you over there don't even want to be counted on that. You're all staring at your computers, all looking at the ceiling. Open Primary, I didn't have any idea that was out here. Gosh, I... I'd never thought of that. You never thought of that because your Party bosses won't let you vote on it, and your Party bosses don't want it. And there are Party bosses on my side of the aisle who don't want it either, but the people you... we represent do. So, don't give me all this nonsense about, well, we'll open up democracy. When did it close? Well, we'll make it easier. How much easier can you make it? You want to boost voter turnout and put the people back in charge of elections? Vote for an open Primary. I look forward to 35 Democrat cosponsors on my open Primary Bill, but I won't hold my breath."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Flider, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flider: "Just a question for the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "The Sponsor indicates she will yield."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Flider: "Yes, Representative, just studying your Bill, and I know the debate's been going on a long time. I haven't heard all of it, but is there a requirement that when a person goes to vote early in the weeks before the scheduled election date that they have to state the reason why they're voting early?"

Jakobsson: "No, there isn't."

Flider: "Okay. Well, thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she will."

Bost: "Representative, could you once again, before we close out this debate, repeat right now what the law is? What exactly you can go in and vote early, vote absentee ballot for? What the... what those requirements are right now?"

Jakobsson: "There are several requirements, Representative, and separate applications are available for different ones. They include those who are working as election judges, those serving in the military, attending school, or facing a number of other obstacles preventing them from reaching the polling place."

Bost: "All... all sensible, legitimate reasons, correct?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Bost: "Would you say that? Yes. Representative, I... I can go down the whole veterans and things that everybody else has done, but what I'd really like to know is... is that... do you

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

believe it is important for a voter... a voter to be as informed as possible at the time of their voting?"

Jakobsson: "Certainly."

Bost: "Certainly. Then why in the world whenever they are, prior to an Election Day when certain things might come to light, towards the end of the election more information be found out where you can be a better informed voter would you go ahead and say, well, for whatever reason... and I understand the importance of those reasons listed, and if you wanted to add to those one by one, I could understand that, but just swinging the door open and encouraging people to vote when they're maybe not as informed as they should, and could possibly be by waiting 'til the last day, that day, the Election Day, to vote so you are encouraging uninformed voters to vote, correct?"

Jakobsson: "No. Absentee voting already exists. Early voting already exists."

Bost: "Rep... Representative, let me ask you this..."

Jakobsson: "I don't think people are asked, have you read everything..."

Bost: "Let... Yeah, there are..."

Jakobsson: "...there is, or are you as informed as you should be."

Bost: "Rep... Representative..."

Jakobsson: "That's not part of our..."

Bost: "...let me ask you this. Have you learned more today than you did yesterday? Are there certain things in life that you've learned?"

Jakobsson: "Today?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Bost: "Today."

Jakobsson: "Sure."

Bost: "Did you... have you learned something today that you didn't know yesterday?"

Jakobsson: "Probably."

Bost: "Uh huh. So, every day that we can... can wait until people get the opportunity to vote on that very last day, they can be as well informed as they possibly can be, and we can encourage them to do that thing, which might take a little effort on their part to actually go in and be an important aspect of what we consider here in the United States, an informed voter. Not a, oh, let's say a drive-up window voter, where I can ask for it right now, and get it right now, and just throw it out there, and not have to really think about what I'm doing. Ma'am, I'm..."

Jakobsson: "This isn't changing the election time period. This is just changing..."

Bost: "No, no. Yes."

Jakobsson: "...the absentee."

Bost: "No, it is. It is changing for that individual person the time frame in which it allows them that opportunity to think about one of the most important things that they're going to be doing that year, which is electing those elected people who are going to serve them, either in this Body, in their local bodies, or in the bodies in the United States. And I'm going to tell you, Ma'am, that it's very important, I think, to be as well-informed as possible, and... and you don't agree with that?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Jakobsson: "I have confidence in the voters that when they are ready to vote, they feel that they have learned what they can learn about candidates and issues."

Bost: "Yes, and I'm... I have confidence in the voters, too, but who's to say that the events that would occur don't happen on a Monday, or a Saturday, or a Sunday before the election on Tuesday. But we went ahead and thought, well, just for convenience sake, I'm going to go ahead and run and throw that ballot in there, and then all of a sudden, something comes out on that Monday, and then you... then for four, or two, or the election period set forth, that person made a terrible mistake."

Jakobsson: "As has been said over and over, this doesn't change the time frame of elections."

Bost: "It does. It does not change the time frame of the voting public at all in the general over... overall, but for the individual, it does. It... it'll... it shortens their time to consider exactly what they shortens their time to consider exactly what they should vote, and how they should vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Folks, it don't... don't let your... let all of yourselves be fooled by the fact that, okay, this is a more convenient thing and we'll just be able to pop out. What this does is, it discourages people from taking the time to truly consider, and then wait until the right time to cast their vote, after all of the evidence has been heard on that day, the Election Day, which is so vitally important. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Froehlich, seeks recognition. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Froehlich: Bill. We've just been told you need to wait until Election Day to vote, because there's new information. argument ap... that argument applies to the early voting. I guess we should repeal early voting. Early voting made a significant change, and by the way, Representative Black, I do support open Primary. I'm happy to sign on to your... to your Bill. Look, Election Day's not what it used to be. Due to not just early voting, but late registration, where somebody can go to the county clerk a few days before the election to register and then vote in person, immediately. Okay? And as far as fraud goes, you don't need this Bill if you want to commit fraud with an absentee ballot. This Bill simply says, you don't have to check the box to say you're going to be outside the county on Election Day. This Bill is not that big a change. This Bill is not that big a deal. That's why the Senate passed it unanimously. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Sullivan: "Representative, you had indicated in the debate that the County Clerks' Association is in favor of this, or neutral? Or, I'm sorry. In the debate, I believe one of

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

the Representatives said that they are in support or neutral. Can you clarify for us where the county clerks' position is?"

Jakobsson: "My information that I have says that the Illinois
Association of County Clerks, an association, is a
proponent."

Sullivan: "Is a proponent?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Do... do you know that your county clerk just called us and said that that is incorrect?"

Jakobsson: "That might be his position. As I said..."

Sullivan: "No, no, no, no, no, no."

Jakobsson: "...the information that I have..."

Sullivan: "That is the position of the County Clerks' Association."

Jakobsson: "That's not the information I have."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, I'm just trying to update information that you might have that is wrong, that we're hearing word from the county clerks that the County Clerks' Association is... is neutral on the Bill, and they are not proponents. Secondly, we had someone on or side of aisle that... that many of us would consider a hero, talk to you about what the UN's position is in regard to this very particular legislation. How do you answer him when he says that the United Nations, which is all... many would consider a very liberal organization, would never allow this to happen in a fledgling country that would we're trying to help turn into a democracy? How... how do you answer that?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Jakobsson: "We have stability in this country. This is... this system has been in place, our elections for our country, and when they're talking about a country that's not stable, that's an entirely different address."
- Sullivan: "Do... do you go by stability? The voter turnout is that what you call stability because in Iraq people had to go through many things to get to vote with the potential of dying, and in that country, the United Nations would not allow this piece of legislation to move forward. Don't you agree that the United Nations is a very liberal organization?"
- Jakobsson: "I'm thankful that we've had people stand up for our country, fight for our country, die for our country, and give us voting rights. This is about elections in the United States."
- Sullivan: "Thank... thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I don't know what else we can say about this, but the County Clerks are neutral, and we just received word from them and... and when the United Nations, who's trying to help the voter process throughout the world, would not allow this to be used in a country we're trying to foster voters' rights, then why in the world do we want to have this here? I don't... it... it boggles the mind. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Riley, there are two other speakers on this. We just want to go ahead and hear them out."

Riley: "I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I was... I was not going to speak on this until I heard the Gentleman from Cook talk about fraud. Now, I will not be lectured by the Gentleman from Cook. I wonder... to the... if the Lady will yield for a question. Repre... Representative, under your legislation, will you be able to put campaign signs in a school bus and deliver them to households?"

Jakobsson: "That's not part of this legislation."

Stephens: "Or, would you... is that... is that covered under your Bill?"

Jakobsson: "This is talking about absentee voting."

Stephens: "Well, I'm talking about those absentee voters.

Would... would, under your Bill, would a... an anonymous

Representative from Cook be able to use a school bus to

deliver campaign signs to his office?"

Jakobsson: "This Bill is addressing the changes to absentee voting..."

Stephens: "Yeah, you're right..."

Jakobsson: "...requirements."

Stephens: "...and one of... and one of your defenders wants to talk to me about fraud. I wonder... I wonder if you could go down to the assessor's office with a special stack marked with your initials on it, and then we see campaign contributions to the Illinois Democratic Party, to Citizens for Madigan,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

to the Democrats that you're trying to shove down our throats, the ones you're trying to steal elections with."

Jakobsson: "Let's talk about Senate Bill 2022."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, we... there are a variety of reasons to be for or against this legislation. Members on each side of the aisle have tried to invoke the souls of veterans who died on the beaches at Omaha, and those that died in recent wars. I don't know that... what those soldiers, and sailors, and Marines, and airmen that died would think of this Bill, but I do know that they would... they would probably chastise us a little bit for debating over their memory and how we should use it to our advantage. I... so, I resent that a little bit, but I tell you, we have so many serious issues before us, and then to have one of your Members on your side of the aisle, Speaker, stand up and... and use the word fraud, that's the ultimate insult. It's an insult to all of us, Representative."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Lang: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before you turn on the clock, can we get a little quieter in here? Thank you. I know you love playing with the gavel, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've sat through a very long debate on a pretty simple Bill. I've... we've heard about voter fraud, and we've heard about Omaha Beach, and we've heard about school buses with signs, and we've heard about all kinds of things, but this is a very simple Bill. Yes, it would be good if people went out and voted. We all want people to

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

vote. At least, I think we all do. There's some question about whether some people in this room actually want people to vote. This is a simple Bill. People can go to vote before elections in early voting without any reason at all, without any reason at all. They've always been able to vote absentee by checking a box on a form, and some of those boxes require no proof at all, and all the Lady wants to do is simplify the process. Why should the county clerk have to sort out dozens and dozens of forms? One form, one absentee ballot, one vote. People can vote now all kinds of different ways without any excuse at all for voting early, without any excuse at all for voting absentee. the Lady wants to do is make a simple change in the law. Now, one would have to question, certainly not everybody's motivation, but one would have to question the motivation of some from the other side of the aisle when we know how the other side of the aisle has felt, for instance, about... about, well, let's say Senate Bill 600. So, we're all about, on this side of the aisle, letting people vote. want people to vote for their elected officials. them to have the opportunity to vote in elections. them to have the opportunity to vote for their leaders. want them to have the opportunity to vote. For those on the other side of the aisle that brought up how men and women have died for their right to vote, we agree. have done that, and people ought to come out and vote, but I find it curious that those that are worried about the right to vote would deny people the right to vote when you, maybe, you don't like how they're going to vote, or maybe

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

you think that a certain form may bring out a few extra votes on the other side of the aisle when there's no evidence of that, whatsoever. I notice you have... you're all concerned about people's right to vote except when it comes to some of your Party Leaders. You're not interested in having people come out to vote for that, and then you want to raise the ... you want to use this Bill to attack a decent Legislator on this side of the aisle that does the work of the people for his district, without mentioning his name, I think that's appalling. appalling the way you've treated Representative Jakobsson over the last couple of days. It's appalling the way you continue to attack Representative Froehlich. Why don't we get around to the peop... the people's business, and why don't we just take a look at what this Bill does? A very simple Bill to codify what most of the practice is anyway. A very simple Bill. It won't lead to voter fraud. won't lead to any of these weird excesses that you're talking about. People can vote early today. They don't need this Bill to do that. So, the concern that this is going to bring about voter fraud is a red herring of the worst kind. I don't know what's going on with you folks over there on that side of the aisle, but I, for one, am not going to sit here and listen to it for much longer. And so... and so... and so, you can expect for the next 10 days that when you continue to attack Members on this side of the aisle for no good reason... now, if you have a good reason, I'll help you, but if you want to attack people on this side of the aisle for no good reason, you're going to

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- have some people on this side of the aisle pretty angry, and we're going to deal with that in the way we need to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Miller: "Any further dis... questions? Repre... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Miller: "The previous question has been moved. The Chair recognizes Representative Jakobsson to close."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2022 is a very simple Bill, but it's an important Bill. It eliminates the requirement for a voter to state the necessity of the application for the absentee ballot. People, yes, can vote often... can vote early, but they can't always leave their homes in order to do that. And they... people who are voting absentee have to fill out an application, they have to get the ballot back, they have to send it in. It's not because they don't want to take the effort. They have to put in as much or more effort in order to vote absentee. Let's make at least the requirement part of that application disappear so people can just get their absentee ballots and vote like the rest of us are able to do. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House... shall the House pass Senate Bill 2022?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Tryon. Mr. Clerk, take the record.

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

On a vote of 69 'yeas', 48 'nays', 0 'presents', the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'approve for consideration' is floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2132."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

Reboletti: "I... I heard the previous speaker close the debate. I was very interested to find out about if who was concerned about who will come out to vote, because we wanted to have a Special Election for the U.S. Senate seat, but guess what, we couldn't have it. What were... what was ... what were you afraid of? Who would come out to vote at that time? You've... you were afraid that you would lose the U.S. Senate seat that is now... that was the former President Obama's Senate seat. So, when you talk about who's coming out to vote for whom, nobody's afraid. We're prepared to do what we have to do to make sure that there are fair elections in this state, but when you deny the people of my district and the State of Illinois an opportunity to vote for a U.S. Senate under a cloud of corruption, then I don't think that you have any position to speak about that particular Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

Joyce: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, can I get your attention for a second? Hey, Bill, give me your... give me your attention for a second, Bill. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Black, if you will. I have a... two very special guests here today, up in the gallery. One is a former Member of the General Assembly, and was also the past president, and a very unbelievably committed woman to the people of... the State of Illinois, and the past president of the Special Olympics of Illinois, former Legislator Pam Munizzi. And... and what brings her down here today is she's got her nephew with her. Anthony, would you please stand, please? Anthony just received, about an hour ago, the Illinois Medal of Honor for bravery in the line of duty. He was injured, shot in the shoulder. Thank you... thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Miller: "Welcome to Springfield, and thank you for your service, Anthony. The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mendoza: "A purpose for an announcement, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to announce that today after the softball game, and after the House beats the Senate, you're all welcome to go to Representative Jack Frank's house where we'll be having a party, and a good time will be had by all. So, you're all welcome. Thanks."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative

Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

"Thank you. Joining us in the gallery today are a Mautino: group of steel workers from Hennepin, Illinois, the head of our union's Dave York, Duane Calbow, who is the vicepresidents of them, and they're here on behalf of the Hennepin Steel Mill, which also has an impact on Riverdale, Mr. Speaker, as well. As some of you may or may not know, ArcelorMittal is the largest steel company, and by its pattern and its practice has been closing and taking the equipment out of their American operations, and has been taking that and shipping it into their foreign markets to bring in their foreign steel. Recently, they announced the closure of Hennepin plant. These people are here fighting for their jobs because the world's largest steel company has refused to sell that steel plant to a willing bidder, and this has been their pattern and practice. They have laid off 428 people in the Speaker's district, Speaker Miller for today, and we join together with them in trying to get ArcelorMittal to listen to the Steel Caucus and to stop this pattern of practice of destroying American jobs in order to increase their levels of production that they can bring in from other countries. This is the fight that being placed here by the steel workers in our automotive industries and you can see it by going two hours north, or travel to Representative Miller's district and you see the people who are laid off there. Many of our Representatives

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

have been hit. This is where we need to try and urge Congress to take some action and quit rewarding companies that destroy American jobs and American lives. We're honored to have you here, and hopefully, we can help you out."

- Speaker Miller: "Welcome to Springfield. On page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 214... Excuse me, correction.

 On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2145,
 Representative Joyce. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2145, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Joyce, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Miller: "Represent... Representative Joyce on the Amendment."
- Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment 2, the only difference is on two different... from committees testimony yesterday, the only difference is there's a \$500 thousand increase in Section 15. It's on page 86 of the Bill, which was a staff mistake, and we inadvertently left out \$500 thousand worth of employees' salaries. And then on page 32, when it came to regards of the General Assembly, we had to actually match up the total line item to the individual line item for the pay sal... the salary of the Members of the General Assembly, and that's actually a reduction from yesterday's testimony. I'd be happy to answer any questions and move the adoption of the Amendment."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Seeing no questions, all those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No..."

Speaker Miller: "Excuse me, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Miller: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2145, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2145 would allow us to fund our operational expenses in the state agencies. It would pay for personnel services, cover all collectively bargained employees, and all merit employees, and this would indeed, allow State Government to still function come July 1. This is a spending Bill that authorizes State Government operations. I'd be happy to answer any questions that any of you might have. I know that there will be further appropriation Bills coming down the road to expand our spending abilities as the Leaders continue to negotiate the budget."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to vote on this Bill, so I'm just going to vote early. Is that all right? I don't need a reason. Okay. I... as I leave, just vote me however you want. I don't need a reason, but I do... I would like to ask a question, if the Sponsor would yield."

Speaker Miller: "The Spon..."

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Miller: "...the Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Black: "All right. Representative Joyce, you know, I hold you in the highest regard, but this isn't a real budget, is it?"

Joyce: "This... feel good, is it?"

Black: "This isn't a real budget, is it? It doesn't have salary increases in it. It doesn't have grant funds in it. It's kind of a, what would we call it, an outline?"

Joyce: "This is... this is an appropriations Bill. It's a spending Bill. It... it's not the complete spending Bill of the State Government operations that we're going to see, but it... but it's a start that covers all existing employees, all existing in operat... existing operations."

Black: "Okay. So, it really only has GRF money that we are anticipating we'll have. I always love it when we pass a budget when we still don't know the revenue, but... It seems a backwards way to do it, but what isn't plugged in here? I mean there... these figures aren't... aren't realistic. I've been here long enough to know that. So, what... what isn't in here? We... you haven't plugged in the anticipation of grant funds, or things of that nature?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Joyce: "This... this is GRF money now, and then..."

Black: "Okay. Money that we think we're going to have."

Joyce: "That we reasonably believe we will have."

Black: "Okay. Now..."

Joyce: "And... and I would say there's, what, 2 b... over 2 billion's for collective bargaining units, 645 million for the other employees, merit comp employees, and a billion dollars for other operations, there... you know, everything from contractual services to data processing, tele... telecommunications, but the... the ones that have... the funds that have zero GRF are not in here. They will be funded. They will be appropriated in a later Bill. Things like the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission, Teachers' Retirement System, General Assembly Retirement System, all the retirement systems for that matter."

Black: "Okay."

Joyce: "The Capital Develop Board, Metropolitan Pier, Environmental Protection Agency, Historic Preservation Agency. I mean..."

Black: "All right."

Joyce: "...you want me to keep..."

Black: "In... in the General Assembly portion of this Bill, I'm going to assume there's no appropriation in there for the proposed cost of living increase for Members of the General Assembly and constitutionally elected office holders."

Joyce: "That is correct."

Black: "So, I'm assuming that without some extraordinary action, then the cost of living raise that we are due by law will not be funded, unless we change it later on."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Joyce: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. There are a number of these sections, for example, on page 38 of Amendment #2, on line 11, Section 17, the amount of \$1 shall be appropriated from the General Revenue Fund to the Department on Aging for professional and artistic services, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. Is that put there simply because we... you do not have the anticipated figure that will go in there?"

Joyce: "That... that's correct and I don't think, and I want to be very clear, I don't think anyone's saying that all these are going to be cut down to a \$1 like in this particular case. I think we're definitely going to come back and put more money into that. I don't think we've figured out what that number is yet, and I think, you know, that will be forthcoming... "

Black: "All right."

Joyce: "...in a ...in another Bill."

Black: "Now, as I recall, artistic and professional services generally do not... if the money's put in there, as I recall, those are non-bid services, aren't they? I think former Governor Blagojevich loved professional and..."

Joyce: "Right."

Black: "...artistic services."

Joyce: "Well, they cannot be swept."

Black: "It can be swept. Okay. Now, does... does this Amendment consider or take into account, or otherwise roll in a potential income tax increase to meet any of the figures you've put in here?"

Joyce: "No."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Black: "No. So, you're talking then about this Amendment being a relatively flat... I don't like the work doomsday. I... I thought we were done with that six years of doom and gloom and the sky is falling, and if you don't vote for this, a hex on your house or what... I thought we were beyond that."

Joyce: "Me too. Me too."

Black: "So, I don't like the word doomsday budget, but this reflects, perhaps, a flat growth budget."

Joyce: "A streamlined budget, I'd say."

Black: "That... that's a good word, streamlined budget. I'll..."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Black, could you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Black: "...you I will, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for your indulgence, and thank the Sponsor."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Indicates he will."

Franks: "I just wanted to follow up with a few questions from the previous speaker. In... is this the same level as the 2009 budget?"

Joyce: "Actually, it's probably more the 2010 introduced, because we're talking about merit comp, we're talking about collective bargained agreements, so those... these numbers that are in this appropriations spending Bill are really required by law to be introduced at that level. So, it's really 2010 proposed."

Franks: "So, there's an increase because of com..."

Joyce: "Existing contracts."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Franks: "...of existing contractual... Okay. Have... would this document here reflect any of the efficiencies that we've been trying to get in these last few months? Has... are there any cuts at all in any of the agencies? Has there been any consolidation? Has there been anything in here that would show any ability to... to save any money?"

Joyce: "So, the… so, the way this is done, Representative Franks, is that the agencies in this appropriation Bill for their other operations expenses, the nonemployee expenses, we're giving lump son… lump sums and the discretion to effectively cut those operations to what they deem the most effective and efficient way."

Franks: "Well, I'm going to use Human Services for an example. I'm looking at our analysis here, and I see in FY09, we did 660,710,000, and in this budget, we're at 665,000,000. So, we went up 4.4 million on Human Services, and as a result, our Social Security match is higher as well by another 350,000. So, it's an increase of about \$4.8 million for Human Services, for instance. And my... and my concern is, Mr. Farnham had done some investigation on that agency and learned, for instance, that they had spent \$56 million on overtime. And I'm concerned about appropriating a lump sum in a situation like this, when I don't think that they've managed the department correctly in a way that we would limit that overtime, because it might have been cheaper to actually hire some employees, and I'm concerned about that. I don't know if you... if you're... if you're the right person to answer this question."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Joyce: "So... so, the overtime costs, for the most part, have come from contract with a collectively bargained unit and right now, there's a negotiation going on with that collecti... collectively bargained unit and the Governor's Office, and by giving them this... this discretionary way to appropriate, I think it's fair that we stay out of that negotiation. It's between the Governor's Office and the collective bargaining unit."

Franks: "No... and I'm not disagreeing with you. My... Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that. I quess I'll go to the And my... my only concern is, I understand what Representative Joyce is trying to do and I don't think you have choice because of our... of our contracts, but what I'm concerned about is the perpetuation of a structure that is imploding. And I think until we work harder, and do a zero-based budget, every year we are going to be faced with this same conundrum. You know, do we vote for this, or do we not? And because of the contracts, oftentimes we're put into this position, but the fact is, we are never looking at the underlying agencies and requiring them to defend their line items. And I think that the way we do our budget system here is... is probably the worst system that one could put together if one tried. And until we go to a zero-based budget, we are always going to have this structural problem. And I'd encourage us to think long and hard before we vote on these things to determine whether maybe we need to go back to the drawing board, 'cause that's something I think we need to do, otherwise, we're never going to solve our problems in this state."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

 Representative Mulligan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will."
- Mulligan: "Representative, were there any questions asked in your committee before this Bill was passed?"
- Joyce: "Hmmm. I'm not... I'm not quite sure, I... you know what, there was..."
- Mulligan: "I'm sorry."
- Joyce: "...one or two... one or two questions, I think. You mean...
 any questions on the actual presentation of the Bill?"
- Mulligan: "Yeah. Were there any questions on this committee as to what's in this Bill?"
- Joyce: "I... I think I explained everything that was in the Bill, and I think Representative Mautino did ask a question, yeah."
- Mulligan: "Good for him. I really applaud that."
- Joyce: "And... and we've been having hearings for the last four months with active participation from all the Members in the committee."
- Mulligan: "I understand that, but the good portion of your Bill has nothing to do with... with the hearings you had in your committee. It has to do with other..."
- Joyce: "I can't hear you. I'm sorry."
- Mulligan: "Well, listen up strong. It... a lot of this Bill has nothing to do with what's in your committee. It has to do with..."
- Joyce: "All right."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Mulligan: "...what came before other committees. So, if your committee voted on the parts of the Bill that they looked at, I'm sure they were familiar with it. But as far as the other parts of the Bill, because all these Bills are composite, there are other parts of the Bill that people in your committee knew nothing about, and did not ask any questions about. Is that not correct?"

Joyce: "No, I think Representative Mautino asked about the operations of those other departments that you're talking about because it was the funding of the operations and the funding of the collectively bargained units..."

Mulligan: "Right, and you have..."

Joyce: "...in those..."

Mulligan: "...an amount..."

Joyce: "...in those departments, and the merit compensation employees in those departments, in addition to which the money that has been appropriated in this Bill to those departments, Representative, is... cannot, in the way the Bill is written, cannot be transferred out. So, it ain't... you know, I think if you're going along the same lines as Representative Franks was going and worried about where is this money going, and the discretion that's in... that's in... given to the agency. It can't be... or the Governor's Office, it can't be moved out of those departments. It has to be spent in those departments."

Mulligan: "Well, what I'm worried about is the fact the way that the series of Bills that's going to be voted on is put together, it makes it practically impossible for the people that have given up their time for years, or for this

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Session, to track what happens in those individual agencies that they care about, and that they know about, because they've divided the money up. But I have another question for you. How can you put the amount of money in for the bargaining unit, when normally we don't know what they're going to bargain, and we don't signal to the unions how we're going to bargain? Was it a guesstimate of what..."

Joyce: "No."

Mulligan: "...you think will be there?"

Joyce: "No. It was a baseline budget to keep the operations going."

Mulligan: "So, isn't it right that if we pass the whole series of Bills that's coming up, that we could go home from here without doing anything else? We don't have to do capital; we don't have do any more of a budget. You have a core budget that you could walk out of here with, except you wouldn't fund grants, and you wouldn't fund a lot of things that are important to people, or you could use the core budget as leverage for people to get their things in if they want to pass an income tax increase, or you could walk out of here without doing a capital Bill, because this is part of a series of Bills that gives you a core budget that dumps it on to the Governor and a few other people. That is part of the reverse psychology of what was used last year of doing a full budget and dumping it on to the Governor, all coming out of this House, and that you had Members sitting in your committee that made no statements or didn't even ask questions about some of the important parts of this Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Joyce: "Well, you know what, we... Representative, you know, there were some questions asked and we communicated with your staff and the Members on your side of the aisle in the committee quite extensively, and we... to answer your question, yeah, we could go home at any time. You know, and I think it would be pretty difficult. I don't think this is the end. I think there's more funding coming, Representative. I think we're going to see that, and I think talking about last year, you know what, I wasn't dealing with this... with this type of a Bill last year, and I'm ready to move on. I hope that..."

Mulligan: "That's really..."

Joyce: "...you are, too."

Mulligan: "...too bad, because there are a lot of us that have dealt with this over the years that don't see this as a good way to do a budget."

Joyce: "Okay. Well, then vote 'no'."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition? The Gentleman from Du... the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Biggins: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I... I'd just like to address the Body on the merits of the Bill. I support the Bill, and the chairman. I'm the Republican spokesman on Appropriations General Services. We heard several months, different agencies' budgets, 80 percent of... 90 percent of the budgets in this Bill are from those committee hearings. So, I do support House Bill 2145."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Speaker Miller: "Seeing no further discussion, Rep...

 Representative Joyce? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2145 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On a count of 104 'yeas', 8 'nays', 5 'presents', House Bill 2145 have... has received the Constitutional Majority, and is declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2206.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Yarbrough, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Karen Yarbrough on the Amendment."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2 to House Bill 2206 fixes some drafting errors in the Bill, and it's a technical Amendment. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady moves for adoption of the Amendment.

 The Gentleman from Jasper... On the adoption, all those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Miller: "...Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2006... a Bill... House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Karen Yarbrough."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. House Bill 2206, as amended, is an appropriation of all other state funds and federal funds to all the state agencies receiving these types of funds. Basically, any of the funds that are not GRF. It appropriates 27.3 billion in other state funds and federal funds, and an increase... an increase of 3.3 billion over last appropriation level out of other state funds and federal Of the 3.3 billion increase, 1.1 billion is a result of the American Recovery Act funding. Other state funds are non-GRF funds and has very little spending discretion due to the fact that these funds are generated from specific revenue sources. House Bill 2206 as amended mirrors the Governor's proposed budget for other state funds and federal funds with one exception, and that is The Governor's introduced budget with retirement. retirement was 11.35 percent, and House Bill 2206 reflects retirement at 28.377 percent, as required by statute. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Miller: "Any discussion on the Bill? Representative...

 The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Reis: "Representative, just to repeat a couple things, all of these expenditures come from either other state funds or federal funds, is that correct?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Reis: "And there's very tight latitude on where these dollars can be spent?"

Yarbrough: "That would be correct."

Reis: "Okay. Is there any place in here, and we thought about this after we... we voted on this yesterday, but this is a small... or not a small, but this is a portion of what all the moneys that's going to be appropriated to this area by the time we leave probably. Is there anywhere in here where we could have cut... By doing this so early and putting this to rest, so to speak, is there any place in here where we could have cut to help close the budget deficit, that's going to kind of take that option away from us with the GRF spending?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Reis: "When do you anticipate that we will do the rest of the funding for this agency?"

Yarbrough: "I'm not sure, but I certainly hope by the 31."

Reis: "Okay. On your Second... on your Floor Amendment that we just passed today, how much of an increase did we add on over yesterday's committee vote?"

Yarbrough: "These... these were just drafting errors, Representative. I'm looking at the Amendment now. Let's see, by replacing 400 thousand with 500 thousand... I'm on page, let's see, on page 250, line 1, replacing 400 thousand with 500 thousand, and then on page 262, line 3,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

by replacing Section 80, the amount of 290 million, and then sec... the same Section, 375 million, and then on page 330, line 12, replacing 270 million with 292 million. On page 401, line 7, by replacing 1,837,700 with 1,973,600."

Reis: "So, half a million dollars, a little over that, that we added on today?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Reis: "Not even quite that much?"

Yarbrough: "Okay. This represents the Governor's introduced, but they made a drafting error when they printed it up."

Reis: "I understand that, but the drafting error's going to cost us more money. So, I was just trying to get some idea of how much more money that... over yesterday's totals that was going to be, but that's okay."

Yarbrough: "This... this is the initial amount that was put in the Bill."

Reis: "Okay. To the Bill. Well, here we are, the last 10 days of Session. We've had all year to do this, and what we're doing is piecemealing this budget together, folks, and I support this part of it, but it's going to be very hard to follow what's going on here. Basically, all these Bills that we're going to vote on this here, this afternoon, represent over \$16 billion, leaves us about 6 billion left to plug a \$11 to \$14 billion hole. There's going to be some hard choices to be made here, and it's going to be even harder when we piecemeal this budget together like we're doing. And it... it's hard for the people to follow. We've had all year to do this and here we are trying to do it the last 10 days, but that's what's before us. I rise

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

in support of the… the Lady's Bill for public safety. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussions? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Julie Hamos, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?"

Hamos: "Thank you. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she'll yield."

Hamos: "What... Representative Yarbrough, what I don't really... I mean, it's obviously very hard for us to follow along, especially those of us who are not on appropriations committees, maybe they can enlighten us. The Governor's budget included about, I think, \$230 million in what we call fund sweeps, or fund transfers. Are these locking in all the funds so that this presumes that we're not going to do any fund transfers? Is that what this is doing?"

Yarbrough: "No, that's not what this is doing."

Hamos: "Well, you said this includes all the funds except GRF, and that's why..."

Yarbrough: "This is all other... all other state funds."

Hamos: "So, does this include... does this, in fact, take into
 account the fund transfers that the Governor's budget
 included?"

Yarbrough: "I'm sorry, Representative, I didn't hear your question."

Hamos: "The Governor's introduced budget, I believe, if I see… if I can analyze that, I... I may be getting this wrong, it's presumed that this year, because of our big budget deficit, we would do about \$230 million in fund transfers. Is the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Bill that we're voting on, is your Bill, does that include..."

Yarbrough: "That this is... this would not... first of all, the... this would not have anything to do with any sweeps. We could do that later on if we want to. What's in this Bill is when you look at some of the increases, you will see items that have lapsed and they're being re-appropriated."

Hamos: "So, what... and what did you say about the pension payment?"

Yarbrough: "In the… in the Governor's introduced budget, his introduced budget had retirement at 11.35 percent, and this Bill reflects retirement at 28.377 percent."

Hamos: "So, you called that an error? Was that an error?"

Yarbrough: "No, no, no. It's not an error."

Hamos: "No, no, but I mean, that... that wasn't an error in the first place..."

Yarbrough: "Well, we're..."

Hamos: "...in the Governor's budget?"

Yarbrough: "We're just funding the pension at the statutory requirements."

Hamos: "Okay. So, does this presume, again... We have a big pension payment this time, \$4 billion. Does this Bill that we're voting on right now assume that we're going to be putting the full \$4 billion toward the pension systems?"

Yarbrough: "It's my understanding that this... this, first of all, this is an appropriation to all state agencies dealing with other state funds. The Governor's introduced is what was at 11.35 percent, and what we're trying to do here, as

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

doing what's the statutory requirement at the 28.377 percent."

Hamos: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Mulligan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, was Amendment 1 the only Amendment that you put on, and that's the whole Bill?"

Yarbrough: "There's Amendment #1 and Amendment #2."

Mulligan: "And, what did it..."

Yarbrough: "Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. The second Amendment just dealt with some drafting errors."

Mulligan: "And what were those drafting errors?"

Yarbrough: "I just read them a minute ago. On page, line number... number 1 on page 250, line 1 replaces 400 thousand with 500 thousand, and on page 262, line 3, by replacing Section 80, the amount of 290 million, and the amount of 375 million. On page 330, by replacing 270 million with 292 million, and on page 401, line 7, by replacing 1,837,700 with 1,973,600."

Mulligan: "Well, with all due respect, I'm sure everyone in the Body knows what... how it affects the budget for the State of Illinois for FY10. Were there anybody... was there anybody in your committee that asked any questions, and did they ask any questions specifically on the human service parts of budget, which normally don't come through your committee?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Yarbrough: "No. The questions really had to do with... they...
they asked questions about GRF funding, and this doesn't
really have anything to do with this. These are non-GRF
funds."

Mulligan: "And you're... this Bill is supposed to be other federal funds..."

Yarbrough: "And state. And..."

Mulligan: "...other state funds. Does other federal funds also include stimulus money?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So, that your Bill can dispose of stimulus money in what they did or didn't do at some of the agencies?"

Yarbrough: "I'm sorry. I... I didn't hear what you said."

Mulligan: "I'm just trying to figure out how they could put stimulus money into this package, which I'm sure they'll figure out someway that would handle this, but I notice in just quickly looking through some of this..."

Yarbrough: "Representative, this is..."

Mulligan: "...there are cuts in DCFS..."

Yarbrough: "...just raising the..."

Mulligan: "...there are cuts in foster parents. There's all kinds of cuts in programs that this would have to come through another whole set of budgets. My problem with the whole process is that they've piecemealed all the agencies, and doled them out to different committees that don't usually look at those agencies and might not know what to look for if a Bill was presented in a very quick fashion that had to be gotten out, and this was only out there for less than a couple of days for people to take a look at.

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

You know, advocates are concerned, and that this is kind of a interesting way to... and that's the nicest thing I can say about it, to present a state budget by piecemealing all the things that have been discussed over years on how you run different state agencies. So, did you feel comfortable with doing it this way?"

Yarbrough: "Representative, that's... this is the process that I've been... you know, that I'm dealing with here, and I'm just trying to work within those parameters."

Mulligan: "Well, as a chair for that committee, you are a part of the process, because I would imagine that if you're vocal, you have some input into how we're doing it. But this is really very confusing for people on a committee that don't normally look at those types of budgets, and there's a whole lot of human service things in here and yet, the human service budget is very imperfect. So, it's interesting to me what's... what's in this Bill and the way they're going about it, and it's part of a package that would be a core budget, which you could leave, as I've said before, and really not meet the needs of the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Durkin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she will."

Durkin: "Representative, could you explain to me what type of funding's going to go to the Capital Litigation Trust Fund?

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

It's been a question I know a number of us have been asked by..."

Yarbrough: "Okay. Your..."

Durkin: "...defense counsel and also..."

Yarbrough: "...your question is dealing..."

Durkin: "...state's attorneys."

Yarbrough: "...with the Capital Litigation Fund? Okay. Your question was the amount in the Capital Litigation Fund for expenses?"

Durkin: "I guess the question I have, are we going to be decreasing that level of funding this year, or are we going to maintain..."

Yarbrough: "No, no."

Durkin: "...the previous year's level?"

Yarbrough: "They're increasing it \$100 thousand."

Durkin: "All right."

Yarbrough: "There's an increase."

Durkin: "Where are those appropriations going to? I know that the Cook County Treasurer is responsible for releasing that money for cases within Cook County and the State Treasurer outside of Cook."

Yarbrough: "Yes. It's my..."

Durkin: "Is that money going into the… I'm curious how that… where that money's going to be sent and then it's… what is the… how's it get to the Cook County Treasurer?"

Yarbrough: "It's my understanding that the expenses incurred by the State's Attorneys Office other than Cook County, there's a million dollars appropriation authority."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Durkin: "But I guess the point is, we're not giving that money to the Cook County State's Attorney directly, are we? Or we... or we giving... nor the public defender, directly?"

Yarbrough: "It's going to the Treasurer's Office..."

Durkin: "All right. All right."

Yarbrough: "...for the state's attorney."

Durkin: "Could you tell me exactly what the overall appropriation is for the State of Illinois in this year's budget?"

Yarbrough: "For which agency?"

Durkin: "All of them. What is the… bottom line, what is the… what is the total number… what is the… what is the dollar amount for the Capital Litigation Fund money this year for the whole State of Illinois?"

Yarbrough: "One... one million dollars."

Durkin: "One million for the whole state? One million above last year's, or we're saying we're getting one..."

Yarbrough: "Wait, wait, wait. There's a million with the… the litigation's Act. For the appellate prosecutor… Is that what you're looking for, the appellate prosecutor?"

Durkin: "Everybody. You've got appellate prosecutor, you have the state..."

Yarbrough: "Okay."

Durkin: "...you have the state appellate defender, you've got the Cook County public defender..."

Yarbrough: "Which number are you looking for?"

Durkin: "Cook... I'm looking for the combined number for all the different agencies who are going to be drawing from that fund. What is the actual..."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Yarbrough: "Okay."

Durkin: "...dollar amount we're putting into that fund?"

Yarbrough: "Representative, I would have to add those numbers up."

Durkin: "That's fine. You just... All right, that's fine. Just you have somebody tell me, 'cause I... I got to get this number back to some people, 'cause there's a lot individuals who are interested in how we're going to be able to fund this area of the criminal justice system, despite what the other problems we have in the state. So, it is a concern. I just need to know. You can tell me at some point this afternoon what the bottom line is."

Yarbrough: "I'd be happy to do that."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
Representative Bellock, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?"

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

Bellock: "Representative, is there any money is this budget for Medicaid bills?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Bellock: "How much?"

Yarbrough: "Representative, if you have another question, I'd be happy to entertain that. Staff is getting me that number."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. I mean, the reason being is we had quite a discussion yesterday at these Human Service Approp Committee as to why so many other Medicaid funding

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

bills were going through another committee rather than the Human Service Approp Committee which usually addresses the issues of Medicaid, especially since it's been such a major issue this year with unpaid Medicaid bills, and also looking at Medicaid reform. So, that's why we're trying to figure out where else that money is being spent in the budget. One of the other things I wanted to ask was, on this is... there is, under the aging, we're trying to figure out, 'cause yesterday there was discussion about home health care services, which are so important to keeping seniors in their home and out of nursing homes hospitals. We're looking for where that money is being spent, and I'm looking at this budget under aging and... under this Bill, and it says a decrease in social serves of \$10 million. So, I'm wondering which services those are being decreased in the amount of \$10 million."

Yarbrough: "Let me give you the Medicaid numbers, about three and a half billion, and now we're trying to figure out the decrease in social services of 10... \$10 billion."

Bellock: "Ten million."

Yarbrough: "Is it 10... yes, \$10 million."

Bellock: "And then you have another decrease in what is considered discretionary government projects under this same... under the aging of one billion... one and a half billion dollars."

Yarbrough: "The... I'm told that the decrease in social services, that's... it's not social services, it's shared services."

Bellock: "So, that's not the home health care?"

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Yarbrough: "No, it's a typo. It's shared services, not social services."

Bellock: "Okay, thank you. And what about... can we... the decrease in discretionary government projects under aging, one bil... one billion dollars, is that correct?"

Yarbrough: "You know, Representative, this is all from the Governor's introduced. It's just not there anymore."

Bellock: "Okay. That's not there. Okay. To the Bill."

Yarbrough: "Okay."

Bellock: "There's been a lot of discussion on the Human Service budget. A couple of weeks ago, we went over all the Human Service budgets in the Appropriation Committee, in most of those budgets, by the agencies, there was between 4 to 10 percent increase for the people in the agencies, and yet, when it came time for the programs, there's was a 10 to 20 percent decrease. If all of us are willing to take a decrease, I think that's the right thing to do in this age, but for others in agencies to all get increases between 4 and 10 percent, I think it's outrageous."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I... I just want a couple clarifications.

I think I heard you cor... Oh, there you are. I was looking over there. When... whenever our analysis discusses the pension issue, it states that... for example, the EPA budget

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

that's being funded by these funds, these are non-GRF funds I believe. Is that correct?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. The EPA budget that's being supported by these non-GRF funds are the Governor's introduced level. We're funding the Governor's introduced level from the FY10 budget, right?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "Except in the retirement area, his introduced level was lower, and this is funding the statutory payment as calculated. So..."

Yarbrough: "That is correct."

Eddy: "...I just want to make sure everybody understands by voting for this, you're not voting for a pension payment that's less than the statutory amount. This is actually supporting that full payment. Is that correct?"

Yarbrough: "That is absolutely correct."

Eddy: "When we get to the other differences from FY09, let's just use the EPA budget. There's a decrease. Now, that decrease actually reflects the Governor's introduced amount."

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, is it possible that later, and this is a...
this is the real question, I think, that we'll see another
budget that could increase any of those appropriated line
items if General Revenue or other revenue could support an
increase to restore some of this?"

Yarbrough: "That's a hypothetical, but it... it's possible, certainly."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Eddy: "I mean, this is basically action dealing with federal funds?"

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Are there any other funds supporting this except federal funds?"

Yarbrough: "There's some other state funds and federal funds that are included here, lapsed funds."

Eddy: "Okay. Some lapse spending funds..."

Yarbrough: "Lapsed funds that could be reappropriated."

Eddy: "...Reappropriated money that... Okay. I think specifically..."

Yarbrough: "...That was for a specific purpose."

Eddy: "Okay. They aren't… they aren't dedicated funds that we're… we're using right now, though. These are lapsed funds or federal funds."

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. The fund sweeps that were proposed by the Governor in his introduced budget, some of which there are... there's opposition to, those fund sweeps are not part of what's being used to support the spending... the appropriation in this budget?"

Yarbrough: "No."

Eddy: "Okay. That... that clears it up to me for... to some degree. Part of this deals with the education budget. Just very quickly, if I could, take you down to the education portion of this, and if you'll give me just a second so that I can find that again. Are we, basically, talking about the same thing there? We're... we're talking about, for example, there's \$2.7 million in there for longitudinal

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

data study. Does that reflect the amount from the recently granted federal money that the State Board of Education won from the… the Race to the Top or those ARRA funds, or is that General Revenue? Where does that money come from?"

Yarbrough: "This particular amount is a grant from the Federal Government."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative Smith, the other day, I... I forget the number, I think it was Senate Bill 1826, he... he introduced the longitudinal data Bill, and we said at the time that that... that payment was going to be made with federal funds because the State Board of Education won a \$5 million..."

Yarbrough: "That's the one."

Eddy: "...federal grant. That's the one?"

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, any other of these line items here that are increases, are probably due to federal stimulus money or some lapse spending, and General Revenue's coming later."

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you. I appreciate the clarification on that. This just basically spends that federal money in a way that supports the Governor's introduced budget, and any cuts are the Governor's cuts. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Lake,

Representative Osmond, for what purpose do you seek

recognition?"

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Osmond: "Representative, under financial and professional regulations, it shows that there's a difference of \$7,900,000. Then it comes down and shows that there's 8 million, which is being transferred over to the Department of Insurance, which you and I know was done this year, but then down under the Department of Insurance, it's showing for FY10 a budget of 34 million. My question is, when they were transferring that money, was that money that was left over in this year with the anticipation that this particular funding would be coming in from the premiums that are paid in the insurance?"
- Yarbrough: "Okay. This... this is at the department's request to increase their head count in their department."
- Osmond: "Right, and I understand that, and I know that in the previous administration this money was all put into professional regulations... yeah, professional regulations when... was it divided specifically for the Department of Insurance?"
- Yarbrough: "Representative, I'm told that these are the numbers from the Department of Insurance saying that this is what's due them from professional... from Financial Regulation... from the department. This is going to cos... this is going to take care of the costs of running that agency. These are their numbers."
- Osmond: "So… so, they put together the numbers of the transfer from the department and what the income will be from the insurance premiums?"

Yarbrough: "Basically, yes."

Osmond: "All right. Thank you."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Coulson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Coulson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."

Coulson: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking at the aging budget, which is something that I've dealt with for over 12 years, and I'm having a little bit of a difficulty in understanding in your committee what happened with that. So, I have some questions related to the increases and decreases. As I read this, there's a \$1 million increase in the ombudsman services, a \$1 million increase in preventive health, and a \$500 thousand increase in prevention of elder abuse, all which are very laudable, and I appreciate those. But then I get to the next line and it's a \$10 million decrease in social services. Can you explain that and why there would be that decrease in probably the most important lines that aging does?"

Yarbrough: "Representative, this is the same information that was shared in your committee. These..."

Coulson: "I was not..."

Yarbrough: "... are the... this is the..."

Coulson: "No, this is not... I... this is in your committee."

Yarbrough: "No, I didn't see the aging budget in my committee.

This happened in aging. This is the Governor's introduced,
so everything you see here is what was in his budget."

Coulson: "Okay. I was just told by my staff it's not social services, it's shared services, but it is still a \$10 million decrease."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Yarbrough: "Yes."

Coulson: "You're saying this is what the Governor introduced to us."

Yarbrough: "That's correct."

Coulson: "That's not what we agreed to, though."

Yarbrough: "That's... that's correct. This is..."

Coulson: "Okay. Just assuming that the Governor introduced it doesn't mean that we would have agreed to it, nor do we agree to it at this point."

Yarbrough: "But now you understand, it's not social services, it's shared services."

Coulson: "Which again, is one of the more important items.

Under the adult day care, as I understand it, there's a
\$1.7 million decrease in adult day care services? Is that
accurate?"

Yarbrough: "Again, this was in your committee. These... this... these... every..."

Coulson: "No... no, this Bill was not in our committee."

Yarbrough: "This is the Governor's introduced budget for other state funds. They voted out of... you voted this out of committee."

Coulson: "No, we did not vote this out of committee. So, I... I mean, that's the problem here, and I usually try not to be that adamant, but I'm really concerned that we're being told that we voted this out of a committee. We've never seen this until this minute. If it's the Governor's introduced, we did hear about it in committee. That does not mean that we voted it out of committee. There's also a

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

question about the addiction services, and can you explain what happens in this budget with the addiction services?"

Yarbrough: "Same answer. This... the Governor's introduced budget. This was in his budget."

Coulson: "So, I guess, and I... to the Bill. It's unfortunate that the people that know these budgets the best were not allowed to be in the committee yesterday to ask some of these questions, so we had to ask them on the floor to try to clarify, really, what is in each of these Bills that, by the way, we've just received, and I really think the lack of transparency here is exactly what our constituents are mad about. And it's not just in campaign finance, it's also in the budgeting process, and this is completely nontransparent. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Leitch: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I just hope that every Member of this House is paying close attention to the travesty that is unfolding here, otherwise described as a budget. Many of you haven't been around very long, and certainly, not as long as a few of us have been, but there was a day in this House when there were actual appropriations, agency by agency, department by department, where the directors even of those agencies from the... and Governor's staff and liaisons were on the floor, where individual Members could introduce Amendments, could work with their colleagues, could have an impact on the budget of the State of Illinois. And what a travesty it is that

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

the Human Services budget is going through three different committees, and on the backs of the people who need the most help in our state. Nobody has a clue on the floor of this House what is in this budget, and nobody understands where this mess comes from, and nobody should accept the lack of your individual rights. Be you a Republican, be you a Democrat, your constituents are being disenfranchised by this process. At some point soon, you must say enough is enough. We must demand a process that is indeed transparent, that is one that enables you as individual Members to represent your constituencies, to make valuable the time that you spend in these committees, and put an end to the politburo style and replace it, what we all know, and what we all respect to be authentic American principles of democracy. If we continue to accept this, this is our fault. And I would encourage you to reject this process, and to reject these budgets, and to restore democracy to this House. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Yarbrough to close."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me be clear here. This appropriation is not cutting Medicaid, it's not cutting education, it's not cutting higher ed, and nobody wants layoffs. We need this Bill to keep government running. Please vote for House Bill 2206. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2206 pass?'

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

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the count of 79 'yeas', 29 'nays', 8 'presents', House Bill 2206 has received a Constitu... Constitutional Majority, and is deemed passed. On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2194. Rep... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Miller: "Representative Feigenholtz for an Amendment.

 I stand corrected. No Amendment. Third Reading, Mr.

 Clerk. ...the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2194 represents funding so that Illinois will be in compliance with the prompt payment provisions of the stimulus recovery plan of 2009. It is physicians, dentists, optometrists, chiropractors, hospitals, DSH and ambulatory care, and long-term care services. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Miller: "She indicates she will."
- Mulligan: "Representative Feigenholtz, yesterday when we were talking about this Bill, we were told this was all the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Medicaid money, but the last speak... the last presenter of the Bill previous to this one, said that there was Medicaid money in her Bill, too, which they looked up. What's correct and why should there be Medicaid money in this Bill and in the previous Bill, which we did not get to discuss?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, you and I have been working together for many years, and I know that we've been waiting for the Federal Government to respond to an increase in our federal matching funds. This Bill alone are the specific items that the Federal Government requires us to be in 30-day prompt pay compliance with in order for us to get the other 10 cents on the dollar. It has... it is certainly not representative of any other Medicaid item in the budget. It is just simply those particular items that essentially unlock the door to that increased federal match..."

Mulligan: "Do you..."

Feigenholtz: "...out of General Revenue."

Mulligan: "...anticipate a follow up Bill of some sort, or some kind of a patch on the budget that will give you additional Medicaid funding for other sources?"

Feigenholtz: "Of course."

Mulligan: "And so, what happens if we leave here and it doesn't, and are you comfortable with the current process?"

Feigenholtz: "Of course not."

Mulligan: "So, my question to you is, if none of you who have any idea about what's going on on the budget on your side of the aisle are not comfortable with this, why are you moving forward? Do you not have any say in your caucus

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

about how you actually do things? I won't put you on that spot, because I res... I respect having worked with you over these years, but as far as I'm concerned, this is the most abhorrent way we have ever done a human service budget in the 17 years I've been here. You can not tell what's in this budget and what's not in this budget, and we all know there's a lot not in this budget because of these si... five Bills that are being presented. There's only \$16.9 billion of a budget that was anticipated to be somewhere between 23 billion and 27 billion. And so we have advocates standing in the hall, calling us out there wanting to know what's happening with their grant money, what's happening with DASA, what's happening with this, that, and the everything. We have human service budgets going through committees that people have no clue how to ask the questions about what's So, basically, what we have is a happening there. piecemeal. We could find ourselves going home, and I think that's part of what the plan is here from the ultimate plan players, going home and spending our whole time answering questions from outraged people who aren't getting services. So, I guess the goal is to either make this Governor look bad, as you did last year with the previous Governor, make us look bad in general, make us vote on votes that you can portray however way, not adequately fund anything, and certainly not to go over the human service budget in a way that is indicative of any forward moving issues. think it's your desire to go along with Tribune articles that say the General Assembly is less than transparent. I mean, if you want to fim of a year, when we are being beat

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

ethics and transparency, this is the most up untransparent, worst budget. The people that are here new, at least for the last six years, don't even have a clue of what it is to do a budget. But the fact of the matter is, the Human Service Approp Committee voted only on the stimulus money for three areas: pediatricians or doctors, nursing homes and hospitals. The whole rest of the budget, which is about 40 percent of your state budget, came through little piddling pieces in other parts of committees that has not much to do with anything. So, what happens is, you have been usurped in your power to do anything for the people that you represent by convoluted politics that is to play games in the overall end game here of who has a say in the budget. I can't believe that your caucus just blithely is going along with this, and I'll tell you, if we go home out of here with this core being the only budget, and having to come back and forth and listen to people complain, it's on all of your heads, certainly not on ours, and I think that's really sad. I think there should have been more of a fight to make sure that we have a comprehensive budget that we know exactly what we're funding, and what we're being asked to fund, not this sham. Representative, I respect you, but I think you should've spoken up more. I... I know it's hard to be the lonely voices in your caucus. I notice there's a number of your Members voting 'present'. That's a really good idea. Maybe they'll get the message."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reflect the last
 Bill that we dealt with, I had meant to push the 'green'
 button, and pushed the 'present' button on Representative
 Yarbrough's Bill. For the record, please."
- Speaker Miller: "On House Bill 2206 your intentions will be noted for the record. Seeing no further discussion, Representative Feigenholtz to close."
- Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the previous speaker had some very legitimate points about this budget being divided into different committees. I agree that it has created a great deal of confusion and consternation, especially for the Members who sit on this committee. Having said that, the things that are in this particular Bill are things that are the key to the kingdom for additional federal matching fund, which our state sorely needs. So, I ask you to consider the substance of what we're doing and not the process, and vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2194 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote
 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.
 Clerk, take... Connelly, Burns, Sullivan, Try... Mr. Clerk,
 take the record. On a count of 103 'yeas', 8 'nays', 6
 'presents', House Bill 2194 has received the Constitut... the
 Constitutional Majority, and is deemed passed. On page 2

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

of the Calendar appears House Bill 2132. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2132, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Miller: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. Yesterday, in Higher Education Appropriations Committee, we passed the federally mandated Bill to secure our stimulus funding. I am now withdrawing Amendment #2 and I move to consider Amendment #3, and move for the adoption on... on Amendment #3. This Amendment contains adjustments by the Governor's Office for distributing federal stimulus funding. And I urge this General Assembly for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Miller: "The Lady has moved for adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2132. Seeing no objection, in the opinion of the… all those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Soto."

Speaker Miller: "Representative Soto on Amendment #3."

Soto: "Amendment #3 will just be technical corrections. And I urge adoption of this Amendment #3."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens on Amendment #2. Excuse me. Representative Stephens on Amendment #3."
- Stephens: "Well, maybe we should just take a deep breath here.

 I... I heard the Lady say that she wanted to withdraw

 Amendment #2, and then we... am I right... and then we voted it

 out. Maybe we should go back to Amendment #2 and withdraw

 it."
- Speaker Miller: "Representative... Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Yes. Again, I will withdraw Amendment #2. And I move...

 Amendment #3 will now become the Bill. Yes, and I move...

 Amendment."
- Speaker Miller: "The Lady moves for adoption of Amendment #3.

 Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, I... I understand what we're trying to do, but for the record, what became of Amendment 2? We voted on it by voice vote. I... I think, for the record, we need to clarify that."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted."

Speaker Miller: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Guts and replace the Bill. And I Table Amendment number 2..."

- Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Myers, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask for the Sponsor to yield, but until we get this cleared up as to which Amendment that we're actually working on, I'll just wait until we get that cleared up, if that's okay."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Speaker Miller: "That's fine. Rep... Representative Soto."

Soto: "On Amendment #3."

Speaker Miller: "Representative Soto has moved to adopt Amendment #3. On that question, Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, Representative Soto, could you give us some... you said it was a technical change from Amendment #2. Could you give us the exact details of that technical change?"

Speaker Miller: "Rep... Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yeah. The agreement with the Governor and the Federal Government stipulates various stimulus money. This conforms this to that."

Myers: "I... Okay. So, you're saying that this is a change in the stimulus money?"

Soto: "In the two lump sums of stimulus money."

Myers: "I'm sorry, Representative, I didn't catch that."

Soto: "In the two lump sums of stimulus money."

Myers: "Okay. But the bottom line stays the same. The amount of money coming from the stimulus program in the two lump sums, and the bottom line of GRF remain the same. It's just changing from one lump sum to another, in the stimulus program?"

Soto: "The bottom line of stimulus stays the same, and the bottom line of GRF changes by \$500."

Myers: "The bottom line of GRF changes by \$500. Up or down?"

Soto: "Up."

Myers: "And where did that \$500 end up, or 500..."

Soto: "It will be now transferred into ICCB."

Myers: "Okay. Okay. Thank you very much."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Soto: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Seeing no further questions on the Amendment, all those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Miller: "Third Reading. ...Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2132, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes. I move for an 'aye' vote on this... on this Bill, and I'm open for questions."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? Rep... The Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Rich Myers. For..."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have the Amendment adopted and we're acting on the Bill on Third Reading, this is a Bill that only funds the state ins... the state... the 4-year state colleges and the community college system. Is that correct?"

Soto: "That is correct."

Myers: "There is no money in this particular Amendment for the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, or the Board of Higher Education, or IMSA?"

Soto: "No."

Myers: "And is that forthcoming, or do you know where that funding is going to be coming... it... was it in one of the appropriation Bills that we've already acted on?"

Soto: "Well, that's something that is still being negotiated."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Myers: "It is. Okay. But at the current time, we're funding the 4-year colleges and we have support from the 4-year colleges for this particular Bill, and as I understand, it treats the community colleges pretty well, as well."

Soto: "They're very happy."

Myers: "The... the change in the... the technical change that we didn't discuss before on the Amendment #3 with respect to the community colleges, was my understanding there were some shifts from the base operating grant to a couple of other... a couple of other line items. Did the community colleges agree to those changes?"

Soto: "This is part of the agreement with the mandated... with the Federal Government."

Myers: "Okay. So, the community colleges have signed off on it, and they're okay with even... even though it was mandated by Federal Government?"

Soto: "Yes. Yes, they were."

Myers: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Soto: "No, thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Soto to close."

Soto: "Thank you. I... I urge everyone here today... this is one of the most important Bill... votes that we take every year on higher education, which is one of the most important Bills that, and votes that I take myself. So, I think that you will agree with me and again, I thank you for your vote."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2132 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- 'nay'. The voting is now open. ...all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Burns, Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On a count of 108 'yeas', 3 'nays', 6 'presents', House Bill 2132 has received a Constitu... Constitutional Majority, and is deemed passed. On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2129. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2129, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Miller: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2129, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Miller: "Repre... The Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the committee. I think this is our last budget Bill for the day. House Bill 2129 contains 6,649,597,800 in mandated GRF spending, which is required in order to receive the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act funding from the Federal Government. Once again, this Bill, and I'll keep on after this, but it is the funding that we're going to receive from the Federal Government. It's our match that we are bringing in as a state, so that we do not lose any dollars, or leave them on the table. The 6,649,597,800... 7,800 is the total amount that the Governor's Office pledged to spend on general state aid, general state aid hold harmless and mandated categorical lines in the state application for

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

the federal ARRA funding. Eight hundred... 900... 897,461,000 of the general state aid funding is House Bill 2129, is being funded through federal ARA (sic-ARRA) funds. money was specifically put towards general state instead of other programs in ISBE's budget because of the stringent reporting requirements the Federal Government has In House Bill 2129, general placed on the ARRA funds. state aid appropriation allows per pupil spending to be increased this year by \$231 bringing the foundation level to \$6,190. Mandated categoricals will be funded at 100 percent. Following the recommendations of ISBE and the Governor's FY10 budget, House Bill 2129 cuts hold harmless by 50 percent in FY10, \$15,670,600 that is appropriated. In House Bill 2129, the general state aid hold harmless was figured using the assumptions that there'll be no new districts added to the general state aid hold harmless after FY09. This will leave only 81 districts in general state aid hold harmless. The last comment I want to make is, we had a lot of discussion in my appropriation committee, Elementary & Secondary Committee, with the other side of the aisle on issues that are happening in this state specifically to block grant money used by Chicago which is almost parallel to the hold harmless money that's outside the City of Chicago. And I'm going to leave it up to my Republican counterparts to discuss that side, but in this state, education is supposed to have parity, and we've been trying to get there for quite some time. It always seems that Chicago gets extra things in the budget without coming to talk with us, and ask us, and show us how they're

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

using the money to make sure it's appropriated properly. So, there will be further discussion with the executive gentleman from Chicago Public Schools on other areas in which we need to make sure that they're spending the money wisely, and it's going to be paritied across the state. If the downstaters, which is everybody outside of Chicago, I'm considered a downstater, have to cut their hold harmless at 50 percent and phase it out, I think it's only fair that we look for other areas in which we can find some parity, which Chicago would have to... the children of Chicago would look like the children of the rest of the state as far as the funding and we get to some kind of even playing field. And I'm open for questions."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, you mentioned the \$231 increase in the general state aid foundation level, and I think you mentioned the amount of 6190. I think we all know in here that that's still well below what EFAB would have recommended to fund that level at, but given the circumstances, the... the federal stimulus money was used as the application that is being submitted stated, and that was to... to fund the... the program... the general support program for students in the state, and... and there's a great deal of stimulus money going into that. What you failed to mention and I think is important is the fact that mandated

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

categoricals are also supported with this federal stimulus money, and instead of prorating... instead of prorating mandated categoricals, as we might have had to, this allows for 100 percent funding of mandated categoricals. So, in the two areas that... that a lot of times get the most attention here, mandated categoricals and foundation level, federal stimulus money is being used to support both of those areas."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. And I did state in my op... opening remarks that is 100 percent of the mandated cats for this next... this... this budget, this piece of the budget."

Eddy: "Well, I apologize for not hearing that."

Chapa LaVia: "That's fine."

Eddy: "And I... I think another important part of what you stated is the, you call them onerous, reporting requirements. I think... as a... as a school superintendent, I can tell you that I actually am grateful that there are going to be two codes used, and a minimal amount of reporting will be necessary because of the way this money is being distributed. If it's used other ways, and probably there's a couple hundred million dollars in here that could have been distributed throughout the budget in other ways, but there would have had to been set up at the state board and at every district, a separate code function for receiving the money, for spending the money, and for reporting all spending. So, I think this makes the most sense with that federal money for a variety of reasons. The... the issue that you brought up, though, I think that everyone in this Body should... should really pay attention to, is the fact

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

the mandated categorical spending that special education in the City of Chicago, overfunds that categorical by \$240 million if the same formula were used in the City of Chicago that's used in every other school district in the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 241 million additional dollars go to the City of Chicago outside of the calculated amount that everybody else in the state has to live with. Now, necessarily for gutting \$240 million out of the City of Chicago's budget, but for Pete's sake, let's have a little parity here, and when... when we have other districts that are facing the same kind of problems, and... and the for ... the formula does not support them receiving that money, let's look at... at making it a little bit easier for them as they get hold harmless removed. And then we have some opportunities to do that in the budget that's coming, and Representative, I join you in an attempt to... to kind of scale... scale that ramp down. I think that's only fair, but folks in here need to understand, this is fully funding the mandated categoricals line item, which would fully fund the additional \$241 million that... that isn't calculated for the City of Chicago under the same formula. There's... there's no removal of their hold harmless in this. They've had an in... a decrease in student population. They've have a decrease in special education personnel spending. had decreases just like the hold harmless schools have had, but they're being fully funded, overfunded actually, by the formula. We need to pay attention to it, and I hope... I hope Mr. Hubberman will make his way down to Springfield a

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

little bit more often to work with us as we together have to... we... we have to address some real serious funding problems, and... and the City of Chicago and my rural area are very much alike in many ways when it comes to the funding formula, and I want very much to work with them on improving that. But... but we can't do it if we're going to treat the City of Chicago differently when it comes to issues related to the loss of enrollment, and the loss of numbers then we are every other school district in the state. We need some parity, that's all, and hopefully, we'll see that in the 'bimp' language, and I hope you'll... you'll join me in supporting that, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "We will work together on that, Representative."

Eddy: "Thank you. I... I think... To the Bill, very quickly. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is, in my opinion, the best use of the federal stimulus money to support the two categories. The only flaw in this Bill is the fact that maybe we didn't... we didn't address something that's important to me regarding hold harmless, and hopefully, we can do that later on. I trust there's going to be a good look taken at that, and... and we can work together to make sure that... that cliff isn't as steep for the other schools if we're going to make sure Chicago doesn't get a cut as well. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook,
Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen... A couple... a couple of concerns. One is that we are... we are doing a good job this year in terms of general

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

state aid, in fact, it is actually the per pupil increases had originally proposed. what ISBE They had originally proposed \$130 increase. We are... they will be giving them \$231 dollars increase per year, and while it's not at the EFAB level, it is substantially over last year's per pupil expenditure. Also, the mandated categoricals are seeing a healthy increase. The concern I have is that this is being funded with ARRA funds, which means that again, we really need to pay attention in that two years from now, we are looking at a huge drop off, another cliff that we will be jumping right off into the air. We have already talked about... the chairman and I have talked about he concern that we have for the bilingual per pupil funding, that it needs to be addressed on an equity basis statewide, and that's a per pupil expenditure that would follow the child, not necessarily be a block grant to any individual school district. So, the other concern I've got is with all of these Bills together, and again, it has to do with process, not necessarily this Bill itself. I think this Bill does a good job under some very difficult circumstances at making sure that the schools can continue to function, but the five appropriation Bills that we're going to be looking at today are going to come up with \$16.9 billion, which means that we will have \$6.8 billion left to cover another \$14 billion in spending, and that would need to include the pension funding. We've got to fund the pension this year or we're going to exacerbate the problems that we've already had. So, we've got tough sledding ahead, but for

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- this part of the budget, I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Miller: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Chapa LaVia to close."
- Chapa LaVia: "I would thank... I want to thank my committee and Chairman Mike Smith's committee. We... we've come up with... well, we were given this budget, but we've come up with some really good ideas how to take the rest of the budget and handle it in a very fair, bipartisan manner. And I want to commend my other side of the aisle for all the work that they've done with me. So, I would request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Miller: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2129 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote
 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.
 Clerk, take the record. On a count of 105 'yeas', 7
 'nays', 5 'presents'... 'present', the House Bill 2129 has
 received the Constitutional Majority, and is deemed passed.
 Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Body to waive the posting requirements on House Joint Resolution 55, so it could be heard in committee today."
- Speaker Miller: "Seeing no objection... no objection, the Gentleman moves to suspend the posting requirement for... for House Joint Resolution 55. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, is the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately:

 Medicaid Reform, Family & Children Services will meet in

 Room 114; Public Policy & Accountability for Education will

 meet in Room 115; Health Care Licenses will meet in Room

 112B; Judiciary I-Civil Law will meet in Room C-1; and the

 Executive Committee will meet in Room 118."
- Speaker Miller: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will stand at ease for about 45 minutes. The intention of the Chair is to return back here. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Osterman: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

- Osterman: "Just want to let everyone know again, tonight is the softball game against the Senate, which will be at Lincoln Park at 5:30. If you want to play in the game, try to get there a little bit early, 4:30 or 5. For House Members that have not received, there's a box over here with golf shirts provided by the sponsor, the Regional Chamber of Commerce and Kevin Rigg. So, please stop by in the corner under Stephen Douglas and grab a... a jersey."
- Speaker Miller: "The House will stand at recess for committees to meet, and we'll reconvene in approximately 45 minutes."
- Speaker Turner: "The House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

recommendations: 'approved for consideration' is House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 51. Representative Golar, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Policy & Accountability, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 226. Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses, to which the following measures were referred' action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' House Joint Resolution 55, and Floor Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 290. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2256. Representative Burke, Chairperson with the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 20, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 54, and 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 51, and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1333."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, on the Supplemental Calendar #1, we have Senate Bill 54. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 54, a Bill for an Act concerning ethics. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 12 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 2090. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is concerned with the repeal of the Compensation Review Board. The Bill would provide that the Compensation Review Board would be repealed, and at going forward after officials FY10 all whose salaries previously were determined by the Compensation Review Board will receive COLAs only. Any other change to compensation in the future would only be done through legislation. In addition, it provides that the COLA, which is currently provided for FY10 for all officials whose salaries are determined by the Compensation Review Board, except for judges, that that COLA will be suspended. It will not be taken. officials include Constitutional Officers, Members of the General Assembly, state's attorneys, department heads, and members of boards and commissions. Going forward after FY10, the COLA will resume. It provides that Members of the General Assembly will forfeit four days of compensation during FY10. One day's pay will be deducted from Members'

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Compensation for each of the first four months of Fiscal Year 10. And lastly, the Bill eliminates provisions of current law that allow the Governor to unilaterally raise the salary of his cabinet level department heads. This will place these department heads in the same position as other officials previously governed by the Compensation Review Board. Other than COLAs, they can only receive raises by legislation. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that first I would like to offer the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2090?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

And Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, first let me acknowledge others in the General Assembly who took initiative in this particular area. First, Mr. Black, the Sponsor of House Bill 832. Representative May, Representative Durkin, Representative Fortner, Representative Lang, and again, Representative Durkin. And then on the Senate side, let's acknowledge the initiative

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

of Senator Lauzen with Senate Bill 2081, and Senator Silverstein, and Senator Garrett. All of those people were active in this area proposing changes in the Compensation Review Board, changes in the methods that were established by the adoption of the Compensation Review Board. At the time of its adoption, the Compensation Review Board was designed to provide a method by which there could be regular adjustments in salary and compensation for Members the General Assembly, and for others Government. Unfortunately, in the last couple of years, because of actions by Senator Jones, the Compensation Review Board and its methods came in to disrepute. Consequently, given all of the controversy which now surrounds the board and its methods, I'm moving to repeal the board, provide that the COLA shall remain in place. It'll be suspended for the next fiscal year, the next budget year, and that the Members of the General Assembly would be called upon to do four furlough days during the next budget year. Again, Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Bost: "Speaker, the only question I have, I think that you mentioned that judges are excluded."

Madigan: "Judges are excluded from the section of the Bill which relates to the COLA, because the COLA issue was fully

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

litigated through the Illinois court system, and the judges in their wisdom decided that they're entitled to their COLA and we are not."

Bost: "I... I can kind of remember that, but that was kind of like the fox guarding the chicken coop. There's just nothing else that we can do about that, and I can understand that. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Winters: "I would... first commend you on this Motion, this Bill. I think we all need to take a hit at a time when our state, obviously, is in serious financial peril. The question I have is, by rescinding the COLAs, but... but really the... the four days of furlough, how do you handle that constitutionally, when I believe the Cons... Constitution said our salaries may not be increased or diminished during our term of office? Do you have a... I'm sure you have a legal argument on that? Or... or possibly it's just nobody has had the guts to stand up and sue over this issue. I..."

Madigan: "Mr. Winters, the answer is that we're not changing the salary level. We're just going to take four days off."

Winters: "Well, I don't know about you, but it seems like my phone rings 365 days a year on state business. I intend to answer the phone on the four days of furlough. I'll probably read my e-mail and continuing doing correspondence and research, but I would assume that there would be

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

considered a diminution of our income if... of our salaries if there is a furlough day. And while I certainly will honor it, I think that this certainly has a legal challenge in front of it."

Madigan: "Mr. Winters, I'm sorry. I was distracted."

Winters: "We all are at many times. The question is, I think, it's still back to the fact that it looks like a diminution of salary, and I... I don't know how you get around that legal argument, but it would have to be, I assume, that it would go ahead and take place unless litigated. Is that correct? Un... unless somebody in the General Assembly who has standing says, I'm not going to take a salary reduction and chooses to file suit, that it would go forward."

Madigan: "The statute will operate as drafted, you're correct. Someone might take the matter into a court. I have no idea what would happen in the court."

Winters: "Okay. And... but that's... that's the answer. It will take effect unless there is a court challenge similar to what the judges did, and I fought the judges over that many... you know, several years ago, and I'm still am on good arguing terms with some now appellate jus... justices who chose to push that forward. I do appreciate your response, and think that this is the right thing to do at this time in our state's financial quandary. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, if I understood you correctly, and I've been trying to pretty quickly read through the language of the Bill, this is for FY10 only?"

Madigan: "The suspension of the COLA?"

Eddy: "Yes."

Madigan: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, after FY10, the Compensation Review Board's standard practice, which now allows for the cost-of-living increases to take place automatically, will continue?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Eddy: "Some... some of the legislation that's been proposed regarding this issue would have simply required that that process always be this transparent, or that we would... we would have a vote each and every time there was an increase. Is there any reason that it was limited to just FY10 instead of trying to... to make this more transparent, just generally?"

Madigan: "Mr. Eddy, it relates to the reason why the Compensation Review Board was created in the first place. Prior to the adoption of the Compensation Review Board, it was very difficult to provide for increases in salary for Members of the General Assembly. For that to happen, required the passage of legislation. It was always very contentious. Generally, it only happened in Sessions after the General Election, but before the start of the next Session. And in... there was a... there was a strong effort in the General Assembly to provide a system where Members of the General Assembly could be adequately compensated, and that their salaries would be adjusted to reflect the

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

increases in the cost of living. That was the background for the creation of the Compensation Review Board. My thinking is that we're now moving to repeal because of some unfortunate events that happened outside of our control. It didn't happen here. It happened in the other chamber. So, I'm prepared to repeal the Compensation Review Board, but in fairness to the Members of the General Assembly, and with a view toward providing that there can be some adjustment for Members of the General Assembly when there is an increase in the cost of living, I would propose leave the COLA in place. I presume that there will be Members of the General Assembly in the future that will file Bills to, again, suspend the COLA from year to year."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I... I guess my question then becomes, as an alternative, those Bills that would have provided Members of the General Assembly the opportunity to vote on... just simply changing the process for good rather than at a fiscal year. That option isn't being provided. This is... this is our one opportunity this year, on a Bill that we're going to vote on in regards to these COLAs, and it is for one year."

Madigan: "Mr. Eddy, I, and again, I want to say and I want everyone to listen. This concerns everyone is this Body. I'm a Sponsor of this Bill very reluctantly. This wasn't my initial idea. As I said, the Compensation Review Board came into place so that Members of the General Assembly could receive periodic adjustments and compensation reflective of increases in the cost of living. Some unfortunate events happened, so here we are, and so we're

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

moving to eliminate the Compensation Review Board, I would simply suggest to all the Members of the General Assembly, let's review this in a year's time. A year from now, again, it may be appropriate to suspend a COLA adjustment. But again, we're Members of the General Assembly, let's give ourselves that option, and this Bill, as drafted, would provide that."

- Eddy: "I appreciate the... the response. Now, this also includes the Executive Branch? All Members of the Executive Branch would not receive a COLA under this legislation?"
- Madigan: "The answer is 'yes', plus members of the Governor's cabinet, and state's attorneys."
- Eddy: "And the Governor's cabinet. The four furlough days for Members of the General Assembly, are just for the Members of the General Assembly? There aren't furlough days involved for the Executive Branch or the Governor's cabinet?"
- Madigan: "Well, that's correct. Let me add that the Governor attempted to reopen the AFSCME contract, and they had discussions with AFSCME, and they asked from the Governor in those negotiations was four furlough days. I'm advised that AFSCME agreed to a voluntary program to be reviewed in about three, or four, or five months, at which point the administration may be called upon to move in a different direction, which would be layoffs. I selected the number four because this is what's being requested of the general work force."
- Eddy: "Is there any reason that the number four wasn't applied to the Executive Branch furlough as well, and the cabinet

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

positions, and just the General Assembly? And let me make myself... I don't mind it. I think it needs to start here, and as Representative Winters noted, I don't think anybody in here is not going to answer the phone or take care of constituents, or have that day blocked. We don't... we don't now. So, is there a reason they weren't included?"

Madigan: "I made a judgment not to put that mandate on the Governor, himself, and the other Constitutional Officers. As I said, the Governor has asked AFSCME to give four furlough days. In the case of the judiciary, you're up against the court decision that Mr. Bost referenced."

Eddy: "I understand."

Madigan: "And so, for us to tell them to take furlough days is something that would just bring on needless litigation."

Eddy: "Is it within the purview of the Executive Branch and other Constitutional Office... Chief Executives to apply furlough days to their staff?"

Madigan: "Sure."

Eddy: "They can do that without General Assembly..."

Madigan: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, they could do this, and they could follow the lead here, and do this without our action."

Madigan: "The ans... the answer is 'yes'."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the answers."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Black: "Representative, first of all, thank you for your kind remarks. It is amazing how many years I have labored here, and a kind word from you makes what has not been a particularly good day, a much better day. I... I, seriously, I thank you for that. Let me ask you a question, if I could. Let me understand... I was talking with staff... do judges get a cost-of-living increase under the same system that you and I do?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Black: "All right. Now, as you'll recall, the judges sued the last time we tried to freeze, or... freeze may be the wrong word, but we did not give them a salary increase that they thought they were entitled to, and they won. Is there a severability clause? Because as I read this, their salary is frozen. So, I'm just anticipating going on what happened the last time the judges said, well, you cannot... you cannot touch our salary. I just... I want to make sure that the whole Bill doesn't get thrown out if the judges again sue us and say, you cannot fool with our cost of living, or our salary."

Madigan: "Mr. Black, the Bill in the Section that relates to the suspension of a COLA does not apply to the judiciary."

Black: "Oh, I'm sorry. It... staff was telling me that it... it freezes the salary of judges. Did that... are we..."

Madigan: "I know... I don't... think..."

Black: "...are we mistaken on that?"

Madigan: "Well, the reference may have been to the fact that with the repeal of the Compensation Review Board, any

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

effort to raise the basic salary of a judge would require a Bill."

Black: "All right. Perhaps... perhaps that is the confusion..."

Madigan: "Right."

Black: "...because I was talking to staff, and it said it freezes the salaries of judges, Constitutional Officers, Directors, General Assembly, et cetera, at current levels, and that frozen amount will then be used as the base level when the automatic COLAs return... might return in Fiscal Year 11. So, as it relates to judges, it just simply means that there is no more automatic pay increase by vis-à-vis the Compensation Review Board."

Madigan: "Yeah. Yes."

Black: "So, if they want a salary increase, because your Amendment abolishes the Compensation Review Board."

Madigan: "Right."

Black: "Long overdue. It's a strange way that we've done that over the last few years. So, if the General Assembly wants a salary increase, or the judges, in FY11, someone will have to file a Bill, and say the salary should be increased by 3 percent, 5 percent, whatever it is, and then you must vote 'yes' or 'no' to grant yourself, or other elected officials a raise."

Madigan: "That's correct."

Black: "Going back to the system that..."

Madigan: "Right."

Black: "...you and I were used to some years ago."

Madigan: "Right."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

Black: "Fine. Now, let me... let me make sure that I understand this, and I appreciate what you're doing, and I don't care if the courts get involved, I will send you a copy of the four checks. I will send that back to the Comptroller, to the State of Illinois for the furlough days. I don't care whether it's taken out or not. I... I just... I thought from day one, and I was being serious, for us to take a raise when the Governor was asking state employees to take furlough days, was just not the right thing to do, and I appreciate you addressing that in your Amendment. But let me make sure on behalf of people that I work with every day for a lot less money than... than what I am paid to do my job... this does not impact legislative secretarial pay, staff pay, on your side, or my side of the aisle. That doesn't impact them?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. So, I guess the bottom line then is, from...
assuming this becomes law, and I truly hope it does, if
there is to be a raise in pay in our base amount, or a
judicial base amount, or a constitutional-elected
officeholder, that Bill will have to be filed, sent to
committee, have a debate on the floor, and a recorded vote
on how much we want to raise our pay, and who all is
included?"

Madigan: "The answer is 'yes'."

Black: "Of all the things we may do in the next few days, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a change that is long overdue. It puts accountability back in the system. If you want a raise, and we used to debate this on this floor for hours,

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

years and years ago, you stand up and you say so, and you go back home and you face the voters and say, here's why I think I did, under the system that has evolved, unfortunately, in the last few years, you could go home and say, well, I don't didn't vote for it. I didn't vote for the pay raise. Well, in effect, you did, but you didn't because of the way that it was handled by competing Resolutions. I think this is a step forward in the right direction. I commend you for your work. I intend to vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stephens: "Possibly a question of the Chair. I wonder, given the nature of the Bill now, if we could change the title that appears on the board?"
- Speaker Turner: "No. We don't change titles, Representative.

 I can remember a time..."
- Stephens: "Well, the entire... the entire text of the original Bill was removed by Amendment, if I'm correct."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, you've been around for a while, and..."
- Stephens: "Now, I knew you were going to say..."
- Speaker Turner: "...I think we can remember... Well..."
- Stephens: "...that. You don't need to remind me how long I've been here every time I talk. I made my point. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Speaker Madigan to close."
- Madigan: "I would request a 'yes' vote."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

- Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2090?' 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. The Lady from Lake, Representative Osmond, for what reason do you rise?"
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans wish to caucus in Room 118 for one hour."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative... The Lady from Kane, Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Chapa LaVia: "I want to, once again, remind everybody after the game tonight, there will be a party at house... the house is 320... 379... 329 South Walnut, free everything on Mr. Jack Franks, in honor of Suzy Mendoza's birthday and when we win the softball game tonight. That's at 5:30. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke, for what reason do you rise?"
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege. I would like to remind the Members that the Misericordia function is being held this evening starting at 7:00 over at the Abraham Lincoln Museum, and certainly all Members and staff are welcome to join us there."

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

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

Golar: "It's all right."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 422, offered by Representative Yarbrough. House Resolution 426, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 427, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 429, offered by Representative Osmond. And House Resolution 430, offered by Representative Wait."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

Mr. Clerk, committee assignments... the announcements."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee announcements for Thursday, May 21.

Disability Services was supposed to be tomorrow at 9 a.m. has been canceled. Disability Services has been canceled. At 11 a.m. tomorrow is the Executive Committee in Room 118. Executive in 118. Appropriations-General Services will meet tomorrow, on Thursday, in Room C-1. Appropriations-Higher Education will meet in Room 114. Appropriations-Human Services will meet in Room D-1, and Appropriations-Public Safety will meet in 122B. Today's committees have been canceled. All committees for today have been canceled, as well as Disability Services for tomorrow."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further announcements, Representative Lang moves that the House stands adjourned until March 21 at the hour of 12 noon. May 21 at the hour

58th Legislative Day

5/20/2009

of 12 noon, and the Republicans will caucus in Room 118 immediately. The House stands adjourned until Thursday, May 21 at the hour of 12 noon. Republicans caucus immediately. Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Just a reminder that the game will be starting in a little while, and those that want to play, come out to Lincoln Park. Anyone needs directions, I have them on my desk."

Speaker Turner: "Game time is 5:30."

Clerk Mahoney: "Introduction of House Bills-First Reading.

House Bill 4565, offered by Representative Ramey, a Bill

for an Act concerning elections. Repre... House Bill 4566,

offered by Representative Rose, a Bill for an Act

concerning higher education. First Reading of these House

Bills."

Clerk Bolin: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."