66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We will be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and our guests are asked to please rise with us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Wayne Padget on the prayer."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Lord, we come before You today in sound body and mind, praying that on this day You grant us wisdom and guidance. During these hard times of negotiations, we pray that everyone can come together on one common ground and resolve the issues for the people of Illinois. We pray for the men and women in our Armed Services, both here and abroad, provide them with Your protection and give them the strength to make it through these tough times. And let us also pray for the men, women and their families who have made the ultimate sacrifice to defend our country. These things we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "On this, our last day of scheduled Session, we will ask our hometown Legislators of Representative Poe and Brauer together to lead us in the Pledge."
- Brauer & Poe 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."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost, what's the status of the GOP?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All House Republicans are here, present and ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Sir. Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, what's the status of the House Democrats?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Lisa Hernandez."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members added as present. And we have a quorum and are prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Representative Dan Beiser, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Beiser: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

- Beiser: "Yes. I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Manteno High School Girls Soccer Team and Representative Lisa Dugan, who represents that high school. They won the girls 1A soccer title last night beating Alton Marquette, my Alton Marquette, 3 to 2 in four overtimes on penalty kicks, 3 to 2. So... congratulations, Manteno and to Representative Dugan."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."
- Reis: "We kind of had a long day yesterday and adjourned early, but I want the Body to wish Kay Hatcher a happy anni...

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

wedding anniversary. She spent her wedding anniversary in Springfield, yesterday."

Speaker Lyons: "Happy anniversary, Kay. Many happy, healthy more. Mr. Clerk on Committee Reports."

"Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Clerk Mahoney: Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is, 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 268, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2218. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 256. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 500, offered by Representative Reitz and House Resolution 505, offered Representative Will Davis, by Representative Ryg. Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s:

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 174."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll start with a few of the Bills on Senate Bills-Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, Representative Mautino has Senate Bill 611. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk? 611."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 611's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 611, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Frank Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are a couple of provisions in this Bill which have passed unanimously: one by Representative Fortner, the other one is mine which deals with a... the ability of a school district in Peru, Illinois, that has built a new school to be able to allow... be allowed to transfer one of their buildings to their special education cooperative from a building they'll be moving out of. And that has... there's been agreement by all parties as far as... as that portion of it. I'd like to go to Representative Fortner for explanation of his portion of the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Michael Fortner."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. What Senate Bill 611 would... as amended captures is language that was in House Bill 809 that this Body passed unanimously. When it went over to the Senate, it was amended to add an extensive appeal process involving the State Board of Education. That language was not agreed to by all sides and therefore, on coming back, I moved to nonconcur to that. We still want to try and achieve... the basic intent and let me just remind the Body what that basic idea is, which is to say that in a special education cooperative, if there is unanimous consent, there should be an easy method for a school district to move out of that special education cooperative and that is by the simple consent, unanimously, and that is on top of whatever other methods may exist, but we want to provide that easy way when there is unanimous consent of all the... of all the parties. Be happy to answer any other questions on that."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing any discussion, the question is...

Representative Eddy is recognized for a question of

Representative Fortner or Representative Mautino, Sir?"

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for legislative intent for Representative Mautino."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Frank, for the purpose of legislative intent, Representative Eddy."

Mautino: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, despite the fact that in the legislations on lines 22 through 25 on page 4 of the Bill, it deletes a reference to the Regional Board of School Trustees. It is still the case that where

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

a school district does not have the consent of all other districts in a cooperative to withdraw from that cooperative, that the school district can then petition for withdrawal to the appropriate Regional Board or Boards of School Trustees and that petition can be granted as current law allows, correct?"

Mautino: "Correct. The Bill does not take away the right of the Regional Board of Trustees or Boards of School Trustees to review a grant and grant a petition by a school district to withdraw from a special education cooperative."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Mautino: "Thank you. I would... that we've done what we promised to do in committee, I would ask passage of Senate Bill 611."

Speaker Lyons: "You still have a question from Representative Jerry Mitchell. Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to... to thank both of these Gentlemen that they had a Bill that flew out of here, it went to the Senate, wound up with a almost hostile Amendment on it and they agreed to nonconcur with that particular Bill, find a new home for their legislation. And their legislation simply keeps things with local control, solves a problem for Representative Franks' district and solves a problem for Representative Fortner's district. So, I'd certainly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 611 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed
vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryg, Kathy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 97 Members voting 'yes', 20 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar on Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative... Representative Barbara Flynn Currie has Senate Bill 1050. What's the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1050's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure designed to help people find out if they might be eligible, never mind a criminal conviction, for certain kinds of relief in terms of getting jobs. And this measure will make sure that those activities happen in the Circuit Court. I've had a great deal of help from Representatives Reboletti and Sacia in narrowing the scope of this Bill so that it is not too expansive for our taste. I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Floor Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1050, a Bill for an Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. As I said, I've had a great deal of help from Representatives Reboletti and Sacia. The idea here is that when people are looking for a discharge or some other kind of relief from disabilities following a criminal conviction, we should have that action take place in Circuit Court in the court in which they were first found guilty. This gives the state's attorney an opportunity to weigh in and it makes sure there is transparency in the process; it makes sure that other people have a chance to find out what is happening. I would appreciate your... your support and I'd be happy to answer your questions and I bet Representative Reboletti would do a better job at answering the questions than I."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields for questions."

Reboletti: "Leader, I appreciate your openness to amend the Bill to take some of the crimes out that cannot be submitted. What would the standard of proof be to show that somebody has been rehabilitated, that they would be eligible for a potential license? I believe that it's clear and convincing evidence, but I wanted to make sure that was part of the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Currie: "That is right... that is correct."

Reboletti: "And another feature of this is that the person would have to be off of parole or off of their probation for at least three years. Is that true?"

Currie: "At least three years."

Reboletti: "And then they would be able to go to the Department of Professional Regulation and basically ask for a nonbinding opinion to see if they... it would be worth their while to even achieve this."

Currie: "That is correct."

Reboletti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think this is a good piece of legislation. It really would show if somebody had been rehabilitated. The state's attorney would be in the courtroom, who could bring witnesses there to either oppose or support the person's rehabilitation. The person will have to bring maybe treatment documents or a NA or AA participation, proof that they hadn't been in the criminal system, no traffic violations. I think this is some commonsense legislation to help those that have truly been rehabilitated. There's a high enough standard to make sure that there is some solid proof there. And I would urge its support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1050 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cultra. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 94 Members voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Tom Holbrook has Senate Bill 12... 1825 on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1825 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #3 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Holbrook on Amendment... Floor Amendment #3?"
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. On Senate Bill 1825 on Floor Amendment #3, this is an adjustment for Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair Counties at their request on the assessments on the state property tax being assessed at thirty-three and a third. Passed out of committee unanimously. I know of no opposition and is a result of some pub... massive public hearings down in the Metro East."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #3? Seeing none, the Motion is, 'Should the Floor Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #4."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a trailer Bill to a Bill we already passed and what it deals with is the relationship between not-for-profit organizations,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

charitable and religious organizations providing housing to low-income people when the developer had taken advantage of a low-income housing tax credit at the federal level. There was a... a misstated date in the Bill we already passed. This cures that problem. I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1825 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Holbrook on Senate Bill 1825."

Holbrook: "Thank you. You've heard the two Amendments. I'll take any questions. If not, I'd move for passage."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, what is the... the ratio right now on the values of the properties in the Madison County and Monroe County?"

Holbrook: "Thirty-three and a third. This just updates the window that it will be set by. It'll be last year's sales rather than the average of the last three. This was by a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

citizen's commission in our area that they asked for this and these three counties have asked formally for this to be done."

Franks: "And that's... and that's because that the values of the properties have decreased in the last year."

Holbrook: "Yes."

Franks: "Why can't we do this for the entire state 'cause we've been..."

Holbrook: "Anyone wants to add their county, they could've; we asked."

Franks: "I didn't even know."

Holbrook: "All right."

Franks: "I would have loved to have done that."

Holbrook: "Okay."

Franks: "And this is..."

Holbrook: "You got time this fall in Veto."

Franks: "Okay. We shall. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Representative Holbrook to close."

Holbrook: "Ask for... I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1825 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative... Representative Hoffman on page 11 of the Calendar under

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 2148. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3 remains in the Rules Committee. Floor Amendment #4 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hoffman on Floor Amendment #5."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #5 really just takes all of the previous Amendments, rolls it all into one and the underlying Bill. And the Amendments addressed concerns of people in the committee, even the Department of Veterans' Affairs, as well as, individuals with the VFW and the American Legion. Now, everybody is onboard. Basically, what this indicates is if you are... have a casualty, you're hurt or you are killed in the line of duty in a terrorist-related activity or basically, Afghanistan or Iraq, that you would receive instead of \$2 thousand a \$5 thousand stipend for your family or for you in the case of an injury. I know of no opposition, only support. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion on Floor Amendment #5? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the Amendment be adopted?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'... by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments or Motions have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jay Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes. I just explained the Amendment. The Amendment, #5, becomes the Bill. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2148 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie has Senate Bill 2218. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2218 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Budget Implementation Act for the coming fiscal year. It involves things like taking PTAB funding out of General Revenue and instead using the personal property replacement fund for it. Since we're doing lump sum budgeting, it would say that higher education appropriations need not be line by line and it also says that certain kinds of moneys that are available to us through the federal stimulus package we will be able to spend. So, there are some... there's an increase in the foundation level for public education, \$231 reflecting the application that the State Board of Education and the Governor's Office made to the Federal Government for federal stimulus. There are about 20 other items and I would be happy to bore you with the description, but I'd also be happy to stop now and answer your questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Questions on Floor Amendment #2. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Mulligan: "Representative, I just found about this a little while ago and I'm trying to kind of go through it. But it appears to me as far as 'bimp' Bills go this is just like clean up and putting money places, but it's not implementing the way you would do it, say, a tax increase or anything like that. It's just saying you're going to add certain things that were left out or clean up other things. Is that going to..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Currie: "This is... it's a traditional Bill in which we clean up items. For example, many items relate to the federal stimulus package so that we... so that if, for example, the EPA under that package is entitled to give larger grants to local communities for water and sewer projects, we need to change our substantive language. And again, as we are, for example, doing some lump sum budgeting, we don't want to leave the agencies in a situation where the law says they have to do it line by line. So, I don't know of any... there's nothing major, nothing controversial here."
- Mulligan: "So, you're saying that somewhere in this, and I'm just looking at the description of the changes, is something that allows the agencies to take the lump sum Bill if it goes with..."
- Currie: "Right. Because we... that's the way we're budgeting this year."
- Mulligan: "All right. So, that..."
- Currie: "So, these are... these are technical changes reflecting either changes in the federal stimulus or for example, freezing rates in some of the Medicaid lines just because we can't afford the inflationary increases. These are the items that we do year by year in our budget implementation Bills. That's all this is and I would be happy to answer specific questions, if you have any."
- Mulligan: "All right. I was just curious because it came up so fast that usually in the budget implementation Act there's usually something that may say some kind of an increase somewhere and some kind of information that's a tax, but

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

this is mainly changing formulary, cleaning up other parts or adding things that were left out separately."

Currie: "That... and that's what this is. I mean, for example, we have a transfer of 1.4 million from the General Revenue Fund to the Violence Prevention Fund so that the Violence Prevention Agency can actually award grants."

Mulligan: "The only thing that..."

Currie: "And it's just a transfer."

Mulligan: "...the only thing that we had come up with earlier is that it amends the veterans' care statute to expand the program to spouses of covered veterans."

Currie: "Yes. And that... that happens in this Bill and there is no new money. It is merely a transfer within the agency of dollars they already have."

Mulligan: "But actually, that's a pretty minimal number because not too many people qualify for that program let alone their spouses."

Currie: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "And you have... if you qualify for VA, you cannot do the Veterans Care statute."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh. Thank you."

Mulligan: "All right. So, it just authorizes different things.

I'm trying to look and see if there's anything significant here that would be like a tax increase or a change other than just formula changing. Okay. So, somebody says there's a transfer from GRF..."

Currie: "Excuse me?"

Mulligan: "We're still looking. There's a transfer of 17 million from GRF to the DCFS Children's Services Fund;

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- that's fund short. So, that was why the transfer was there?"
- Currie: "And... and the reason there is because DCFS expects that it's going to be able to generate \$17 million in new federal Medicaid matching funds and this means that they'll be able to spend that money, if we give that money to them."
- Mulligan: "So, that gives them the appropriation authority to spend that money to get that Medicaid fund?"
- Currie: "That's right. So, we need to put the match first into GRF and then into the DCFS Children's Services Fund."
- Mulligan: "There's a transfer of 15.8 million to the University of Illinois Income Fund. Is that the same type of..."
- Currie: "Let me... let me just find that. And this is really just a transfer because these are programs that came from DNR and are now part of the Institute of Natural Resource Sustainability. And we'll be doing the transfer in quarterly installments."
- Mulligan: "There's a transfer of 1.4 million from GRF to the Violence Prevention Fund..."
- Currie: "I already explained that. That's so that the Violence Prevention Agency can actually... Authority can actually award the grants."
- Mulligan: "But there was also a fund sweep from that last night. Is this... if you swept the fund last night..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan, your time has expired.

 We'll give you another minute to finish your line of guestioning."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Mulligan: "If we swept that fund last night, are we transferring money in to be swept or are we transferring money into the fund to be used?"
- Currie: "In fact, we're putting money into the fund from General Revenue so that the Authority can award grants to stem the tide of violence."
- Mulligan: "That the one that the Attorney General is administering?"

Currie: "I thought that it was..."

Mulligan: "I think it is."

Currie: "...in the Executive. I'm not sure."

- Mulligan: "Well, there're probably are some other questions.

 This came up rather quickly. I'll sit down and look and hopefully, somebody else will ask them or I'll get somebody else to give me some time."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if there's any other individuals wanting to talk on the Amendment, but if we could just move it to Third, if your intent is that, we'll finish the debate there, if that's okay with you?"
- Speaker Lyons: "There's nobody else seeking recognition. I'm sure it would be fine with Representative Currie. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "I've just been alerted that there may be two... a technical problem. So, if we could leave this Bill on Second so that we can file another technical Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll take this Bill out of the record and leave it on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Calendar, Representative Marlow Colvin has Senate Bill 52. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 52's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3, both offered by Representative Colvin, have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin on Floor Amendment #2."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the House to consider Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 52. This is a trailer Bill to Senate Bill 658 that unanimously passed the House just two days ago. It amends the general obligation bond to allow for a facility cost report that is the... that will... is proposed to be prepared for a planned SNG facility on the southeast side of Chicago on a brownfield site along the Calumet River. These studies are paid for are re... our companies are reimbursed for the production of these studies through a bond program at the Illinois Finance Authority. The Bill that we passed two davs essentially created that bonding authority to act on behalf of the company who is proposing the SNG plant, which is synthetic natural gas. The company is Leucadia out of New York City. They are currently operating such plants in several other states with one, of course, being proposed to be built here in Illinois. Essentially, what the Amendment does is, with regard to the funding mechanism, there is already an existing fund that's being operated through DCEO through the same program that was set up through the ISA. In other words, we don't have to reinvent the wheel. We'll just hop on the wheel that's already being... that's already

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

been composed. This is no GRF money involved. These funds... these dollars in this fund are for the sole purpose of conducting these studies, which are considered front-end environmental and design studies. These... Did we mention the third Amendment, the Floor Amendment, or are we just talking about the second one?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we'll adopt Amendment #2 and then you can get... we'll do Amendment #3."

Colvin: "Okay. So, yes. So, I ask for… move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #2? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield on Amendment 2?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this Amendment only... I think it only becomes applicable if... when Senate Bill 658 becomes law. Is that correct?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this is kind of the appropriation or the authority for the appropriation for that particular study?"

Colvin: "That's correct. It is the authority."

Eddy: "So, how would... how would those bonds normally be awarded, through an RFP? Are we... are we going beyond what the normal process for competitive authority..."

Colvin: "No, not at all."

Eddy: "Okay. This is the normal way that these bonds are appropriated to projects is through the General Assembly on an appropriation line item?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Colvin: "That's correct. In fact, this is the exact same program and plan that we used to fund the study for Tenaska."
- Eddy: "Okay. That's what we thought. Thank you."
- Colvin: "And then what it... and all it does is..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 52 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by vot... saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, anything further?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Colvin."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin on Floor Amendment 3."
- Colvin: "Floor Amendment #3 is simply cleanup language that states simply no more than one facility, this particular facility, can ask for… access these funds. I have moved for adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 52, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marlow Colvin."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we explained both Amendments 2 and 3 during the discussion and the adoption of the Amendments. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 52 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Sacia, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Sacia: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, earlier today Barbara Flynn Currie gave kudos to myself and Representative Reboletti for the work we did on Senate Bill 1050. Though my... my assistance was extremely minimal and the two people that really brought that Bill together are exceptional young former prosecutors Reboletti and Rose. And Mr. Rose was inadvertently not mentioned and I think he should be because he put a tremendous amount of work into that Bill. And I would appreciate if he gets a pat on the back. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s:

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1936. On the Order of Concurrence, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 152, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 402, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 9... correction... House Bill 852, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1105, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 2325, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3986, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3987, and a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3987, and a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 55."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to proceed again on the Order of Concurrences starting on page 12.

And the first one we'll do, Mr. Clerk, is House Bill 152.

Representative Mendoza on the Order of Concurrences.

Senate... House Bill 152. Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #2, which I rise to concur on, is a gut and replace Amendment that creates the Organ Transplant Medication Notification Act. This Act applies to immunosuppressive therapy only when an immunosuppressant drug has been prescribed to prevent the rejection of transplanted organs and tissues and when a prescribing physician has indicated 'may not substitute' on a prescription. It allows for the patient to be notified either in writing or through electronic communication 60 days before their prescription will no longer be covered by their current insurance coverage plan. This is an agreed

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

upon Bill working with the original opposition and the Senate Sponsor in the Senate. We've removed all opposition. And I look forward to hopefully, as it passed unanimous out of the Senate, have the same results here in the House. Would ask for your support and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Thank you. Representative, this solely deals through insurance with the medication for organ transplant. Is that correct?"

Mendoza: "Yes. Specific to the immunosuppressive drugs that deal with the rejection of an organ transplant."

Brady: "Is this organ only or does it include tissue?"

Mendoza: "It's organ and tissue."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Mendoza: "Yeah. Sure."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 152?' This is final action. 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 question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Amendment #2 to House Bill 152. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences, Representative Davis (sic Will) has House Bill 164. Out of the record. Representative John Bradley, you have on the Order of Concurrences on page 12, House Bill 314. Representative John Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the... the... there was a scrivener's error with regard to the special education extraordinary circumstances hold harmless. The money was put into a transitional line. It should have been put into a special ed ordinary circumstances hold harmless line. This would correct it. It's revenue neutral. I have a list of school districts that are impacted and it's, you know, hundreds throughout the state. This passed out of committee unanimously. It passed out of the Senate unanimously. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "I'm sorry, Representative. I just caught the end of that. Can you please tell me in a couple sentences what your Bill does again?"

Bradley: "Yeah. They messed... the State Board of Education ended up putting the line for the special education extraordinary circumstances hold harmless into the transition line. It should have been in a different line. So, it didn't get paid. So, this would fix that. It's

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

revenue neutral. If you have two districts that are on the list that would benefit from this: Edwards County and Carmi, White County."

Reis: "Okay. So, this doesn't have anything to do with the hold harmless for foundation payments?"

Bradley: "No."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, this... this takes care of a...
really an oversight which wound up a cut of that hold
harmless is a hundred percent, right?"

Bradley: "Yeah, yeah. So, you have three districts, I'm sure you're aware: Lee, Oregon, and Riverdale that have been shortchanged under the mistake that was made."

Mitchell, J.: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this was simply an oversight by the State Board of Education. I really don't think they meant to do what they've done. I know they do want to get rid of hold harmless. Representative Eddy has a Bill that would take care of the hold harmless situation gradually over a period of years. If we can get that Bill called, probably wouldn't have to worry about this all the time, but I appreciate the fact that Representative Bradley, again, has been alert enough to pick up on this and take care of the problem. It's revenue neutral, but it certainly will help many, many districts that... that would

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

lose substantial amounts of money without it. Thank you. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? Now, this..."

Speaker Lyons: "He awaits your questions, Sir."

Leitch: "What does this do to District 150 in Peoria? I know they were concerned."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Leitch: "They're going to lose about a million dollars."

Bradley: "I've got... Is that in your district or is that in Representative Smith's or Representative Gordon's?"

Leitch: "Well, both... Representative Jehan Gordon and I have 150."

Bradley: "Okay. I have under your listing I have Farmington and Illinois Valley Central and under..."

Leitch: "No, those are not... not correct."

Bradley: "Under Representative Gordon's, the Peoria School District \$909 thousand fixed on this."

Leitch: "So, that would... nine hundred and how much?"

Bradley: "Nine thousand and change."

Leitch: "Would be restored?"

Bradley: "Yeah."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 314?'

This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hamos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 314. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 13 on the Order of Concurrences, Representative David Miller has House Bill 496. Representative David Miller. House Bill 496. Out of the record. Representative Art Turner, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 574. Representative Art Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for concurrence of Amendment #1... Amendment #2 to House Bill 574. This is an agreed technical Amendment, agreed upon by all of the proponents of the legislation. And I just move for the adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 574?' This is final action. 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 Reis. John Cavaletto, do you want to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 574. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Representative Will Davis on House Bill 572. On Senate Bill 852, Mr. Clerk, my mistake. Representative Will Davis on concurrence to House Bill 852."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With regard to what the title is, 852 became the vehicle to our green jobs initiative which created the fund. There were a couple of technical changes that we had to make with regard to the advisory committee that placed the advisory committee in the home of DCEO as well as took out specific language identifying who one of the advisory committee members could be. So, it's essentially technical changes. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Sen... shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 852?' Representative Bassi, did you have a question on that? I'm sorry."

Bassi: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Suzie Bassi."

Bassi: "I'm just curious, since were... we've swept \$45 million out of the tourism funds, how is DCEO going to fund tourism at all?"

Davis, W.: "Representative, this was a gut and replace. So, the underlying Bill does not exist. We passed out of here..."

Bassi: "Ah, never mind. Okay."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Bassi: "Thank you, sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "So, the question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 852?' All those in...

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

This is final action. 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 Black. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 852. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 13 of the Calendar, Representative Reboletti has House Bill 1105 under the Order of Concurrences. Representative Reboletti on House Bill 1105."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #2 makes... actually takes care of some of the concerns that Representative Black brought up in debate. This would be the Bill that would make it a Class IV felony to transmit any specific threat to a school or school function. It would take away any threat that maybe a student would make to another student on the playground. So, I would ask that we would move to concur with the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1105?' This is final action. 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 Hannig. Representative Collins, Annazette. Mr... Representative Collins. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 1105. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Beaubien has House Bill 402 on the Order of Concurrences. Representative Mark Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Yes. The Senate made a very slight change in this Bill because one of the departments did not want to be involved. There's full agreement. I urge passage."

Speaker Lyons: "...the Gentleman's Motion. Is there discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 402?' This is final action. 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 Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 402. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, Representative May has House Bill 2325. Representative Karen May on House Bill 2325 on the Order of Concurrence."

May: "Yes. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3.

Are those the right ones, 1... Da, da, da, da. Yes."

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

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

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, could you provide us with a brief explanation as to what Amendments 1 and 3 do to the underlying Bill?"

May: "Yes. Senate Amendment #1 is language that adds to this Bill about the... about the COBRA continuation, language that will clarify what businesses need to do so that the citizens of the State of Illinois can accept and receive the federal match on their unemployment benefits. If you recall, we were going to add it in the House, but the business groups wanted to look at it a little bit more carefully, so we sent it out without it. This gave them time to look at it and to tweak it as much as they wanted. And then Senate Amendment #3 just clarified some language for the insurance industry about their notification. So, this made all of the insurance companies, NFIB and all of the business groups comfortable with the Bill."

Eddy: "So, our analysis states that Amendment #2 was the Amendment that removed the opposition of the Chamber of Commerce and insurance and the National Federation of Independent Businesses..."

May: "Actually, it was the Senate Amendment #1."

Eddy: "Number 1 removed their opposition."

May: "Mmm mmm."

Eddy: "So... so, there is no opposition at this point..."

May: "That is correct. It's the language that just helps our citizens get the federal match on their unemployment."

Eddy: "Okay."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- May: "Senate Amendment # through... 3 was the tweaking that the insurance industry wanted."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Representative, for your answers. I appreciate it."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the Amendments, Representative Frank Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I'd just like to concur with Representative May's description. And it is a tremendous benefit for the consumers. She's put a good negotiation together. A small business, if you are under 25 employees and you lose your insurance coverage because of the stimulus package, her additions is you'll get the extended coverage. In addition to that, the Federal Government will pay the insurance company 65 percent of the cost of the premium. So, for a very small portion, a employee of small business can keep their health care. And I commend the Lady for working with the industry, the departments and the consumer groups to get the Bill in this final form."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur... Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for putting on the light a little late. I can get a video or an audio recording for you of former Representative Peg Breslin when she was in the Chair. If you really want to know how to do this quickly, I can... I can get that for you. Will the Sponsor yield, Representative Mautino?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Who was that question of, Representative Mautino, Mr. Black?"

Black: "Mautino. Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Rep... Mr. Mautino is ready for your question."

Black: "Representative Mautino, I don't have a problem with this. I just have a problem, not with you, but when we get up and say as I understand it, you said the Federal Government is going to pay the bulk of the premiums?"

Mautino: "The pre... the reimbursement is set at..."

Black: "Right, the reimbursement."

Mautino: "Now, this is actually... the reimbursement rate is set at 65 percent to those companies..."

Black: "Okay."

Mautino: "...and this is the same thing we did under the Act, if someone lost their factory to foreign competition on the trade adjustment agreements. The feds came in and that's where... that's what the agreement..."

Black: "Just say it."

Mautino: "...that we did with those bigger companies..."

Black: "Yeah."

Mautino: "...to help them get by. This was included for small business under the Act."

Black: "I... I... Having grown up in a small business, I think that's wonderful, but as I did the other day, couldn't we say what this really is rather than say the Federal Government will subsidize..."

Mautino: "It's us."

Black: "...couldn't we really say..."

Mautino: "It's us."

Black: "...that the taxpayers will subsidize?"

Mautino: "Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Black: "It might… it might make us all remember when we cast these votes, we're really talking about taxpayers' money, big money. I mean, it's not big to you perhaps, Representative, but… but it is to me."

Mautino: "Those dollars are all important..."

Black: "That's... there we go."

Mautino: "...and especially in a year like this. So, we..."

Black: "All right."

Mautino: "Thank you, Sir."

Black: "I just... I just get nervous when we talk about federal money and state money, because I think many people in this chamber get to the point where they think, well, that must be free. It's not free. It's all taxpayer money, but this program has some distinct benefits for people that I grew up with and people that I know and people that I see and people, through no fault of their own, who have lost their job and this is an investment, I think, in taxpayers' money that makes sense. And I'm sure you'll get sufficient 'aye' votes to pass this Bill."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Black."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative May, would you like to have a final word?"

May: "Yes, thank you. And Representative Black, you are correct, but as you point out also it does help the citizens of the State of Illinois. So, it is smoothing out and doing what we need to do. The underlying Bill, though, is very important and this also was an agreement with the business community for the mini COBRA to extend the benefits a small amount. It helps the citizens and I thank

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

everyone from the business community, the insurance industry, Representative Mautino and all who worked on this. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2325?' final action. 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 Boland. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2325. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences on page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Ford has House Bill 2537. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrences on page 14, Representative Collins, you have House Bill 3795. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Annazette Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to concur with House Bill 3795. The Amendment just simply allows other counties who don't have enough money to opt out or opt back in when they have money or to consolidate districts in the drug court. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3795?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by saying... by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Stephens, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 95 Members voting 'yes', 22 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3795. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kevin Joyce, on the bottom of page 14 under Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3986. Representative Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Amendment #2 to House Bill 3986. Simply would add to the ability of the park district. It would... to do design-build instead of design and build separately. It'd save a lot of money. And it would add architecture... architect to the Bill. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #2? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3896?' This is final action. 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? John Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, on... take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3986. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Danny Reitz in the chamber? Representative Julie Hamos, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Bill 3987, 3987. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Julie Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Energy Efficient Building Code we've had many conversations about this year and previous years. If you remember, when this Bill left the House I received... I received a question from that side of the aisle asking me about the Illinois Municipal League and their perspective on this Bill and at that time I represented to you that they had philosophical differences with this. This Amendment, and the reason we're concurring in Senate Amendment 2, was actually developed with the Illinois Municipal League. I'm not at liberty to tell you they support it, but they... we've softened some of the language and more municipalities who already have these building codes are now involved. And we did that because there was ongoing conversation over in the Senate. And I seek your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur... Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, what I'm trying to make sure I understand. Does... does this create a statewide building code?"

Hamos: "Yes, it does, for energy efficiency."

Black: "Well, you know, my... my late father was in the heating and air conditioning business and that family business has

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

been in operation for 85 years. We... we've had gold medallion homes that we've put in heating systems for 45 We cooperate with what used to be Illinois Power and now is Ameren. This is a very diverse state. Why... why should we mandate a statewide building code because it's going to change from area to area? Some of our areas don't have electric cooperatives, some areas have... we geothermal, others don't have that land mass, some get a special rate if they do electric heat. Well, all of that was taken away, so that doesn't count anymore. I mean, I just don't understand why in a state as diverse as Illinois you want to try and mandate a statewide Energy Efficient Building Code. What may be very energy efficient in Chicago may not work very well where I live and vice versa."

Well, Representative Black, an excellent "Okay. Hamos: question and really six years ago when I started working on approach and we've done it now for commercial institutional buildings, at that time there wasn't even as much focus on energy efficiency as there is now and even then and especially now, over 40 states have adopted building codes and the reason is because it is clear that if you build the building energy efficient and right in the first place, there's immediate savings in energy costs and there's immediate savings in energy utilization, use. we have to be concerned about both of those. Now, the homebuilders, over the years, have started moving with us because they also recognize that there is a market for this, that people understand that having an

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

efficient home saves costs in the long run. The building code that is adopted in this law actually is reflective of different regions of the state; it is upgraded every three years and because it is now statewide, the homebuilders also believe that there will be efficiencies for them in build... in producing... in buying building products in scale, on larger scale, so that the up-front costs will actually be minimized. So, the... the code does have those regional differences built into it, but I also wanted to point out some of the background and the reason for this."

Black: "But what... what do I tell somebody in my district who builds their own little cabin on three or four acres of land that they've saved for and this cabin is very energy inefficient, but they do that while they're saving money to build their home. The cabin may be just barely insulted; it may have a rather inefficient furnace; it may have a window air conditioner. Who's going to tell that person... I know people who have built... who have built literally a three car garage and they've lived in it while they're building their home in rural Illinois. Are we going to tell that person that that temporary dwelling and temporary may be five to ten years, that that temporary dwelling is going to have to meet some kind of Energy Efficient Building Code?"

Hamos: "Yes, we are. Representative Black, I think just as we have plumbing code which is a statewide code we do have some minimum safety and for health reasons."

Black: "If... if you think we have a statewide plumbing code, I got some houses in my district I'll be glad to sell you.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

The plumbing is out in the backyard and there's no running water and there's no copper tubing. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. The Lady's very well-intentioned and anybody that wants to build a house today... and I know there are people in this chamber who are in the process of building a home that they've planned for over the last 20 or more years, but in the meantime, they often build a temporary dwelling and exaggerating. In my district it might be they're living in the basement while they save enough money and then on weekends build the... the home, frame in the home up above the basement. It may take them 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 years to do that. So, we're going to have a statewide building code to say that when you're trying to build the cheapest, temporary dwelling you can so that you can build the home that you've always wanted, but it may take you a few years, that just doesn't make sense to me. First of all, in my... in my area of the state, we seldom see a building inspector. We seldom see a plumbing inspector. I know there's a statewide plumbing code, but when you live in rural Illinois, you often do the work yourself. You don't see a plumber. You may follow code and you may not. You may put in a septic tank that the health department inspects, but if you're far enough out in the country, you may not. It's just... it just flies in the face of common sense to say what may be adequate in rural Vance Township in Vermilion County should be the same Energy Efficient Building Code as a condominium on Lake Michigan in Chicago. It just... it's this insatiable desire to have everybody

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

conform to the same building code, the same energy efficiency standards. Your utility companies can help you with energy efficiency standards, your builder can, your Home Depot can give you plans. You're going to build what you can afford to build and in rural Illinois, where there aren't an abundance of building inspectors and zoning permits, my home county of Vermilion doesn't even have a zoning ordinance. So, this may look good on paper; it may be what we should do. I'm not going to support this because I know what is real in my area of the state. won't work. People will resent it. They will go out even further out in the wilderness to get away from building inspectors and code inspectors. I know somebody that's building a house with four-foot by eight-foot ceiling joists. That would meet and exceed energy any... any energy standard I'm familiar with. That's what he wants to build and it will, in fact, be extremely energy efficient for a temperature gain in the sum..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, if you could bring your remarks to a conclusion..."

Black: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "...we'd appreciate it."

Black: "...and heat loss in the winter. People are fully capable of making their own decisions based on their economic factor in life. And to say that there'll be a statewide minimum energy efficiency code... all it does in my district is to literally dry up peoples' willingness, desire, or ability to build a home that meets the needs of their

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

family and meets the need of their pocketbook. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "To close. Thank you. I'll be..."

Speaker Lyons: "To close."

Hamos: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this passed the House in the first place 100... with 100 votes. It really only got better in the Senate. There were ongoing conversations and I think this... this is a day whose time has come... an issue whose time has come. Again, everyone will benefit, not only the environment, not only our society, but certainly every homeowner because this will save in energy costs and it will save in energy use. And I seek an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3987?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 89 Members voting 'yes', 28 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3987. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Reitz, you have, under the Order of Concurrences, House Joint Resolution #55. The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Danny Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment... I'd move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This Amendment made some

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

changes. It's an affordable Alzheimer's program. It makes it permissive. It clarifies existing... dedicated Alzheimer's assisted living programs are not guaranteed approval and it gives state discretion to seek the waivers and permission... permits the Governor to determine which agencies will be asked to collaborate in this project. I think it's still a great Resolution, hopefully, will help people that are suffering from Alzheimer's."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's Amendment? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 55?' All those... This is final action. 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 Hannig. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 55. House Joint Resolution 55 is hereby adopted. Representative JoAnn Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to cau..."
- Speaker Lyons: "For wha... wha... One moment, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, for the purpose of an announcement. There's intentions from both caucuses to... to have a caucus, both the Democrats and Republicans. Democrats, we will caucus immediately in Room 114. Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will caucus in Room 118."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "And we will return to the call of the Chair.

 Until then, the House stands at ease. House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 12 under Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Currie has Senate Bill 2252. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2252 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendments #2 and Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Currie, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #2."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd ask if we could adopt the Amendment and debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Should Floor Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment 2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #4."
- Currie: "Again, I'd like to move this to Third Reading and then deb... debate the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 20... Senate Bill 2252, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. before you a proposal from Governor Quinn to help us stem the bleeding in the state General Revenue Funds for the coming fiscal year. This proposal would raise the income tax, the individual income tax, from 3 percent to 4.5 percent; the corporate tax from... to 7.2 percent. It would expand the earned income tax credit to 7.5 percent of the federal credit in year one to 10 percent of the federal credit in year two. The total tax would be a temporary tax from July 1, '09 to July 1, 2011. The earned income tax credit portion of the Bill would itself be permanent. This would bring in \$4.5 billion. I would argue that this state desperately needs \$4.5 billion in the General Fund if we are to respond to the needs of our citizens, if we are to perform the operations of State Government with an eye to children, to the developmentally disabled, to the mentally ill, to the senior citizens who want to stay at home and to the senior citizens and disabled who are in care. We are looking at a very significant budget shortfall and this would staunch the tide. Let me point out, that among the states that tax income, Illinois is the lowest; compared to our neighbors we are low and in fact, state tax burdens in Illinois compared to those across the nation are very far below the median. You might say this is not a good time to

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

raise taxes and I would say it's never a really good time to raise taxes, but during this hard time, economists, including Nobel Prize winner Joseph Stiglitz, say this is, in fact, the time when you really must raise taxes, that if you cut spending, you exacerbate the recession. You make, in fact, the economy worse. During the downturn in the 1990s, 44 states did raise taxes and during this recent shortfall, 16 states have already raised their taxes and another 17 are looking at revenue options. The income tax is a tax better than most to raise; the reality is, if you don't have income, you don't have to pay There are those, in fact, the chief economist at Moody's Economy points out that if we were to close our budget gap by cutting spending we would likely lose about a hundred thousand jobs. That would, in fact, make our recession worse and it would certainly deepen the state's unemployment rate. If, instead, we were to raise revenues to fill that budget shortfall, we may be able to rai... to increase the number of jobs by almost two hundred thousand, shorten the recession period in Illinois by over six months and reduce the state's unemployment rate by almost two percentage points. So, the background is that we can afford to raise taxes; we can't afford not to and only those who have income will pay them. We would still, with this temporary tax increase, find ourselves at an advantage compared to most of our neighbors. And let me just point out what happens if we don't raise taxes. If we don't raise taxes, we are looking at very deep problems in the state's human services and education programs.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

example, the student assistance program, to date \$402 million might find itself with only \$202 million, meaning that a large number of our low-income young kids who want to go to college will find themselves out of luck. childhood, cut in half. Subsidized child care, think of all those parents who are unable to go to work because there is no place that will take care of their children. The basic cash grant for people on welfare that's \$99 million today. Can we really expect... expect people to take a 50 percent cut in the small cash grant they have today. Bilingual education, down by at least \$40 million. Aid to the aged, blind and disabled, that program cut as well, and think about the Circuit Breaker and the pharmaceutical assistance program that helps low-income seniors and the disabled. Can we really say to those people, you're out of luck with the pharmacy bill, you're out of luck with the rent and the real estate taxes you're paying. I think that we, if we are a compassionate state, if we care about people, if we care about those who depend upon us to fund the operations of State Government, we cannot say no to Senate Bill 2252. I'm happy to answer your questions. And I and the citizens of Illinois need your support to pass this Bill and pass it now."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. And if we get a little bit of order in the Body, Speaker, this probably is the most important Bill we've done so far."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a request, and it's a good one, that we please... there's going to be a lot of important discussion on a budget Bill, so we'd ask everybody to please bring the noise level down. Thank you very much. John."

"Thank... thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. There's been a lot of deliberation prior to this Bill even getting here as to how we were going to get out of this situation and I would suggest, also, that most of the deliberation has been on this side of the aisle. should be, we're the Majority Party; we can be expected to lead, but at the same time we should be expected to lead prudently. Governor Quinn is a friend; he's the Governor. I afford him respect in both of those accounts and on many fronts, I would walk through walls for the man. I believe in his sincerity to no end. A number of people don't want to vote for an income tax hike on principle, some people don't want to vote for an income tax hike based on political expediency. I've made it clear that I would support an income tax hike that actually gets the ship of state back on course. I've put my name where my mouth is. I've been one of the lead Sponsors of House Bill 750 for probably five years now. And I have a district that would be a net loser, if you look at it selfishly, under the proposed tax swap Bill. I have a district that could well vote me out of office were I to support the Bill and I'd still support the Bill because it's the right thing to do. All that being said, I won't support this piece of legislation; I do it reluctantly. I had told the Governor

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

I would support an income tax hike willingly, almost eagerly, were it to address our reliance on property taxes to fund education, were it to address the inequities in how we fund schools around this state. Leader Currie is correct that this helps stop the bleeding over the next couple years and I respect her leadership on that issue. I'm not interested in helping stopping the bleeding; I'm interested in figuring out why the patient is bleeding to with. Ladies and Gentlemen, Democrats and Republicans, city, suburbanites, and downstaters alike, at some point in time, whether it's May 31, 2009, whether it is this fall, whether it is next year, the piper is going to demand to be paid. I listen to Member after Member promote any cuts to the programs that they hold near and dear, but refuse to make hard choices and hard sacrifices to prevent those cuts from happening. My constituents like your constituents say, make the cuts, you'll trim down State Government. I don't think a lot of them understand the extent to which State Government has been cut and the extent to which state services will be cut should we not find a new revenue source. That being said, I do not believe that a temporary forestalling of tough decisions can be countenanced any longer. The debate on how we fund schools is older than most of us in this chamber. ideas on how to fix that issue has been before us for years and years after one blue ribbon committee after another, one piece of legislation after another. We are going to have to make tough choices at some point in time. For some people, they may consider a vote on a temporary income tax

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

hike to be a tough choice. I look at it as a football analogy as almost doing a dropkick. It gets you out of the situation you're in right then, but sure as hell isn't going to win you the game. Ladies and Gentlemen, at some point in time, we are going to have to figure out how to address the structural deficit of this state, address the fact that we are 51st in the country in education funding disparity, how to address the needs of service providers, how to address the needs of information technology gaps, how to address the need of staying competitive in a world culture in a global economy going forward. I would submit with all due respect to the Sponsor that we need a long-term answer to a long-term problem not a two-year solution to simply get us through this hard time until the next one comes around the corner. Thank you."

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

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

Eddy: "Leader Currie, I do want to make sure the Body understands first of all the fact that this is three to four and a half percent on the personal income tax."

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "And 4.8 to 7.2 percent on the corporate."

Currie: "Correct. That's the constitutional limitation."

Eddy: "And the… the Governor's incre… introduced budget had personal exemption increases. This does not include any increase in personal exemption."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "What does it do with the earned income tax credit compared to what he introduced?"

Currie: "I believe as introduced it would have doubled the earned income tax credit. This, instead, takes the earned income tax credit today 5 percent of the federal credit to 7.5 percent this year to 10 percent next year and that increase in the earned income tax credit would be permanent."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the net... you take off the, I think it's about 51 million for the earned income credit and does this also take the local government distributive fund away from the local governments?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "It does not? They get their full amount?"

Currie: "They are fully funded."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "Ten percent as with the... the current income tax."

Eddy: "So, what is the net revenue?"

Currie: "Well, actually, you just did the math. So, the..."

Eddy: "It's appro... around 4, 4.4?"

Currie: "That sounds about right, yeah. Yep."

Eddy: "Okay. And how does that fit in with the big picture of the budget then, because I think, and I understand there are a couple pieces of legislation still have to have final action, but we did fund sweeps yesterday and we also did a bond refunding Bill that I think..."

Currie: "That's right. And that was worth... together the two were worth close to \$900 million."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Eddy: "So..."

Currie: "And that coupled with the \$3.5 billion we had left to spend, that means about close to \$5 billion which means that the deficit came down from ten and a half billion to perhaps 5 billion, five and a half billion."

Eddy: "So, how does the pension payment work into the big picture here..."

Currie: "The pension payment is already included in the dollars we're talking about. You remember that we, just the other day, said yes we do want to make the full pension payment as currently required by statute."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "That is law even without the vote of the other day, because the statute would require changing if we were to make a different funding structure. So, this assumes that the full pension payment is made."

Eddy: "So, in the big picture, with this increase, the fund sweeps, the bond reauthorization, the full pension payment, et cetera, does this balance the budget revenue and expenses?"

Currie: "It does not quite. There would still be belttightening, there still would be a need to shave off some
billion dollars. I believe the Governor could manage to do
that and I believe in these times people expect belttightening from their government as they are finding
they're required to do in their own everyday family lives.
But if we were to adopt this tax increase, we would be able
to fund the bulk of the programs that people have come to
rely upon. A person who's right now a senior getting care

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

in... at the... in home, that individual would not be sent off to a nursing home if we passed this Bill. And if we don't, there's a good chance that that individual will wind up in nursing care at a great cost to her individual dignity and independence as well as at a great long-term cost to us."

Eddy: "Representative, I appreciate all that, believe me. I think everybody understands in here the difficult situation. I guess... I heard you say something earlier though that I want to make sure we clear up. You mentioned that if we don't do this and I think early childhood education was the... was the item that you used as a example that would be cut 50 percent. Now, isn't that really kind of up to the State Board of Education based on the other options that are available? Wouldn't they make that decision?"

Currie: "So, you're saying that they could cut bilingual services..."

Eddy: "No, no, I didn't say that. I... I..."

Currie: "...your special... yeah..."

Eddy: "No, Ma'am. What I said was..."

Currie: "I guess my point... my point..."

Eddy: "...isn't it up to the State Board of Education?"

Currie: "And we are going... we are budgeting in a lump sum fashion so that the agencies will manage their money. My point is that there would not be enough to go around without..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, your five minutes are up.

We can add a minute or so to conclude your questions."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, I'll just very quickly to... to the Bill. My point is, it is not our cut. That... the 50 percent is what has to be made by the people who manage those individual budgets. If it's 50 percent in early childhood education, it's because the State Board of Education and/or the state superintendent in consultation with the Governor decide that's the cut. Granted, unless we're going to... we're going to tell them exactly it's going to be 50 percent, but I didn't get that from any of the legislation we discussed. Granted, that that type of exercise would be difficult, there's no question about it, but I want to make sure that people understand that this... if this doesn't happen, there's no automatic 50 percent cut to any line item. It's a function of budgeting and management after that point."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. I don't think it's any big surprise that no elected official wants to vote for a tax increase. It's easy to say, well, we'll just vote 'no' then we don't have to answer too many questions at home. So, we just come here and we vote 'no' and let the State Board of Education make cuts and let DNR make cuts and let labor make cuts and let Veterans' Affairs make cuts. Let them all make cuts. We don't have to do it; we'll let them do it. So, we don't want to vote for tax increases, but Ladies and Gentlemen, the harsh realities of what we face

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

here today in our state budget are that if we don't do the mentally illwill be hurt, developmentally disabled will be hurt, those who depend on treatment for substance abuse will be hurt, the autistic will be hurt, seniors will be hurt, children will be hurt, college students will be hurt, parents who want to work and get day care for their kids will be hurt, dozens of other categories of people who will sustain pain because we have not done the right thing. Everyone on this floor, even those who will vote against this today, even the most conservative ones amongst us will say, we cannot cut our way out of this problem. We all know we can't simply cut our way out of last year's or this current year's fiscal year budget and get to a number that works with the revenue we have available. We all know that. In previous debate, in the last several days, some on the other side of the aisle have said, well, it's a Democratic problem. The Democratic Party created this problem. And you know, Ladies and Gentlemen, you're wrong, but even if you're right, to say we're not going to fix the problem, we're going to let all these people suffer and we're going to let children suffer and seniors suffer and people that deserve the help of the State of Illinois suffer because you have a political issue, is irresponsible. It's irresponsible to just blame and not recognize the stark facts in front of you that have to be dealt with. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, you go ahead and you look these people in the eye, if you vote 'no'; you look them in the eye and tell them that you voted 'no' because it's a Democratic problem. And even

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

people on this side of the aisle, you go ahead when those people come to your office and you're looking them in the eye and you tell them why you voted 'no' when they can't get the services they need for their children, for their parents, for disabled people, for school children. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're elected to lead, not to make decisions based on political expediency. We were elected to lead. Some of you won't vote for this because you have a title next to your name, conservative, and you just simply can't do it. You can't get yourself to do it no matter what the realities are. Some of you will vote 'no' because of politics and you'll say, well, I've got an election coming up, got an election coming up. I don't want to be the one that has that newsletter sent out against me to tell everybody what a terrible person I am, so I'm just going to do the easy thing. I'm going to vote 'no'. We can't let these things get in our way, Ladies and Gentlemen. We were elected to lead the people of the State of Illinois and so, let us take care of the people of the State of Illinois that we were all, 118 of us, elected to serve. want to vote for this tax increase, but we are left with no alternative unless we want to cause real pain to real people by cutting significant programs that help the people of the State of Illinois. So, for those of you who are listening, those of for you who are persuadable, why don't you give some thought to those people who will come to your office next week and say, why, Representative, didn't you help me? Why didn't you take care of my needs and why did you put your next election

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

ahead of my needs. You were elected to help me. You weren't elected because we worry about your career in the year 2010 and 2012 and 2014. This year is 2009 and in this year, the people of the State of Illinois deserve your help. You decide whether you will help them. Mr. Speaker, I will help them today."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My, oh, my, my, my, my, how things change in one year. My good friend on the other side of the aisle said we were elected to lead. How can we go home and look people in the eye and say we aren't going to give you the services you need or deserve? Oh, how could we do that? Isn't that exactly what you did last year, a year ago at this time? Isn't that exactly what you voted for on your side of the aisle and not one Republican helped you do it? Did you take responsibility for what you did last No. No, it was Governor Blagojevich's fault. year? What'd you say a year ago today? We're passing a two and a half billion dollar out-of-balance budget... we know it is; we know it is... but Governor Blagojevich will fix it. He's the Governor, let him lead, let him cut the budget. didn't like his budget address anyway. He didn't come to us; he didn't come to the Democrats and negotiate a budget. Shame on him. So, we'll just show him. We'll pass a budget, meaning the Democrats passed a budget, that you knew was two and a half billion dollars out of balance. I hate to stand here a year later and say, we told you so,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

but we told you so. Then guess what, we went home. Suddenly, your fearless leader and many of you in this chamber enabled him to be our fearless leader with his campaign managers, his finance managers, his apologists, until you'd had more than your stomach could take. Governor Blagojevich surprised you and started making some Did you take responsibility, no. No, Governor Blagojevich's fault. My district lost all of its alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs for seven months. My mental health provider laid off people. My schools weren't reimbursed for transportation expenses, except months and months after the fact. My nursing homes were put on a cash basis by their providers because the budget you passed, the responsible budget that you passed, didn't give them enough money and didn't give enough money to pay the bills to reimburse them for the care of our most vulnerable citizens, so they had to borrow hundreds of thousands of dollars which many of them still owe. got mad at the Governor last year because he didn't negotiate with you. You haven't negotiated with us in four or more years. You don't invite us to budget meetings. We don't get to go to the breakfast meetings on the... at the mansion on Thursday morning. Our Leader in the House and Senate are excluded. You ignore us completely. Then when the bus that you built, designed, and funded runs into the ditch and you can't get it out, it's our fault. It's our Why don't you have the common courtesy responsibility to go home to your constituents and say, I'm sorry. We didn't do a very good job last year. We bailed

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

out of Springfield with a budget we knew wouldn't work, many people throughout the State of Illinois suffered as a result of your leadership last year. Now, you try to turn the tables and say, oh, but now we are going to lead and in the midst of the worst recession in the last 60 years, we're going to raise your taxes. That's leadership. That's the kind of leadership I knew once a guy at a county fair made a good living as a pickpocket. I suppose you'd call him a leader. So, blame us for your failures of the last six years and then come to us in the last 48 hours and say, you have to help. You have to help us. You have to help us get out of this mess, while you have turned us away, turned your backs on us, wouldn't even give us the common courtesy to sit at the table and try and negotiate a meaningful, realistic budget. Had you done that, had you done that, you might be surprised at the level of support you might have received from this side of the aisle. you cut us out of the process and then when your Leadership..."

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

Black: "...unmitigated gall to come over to our side of the aisle and say, hey, it's your mess. You've got to help us out. Just once would I like the Democrats in this state to say, we made a mistake, we fouled up, we didn't do a very good job last year or the three or four years preceding that and we'll take responsibility and we'll try to bail ourselves out of it. You've got 70 votes you can do anything you want. So, do it."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Sara Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. While I've been listening to a lot of people complaining and making statements about what life has been like around her for the past few years and every day when we all walk into this chamber, we see these wonderful women wearing purple These are women who are employed to take care of shirts. children who are in child care and they take care of our parents in the Community Care Program and they take care of our grandparents and they, too, are grandparents. Bill doesn't pass, in the next couple of days many of those women are going to be handed a pink slip. Their fate will be decided because when this state is in a time of crisis... and I'd like to address the previous speakers who are not supporting this Bill because it's not perfect. Well, I've been here for 16 years and I have never seen a perfect Bill go up on this board. This state is in a crisis and as the Sponsor said, when... in her opening remarks, this is the time when we need to rally. This is the time when the people who spend hours... who've spent years on the Human Services-Appropriations Committee, hearing how vital these services are to people, not only in their community, but statewide. All of these programs and I specifically... everybody on the other side of the aisle and my colleagues who are considering not supporting this Bill who sit on the Human Services-Appropriations Committee, know exactly what I'm talking about. They have heard it from previous speakers. They have been hearing it for the last month

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

from people hanging out at the rail and begging, begging for us to help the human services programs in this state. This is not a dress rehearsal, Ladies and Gentlemen, this... voting 'no' on this Bill will be devastating, apocalyptic even, to the... the vulnerable people of the State of Illinois. Please, on their behalf and on the behalf of people who need help and who are the women, mostly women, who are working in these jobs, support this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters, you've returned."

Winters: "Thank..."

Speaker Lyons: "The microphone's yours, Sir."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It is... it's hard to argue when the... the only argument is we haven't got anything else that we can do. The only answer we have is to raise taxes and that seems to be the attitude on your side of the aisle. We have asked repeatedly, include us in because we do have some good ideas as individuals on this side of the aisle. We've asked you to reform Medicaid. We've asked you to reform our pensions. We've asked you to reform the workers' compensation costs that drive our businesses out of Illinois. We've asked you for zero-based budgeting, for ethics reform, for major school reform and each time we ask for these that would give us hundreds of millions of dollars that could be spent in other places in the state budget, the answer is leave it in Rules. it in Rules. We don't want to consider any reform in Illinois. We're really happy. We control things and you have for six years. Your mistakes over the last six years of underfunding the pensions, of continuing to expand

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

programs, have finally come home and they hit you right in the chest. There is no money to get through and yes, you are going to layoff people if we don't pass this tonight. But the problem is this is accumulation of your mistakes over the last six years. We can see now what is happening by looking at the immigration out of our state over the last 10 years. Several people have said already, threequarters of a million Illinoisans have left this state and that three-quarters of a million over the last 10 years. Why are they leaving? Because there aren't any jobs. aren't there any jobs? Because you keep raising taxes on business. This is another example of it and I would predict and I'm a hundred percent certain that 10 years from now we're not going to see a better business climate in this state if you continue your control, you continue to raise taxes. You talked about the pain that's going to happen, the devastating suffering that will happen if we don't pass a tax increase. Well, the pain is going to happen if we do pass a tax increase. It's just a pain in the wallet of every Illinois citizen. And it's going to be a pain on the bottom line of every Illinois business and when their bottom line is not positive, they do not add jobs. You continue... your only answer is higher taxes, the state will continue to be on the bottom of the league tables of states. We are the worst in job creation. are near the bottom in business climate. We can't attract new jobs to this state because your only answer is to raise taxes on the individual and raise them on business. I urge a 'no' vote."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Leader Tom Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... this is not an easy night and I... I don't want anyone to think that people on this side of the aisle who are not inclined to vote for this Bill are insensitive to the things that have been said over the last few days. We have people on this side of the aisle that are leaders in this state in the areas of education, in the areas of human services. When I look at people like Beth Coulson and Rosemary Mulligan, Bellock, who have been there leading the charge for years, if not longer, saying we can make this state a better place for those that need our help. People like Roger Eddy and Suzie Bassi, Renée Kosel, Jerry Mitchell, who know what it's like to be in a classroom and to run a school district. They know the struggles that educators go through. We have people that run small business and have been involved in big business and know what it takes to run those businesses. And they're struggling with where we are tonight, 'cause they're problem solvers by nature. care about this state, they care about the people in this state, and they want to do what's right. This is not easy. We can't be flippant or cavalier about the struggles we're going through. We have a real problem and we know that. And we want to make it better, like I believe many of you if not most of you on the other side of the aisle want to make it better. But we heard a constant word in the last presidential race of the need for change, that we need to change government, we need to change cultures, we need to change the way we run government and we need to do it in a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

better way. Change was the word. And the problem with where we are tonight and why you are seeing resistance from us is not because we want to say we told you so or because we think it's funny or that because we can. It's because we've done absolutely nothing in the last six months to change this state, this culture, this mindset, this approach to running government. We are five hours away from the end of Session and what are we doing. The same thing we do every year. Here's a budget, here's a revenue stream, take it or leave it. This is how we do things. Here's a big packet, here's a big Bill, get through it right away and then we'll vote on it at the last minute. We're in a budget hole; we've lost six hundred thousand jobs; unemployment's at 9 percent-plus. People are leaving the State of Illinois. We can't pay our bills and yet, we do nothing, absolutely nothing to change this culture, this environment, this institution and I'm not even talking about the ethics side of it. I'm talking about the budget side. We've got a financial problem; we all acknowledge that, but to just come along and say, let's make a tough decision and raise taxes and do nothing to change the way we've done things for the last 25, or 50, or 75 years is unacceptable. We're not going to do that. It's time we acknowledge that it isn't working to just say year after year, well, you know what, you know, Dave Winters just mentioned zero-based budget. We don't do that. We just say, last year we gave them this; we're going to give them a little more. We'll just work off that. That doesn't work. You've done that the last six years and that's why

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

we have a problem. Does the economy factor into this? You It exacerbates the problem, but the economy bet it does. is not the reason we are in the trouble we're in today. plays a small part of it. The reason we're in the mess we're in today is, one, we spent money we didn't have. had a pretty good run the last five years, but we spent money we didn't have and as a result, we're in a mess. you're not willing to do anything to change this culture. David Winters talked about zero-based budgeting. anyone want to talk about that, no. It doesn't get implemented. Does anybody want to about Medicaid reform? Patti Bellock has an idea. She's been working with business groups from around the country that substantively change the way we do Medicaid, could save up to a billion dollars. Every state around us looks at managed care, but yet, we don't even want to take an effort or make an effort to change the way we do Medicaid. make sure you understand, no one on this side of the aisle is saying we do away with Medicaid, people need our help. We know that. We owe a responsibility to those that need help from us. We know that and we want to do that, but there are ways to do it better. There are ways to do it efficiently... more efficiently and we won't even do that. Where'd that go? It went nowhere. We had some ides working with the Illinois Policy Institute of different ways to do the budget, four different ideas we filed. Where do you think those Bills are today? They're in that place called the Rules Committee, going nowhere. So, all of these ideas, all of these incentives, all of these approaches to

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

changing the way we run government, change, meet resistance. That's not acceptable. If we are going to help those people that are relying on our money, we need to change. We need to have them acknowledge that things are going to be a little different down the road. going to have to adapt... my guess is they've adapted already and they're probably the best at adapting 'cause they've had to struggle with not knowing whether they're going to get money. But if you look at any successful business in this country, they adapt; they have change and they find a different way to run their business. We don't have to do things the same way every year, in fact, we shouldn't and we can't. So, don't take our 'no' as an unwillingness to participate. Don't take our 'no' as an unwillingness to... to be involved in this. We want to be involved in it. unfortunately, have not had the opportunity and people talk about parti... bipartisanship. You can't come over to us on the last night and say, let's be bipartisan and let's do the right thing for the people of the State of Illinois. You need to be bipartisan all year long, not one night throughout the year. We're not going to play that game with you. That's also unacceptable. We have a great state; we want to make it better. And we care about all those people that you talked about, Representative Feigenholtz and I know you care about them and we want to be part of the solution and we will work with you. budget doesn't do it. This budget is a meager attempt at trying to say we solved the problem and if anybody on your side of the aisle says to me one more time, you're voting

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

'no' to play politics, I would suggest to you that the Party with 70 votes who, when they want to do anything in this chamber they do it and can put on 60 votes. would suggest to you that if this Bill doesn't pass with 60 votes on your side of the aisle, a Party that spent the last six years spending money we don't have, a Party that doesn't want to accept change, the real question is, are you playing politics and why and for whose benefit? Now... now, we pass this budget tonight or we'll pass a budget and my guess is, I'm not sure what the Governor's going to do. We'll be back; I don't know when. We may be back in three weeks, three months, six months. We'll work with you then, if you're willing to listen to new ideas and different approaches and anything but the same old way, because just like those folks that are struggling that need our money to run their operations, the people that you're going to for money need to be... need to know that we're conscious of what they're going through. People are scared right now. They're losing their jobs. They can't make their house payments. Gas is climbing. And we want to go to them and say, we've done nothing to change this climate and we want a little more money from your pocket. What do you think that says to them? Who's watching out for them? saying to them, we know you're struggling and we know you're angry and we know you're scared. That's our responsibility. You haven't made the case yet to those folks and you got a lot of work to do. So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak. We are here ready and willing to have a substantive and real conversation when

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

you're ready. And I, unfortunately, will not be voting for this... not unfortunately... I will not be voting for it. It's unfortunate, though, that we have not had the type of dialogue we need to have in this state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Karen May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We haven't met all of my goals for this year before I wanted to vote on a budget. I've stood for reform. I wanted the 200 ... the federal limit on com... on campaign finance reform. I wanted pension reform, but pension reform was in a committee and it came out with Democrats voting for it and Republicans voting against it. When I spoke to other Republicans, they were not going to be there for it. I wanted belttightening. We have had billions of dollars in cuts. Ι want efficiencies in government, too, but the government... Governor has a commission to look for further the efficiencies in government. It's just very hard in five months to open contracts and to do all the things that we need to be doing. I say keeping the pressure on for two more years is what we need to be doing. We've made a very strong start on reform. We have cut some things. We need to keep the pressure on to do more. People still don't realize... the citizens of this state don't realize what a \$7 billion budget deficit means or 11 billion or whatever, but We know because we've looked at it and we've we know. looked at doomsday. The developmentally disabled, that we can't get in a CILA because there are no spaces for them, will be left further high and dry. The people who deliver

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Meals on Wheels, our community caregivers who care for our elderly, will be left high and dry. They will be given pink slips. The recession is very bad. There has been \$3 billion that... in revenue losses in the last couple years. Several times in my life I've been there to throw a life preserver for people who needed it, either financially or where I knew the services that I could help them. things are bad; I hear it every day, but when businesses lay off people, they come to government for help. when the government doesn't have the help, we can't send them back or send them elsewhere. We need reform and belttightening, I admit that, but I think we made strides. We have strong procurement reform; we've added compensation review board. We deleted it. I suggested it; Speaker Madigan took us up on it. I've kept in touch with my constituents on many of the reforms. We passed a capital Bill; we all voted for it. At that time, I noted that we will have roads, we will have bridges, but I fear we are leaving people in the ditch. I don't want to shut down all the services that are our safety net. Our new Governor had five months and I believe that with further time we can keep the pressure on. We can continue working for reform. We can find efficiencies. We have two years until the stimulus money ends. There will still be further cuts right then and there. It takes many years to pass important Bills around here, for those of you and for me, where we try to change public policy, it takes many years. I believe I heard people from the other side of the aisle at the beginning of this say, we can't cut our way out of

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

this deficit. We cannot cut our way out of this deficit, but in two years we can find the efficiency, we can continue the strategy of reform that we have started. Thank you very much."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Jakobsson: Bill. You know, I have heard just as I'm sure that many of you in this room have, heard from many, many service providers, who are going to have to eliminate programs; who are going to have to eliminate positions, at best, and at worst they're going to have to close doors, services for the disabled, the mentally ill, the addiction sufferers, the homebound, and many more. I chair Human Services and many of the issues that come before the committee get passed out of the committee unanimously and very often there is a price tag connected with these Bills. These are Bills and Resolutions sponsored by both sides of the aisle, both sides of the aisle are looking for ways to spend our money. Yes, the Republicans are, too. Some say... some of these Bills and Resolutions set up commissions or ask for studies or some kind of an institute be set up to collect data and do studies. Just last night in Human Services a Resolution... a Joint Resolution was brought to the committee to establish an institution to collect data and disseminate I asked how much it would cost and there wasn't that data. answer to that question. I pointed out to Republican Sponsor of that Resolution that there wasn't any funding stream that came along with the Resolution.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

spite of that, that Representative urged that it be adopted. None of the Republicans on the committee voted 'no'; they all voted 'yes' for that fund; even though they didn't know what it would cost and there was no funding. So, we cannot say that only one Party has been wanting to spend the state's money. The Republicans must stand up and take some of that responsibility. Folks on both sides of the aisle have and continue to propose and vote for spending our state dollars. I urge an 'aye' vote. We need to have an income tax increase. We need to provide the services that are needed to help this state. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LaShawn Ford."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Currie, you know, I come from an area where believe it or not if I could get the money back that we spent on roads and bridges and schools in a Republican district, my people would be very happy. So, my question is, was the money that we spent only in Democratic district or did they spend money too?"

Currie: "The money is spent statewide, Representative."

Ford: "Thank you. To the Bill. I got to tell you, I represent an area where people are getting killed every day, where we have crumbling roads and crumbling bridges, failing schools, police shooting people, people killing people because of lack of services and the last thing I want to do today is vote for a tax increase. But I do know that if I

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

don't vote for a tax increase that things will get worse. Why would I vote for a tax increase at this point? people will say, huh, black people have been fighting for 40 acres and a mule and you're going to vote for more taxes? Are you going to get your 40 acres and a mule today? No, but I ask you, either you're going to be a part of the problem or are you going to be a part of the solution? If we pass the Bill today, will you spend this money as well? You probably will. Now, I don't want to vote for a tax increase, but I have to and I probably won't get my school that I've been asking for, for the three years that I've been down here and I'm not giving up on the people. I'm not giving up on them and there are people over here and there are people over there have been saying that we want you to get your school. This may not be the time, but it might be the time for a tax increase, even if I don't want it. I've spoke with the Governor and I want the people that's sitting here to know that I asked them, if I vote for a tax increase, will you deal with the problems in my area? Will you help me with foreclosures in my area? He said 'yes'. I said will you help me get a school in my area? He said 'yes'. I asked him will you help me with the dropout rate in my area. The Governor said 'yes' and because of that I'm going to say 'yes' to this Senate Bill 2252 for the people."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We, obviously, have a gigantic budget hole to be filling and even the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

revenues from Senate Bill 2252 will not come close to closing that gaping hole. And I agree that we have not communicated that well enough to our constituents and am... you know, when I tell people we have a \$7 billion deficit in this upcoming budget, I always try to give them some context for that, that that is about 25 percent of our general... of our general revenue. But like some of the other speakers, I really believe that in order to sell that back home we need to... we needed to say I'm not going to deliver you the same old Illinois State Government. need some reform. And we tried to do some pension reform, we didn't get any help from the other side of the aisle on that, but we tried to do it and we're going to continue to be working on that over the course of the summer and I believe we will get there. We've done some significant ethics reform and yes, we have more work to do, but again, I believe that we can get there. But without these revenues, it isn't... it isn't just Human Services that I'm very compa... very passionate about the Human Services line items as well. But our... our nationally leading Monetary Award Program, the MAP program, that students across this state take advantage of and it allows them to get a college degree, is going to be wiped out. Something that all ... didn't... all... that I spoke to last night and that's very near and dear to my heart, as well as many of the Legislators around the state, is AMTRAK. We worked really We have billions of dollars in stimulus money that we can take advantage of to build that system and to do economic development around the state, but without this,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

we're not going to even be able to operate the AMTRAK service that we have. So, there's a lot of things in this Bill that... a lot of things that we're going to be addressing in this Bill. It isn't perfect and it's not going to take care of all the needs, but we need to... we need to... that start. In order to close this budget hole, we have a menu of bad options that we're going to have to be exercising and this is one of them. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie to close." Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. a breath of fresh air in State Government. It emanates from the second floor and it emanates from the work we have done over these last several months, important work to reform the way the state buys goods and services, important work to make sure that the actions of governments in this state are open and accessible to the people, important work in reforming the way our pension systems do business. are becoming accountable and transparent. We are making ourselves and our work available to the people back home, but it is not going to help us reform State Government, that breath of fresh air will not be fresh very long, if we have to close social service agencies, if we have to shut the doors to people in need across the State of Illinois. I'm tired of the finger-pointing; I'm tired of the blame I am tired of partisanship. The problems we face stem mostly from the fact that there is a national recession, probably the worst since the end of World War II. Clearly, we can make the recession even worse in the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

State of Illinois if we slash funding for these programs by 50 percent, if we put people out of work, if we make the unemployment rate go up. The smarter thing to do, to limit the affects of the recession, is to raise revenues as Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Prize winner, says. We can make the recession shorter and at the same time we can make sure that young kid in south Chicago has a chance to go to college because the Student Assistance Commission didn't run out of money and Harry Osterman's constituent, Ruth Long, who was here. An elderly woman, in her wheelchair, earlier this week, she's part of the Community Care Program and she said, I want to stay in my home; I want to be independent; I want to take care of myself, but when you end this program, I go back to a nursing home. I lose my sense of dignity; I lose my sense of independent. here to tell you, Members of this chamber, that we're going to spend a lot more money in the long run taking care of Ruth Long in a nursing home than we do if we fund the Community Care Program. We each have a responsibility, each one of us, to our constituents and to people across the state in need. I urge your 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 2252."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you've heard the issues discussed thoroughly. The question becomes, 'Should Senate Bill 2252 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 Graham. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 42 'yes', 74 'no', 2

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

voting 'present'. And the issue fails. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Readings, is Senate Bill 451. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 451's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 451, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Speaker, I think there was a shelling Amendment on the Bill as it came out of committee. So, I'd like this to go back to Second Reading so I can take off the Amendment and we can deal with the substantive Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put that Bill back on the Order of Second Reading on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Currie, we have that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. We put it back on the Order of Second Reading. We need you to clarify your intentions with the Amendments. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Yeah. If you'd put it on the board, I want to... I mo..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, status of this..."

Currie: "...my Motion is to table Amendment #1, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 451. And then if we can move the Bill from Second to Third."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, we'll take that Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Bill-Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1538. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Danny Reitz on Senate Bill 1538."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill sets up an imprest fund. It allows the Department of Natural Resources to use a imp... use these funds to run events at the World Shooting Complex. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1538 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 Brady, you want to... be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 14 of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences, we have Senate... House Bill 1327. Representative Senger."
- Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1327, I'd like to make a Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment #1 which deletes the current law provisions which require that all free-standing emergency centers to have a helicopter pad. This was passed unanimously in the Senate. I wanted to concur."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Senger, I believe your Motion is to nonconcur."

Senger: "The Motion is to concur."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, that Motion is, I've been informed, is still in Rules."

Senger: "What?"

Speaker Lyons: "Just a minute, Representative, we're... we're checking on the status. Representative, we clarified the issue. It is a Motion to Concur with Amendment #1. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's correct. That is correct."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. The Lady's made the Motion to Concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1327. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1327?' This is final action. 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? John Fritchey, Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1327. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 12 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, Speaker Madigan has House Bill #7. The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Michael J. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 7 is concerned with campaign finance reform.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Bill fundamentally changes the Illinois campaign finance system. It establishes contribution and transfer limits for all political committees. It increases transparency. It enhances the enforcement authority of the of Elections. The Bill Board establishes contribution limits for all political committees. Political committees can no longer accept unlimited amounts of money. The Bill limits the amount of money flowing into the campaign system and reduces the influence of outside groups and lobbyists. All political committees must operate under a system of caps. A committee organized for one candidate may accept... may accept up to \$5 thousand from an individual and up to \$10 thousand from a corporation, labor organization or association. A committee organized to assist multiple candidates such as a political Party or a caucus committee or a noncandidate committee, such as a committee organized by a union or an association, may accept up to \$10 thousand from an individual and up to \$20 thousand from a corporation, labor organization or association. Concerning self-funders. There's an exception to the caps for candidates whose opponent self funds a campaign. A public official or a candidate or his immediate family makes independent expenditures during the 12 months prior to an election of more than \$250 thousand for a statewide election all candidates in that particular race are permitted to raise in excess of the contribution For all other elective offices the threshold limits. amount is \$100 thousand. The Bill restricts transfers between political committees. A committee may transfer up

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

\$90 thousand to another committee. To prevent individuals and groups from circumventing the caps, public officials, candidates, corporations, labor organizations, associations, and political Parties are limited to forming one political committee for a candidate and one multiple candidate committee. Other proposals introduced this year included language that only permitted the Legislative Leaders to form a committee to support Members of their caucus. To me that would strengthen the critics' argument Legislative Leaders control the the election activities of the Members. Under this Bill, every Member the General Assembly will have the exact opportunity to support and oppose candidates for office. The Bill would provide that the Democratic Party of Illinois would be prohibited from endorsing or making contributions in support or opposition to candidates running in that Party's Primary Elections. The Bill provides authority for a constituent services fund. current law, a Member may use political funds to offset the expenses of running a district office. The Bill permits a Member to form a constituent services fund to accept contributions up to \$5 thousand from any source to assist with constituent services in the maintenance of a district office. This fund cannot be used for election created Provides for year-round disclosure. The Bill purposes. requires committees to submit quarterly reports expenditures and contributions. Under current law, a political committee files these reports semi-annually. From May 1 through adjournment, Members of the General

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Assembly must disclose within two business days contribution a Member receives in excess of \$500. Governor is required to make the same disclosures during the 90 days following adjournment of the Session. law, candidates for office must report contribution in excess of \$500 made in the 30 days prior to an election. This Bill extends the limit of the reporting period to 60 days prior to an election. Concerning independent expenditures. An individual who electioneering communications during any 12-month period in thousand relating amount in excess of \$3 candidate or a question of public policy must file a disclosure with the state board. The Bill also provides for the possibility of obtaining an injunction to prevent a person or media outlet from broadcasting an electioneering communication in violation of this provision. Concerning the enforcement authority of the State Board of Elections. The board will have the authority to audit a political committee if the committee fails to submit two consecutive quarterly reports. The Bill also increases the fine the board may levy for violations of the Election Code. Additionally, the board must develop and maintain an online database of complaints filed with the board and the fines imposed. And finally, all hearings before the board must be open to the public. The Bill creates a task force to study and make recommendations concerning the development of a program to publicly financed judicial campaigns. task force consists of members appointed by the Governor, the Illinois Supreme Court, each Legislative Leader and the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

State Board of Elections. Caps go into effect on January 1, 2011. Since we are approaching the beginning of the next campaign cycle, imposing caps at this time would pose an unfair advantage to those who have been raising funds under the current system. An implementation date after the next election will give everyone an opportunity for a fresh start on January 1, 2011. Mr. Speaker, we're on Second Reading or Third Reading? I'm sorry. I'm advised it's a Motion to Concur. I move that the House concur in the Senate's Amendment to House Bill 7."

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

"Thank... thank you, Speaker. To the Gentleman's Fritchey: I will say that it's a unexpected and admittedly uncomfortable situation to stand next to the Sponsor and my Leader, yet voice reservations about what is happening here. Let me be clear about something. We have accomplished some significant, significant advances in the areas of reform this Session: in the areas of FOIA, in the areas of contracting, in the areas of cleaning up problematic hires in the State Government, and none of those would have been done without the leadership of Speaker Madigan. I commend him for it. This Bill also would not be here but for him. Ladies and Gentlemen, those of you that have been here for a while know that while the reform commission may put a hundred days into their efforts a number of us have put a lot of years into our efforts on ethics and reform legislation, myself included. Yet, that notwithstanding, I cannot in good conscience support a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

measure which I do not believe accomplishes that which it purports to do. I'm not going to sit here and say that this is not substantive and significant, but it's not the best we can do. The public is looking to us to address a lot of their concerns. Now, I will tell you from my own experience contribution caps do not take money out of the political process. I've learned that as a legislative candidate; I learned that pretty well earlier this year as a Congressional candidate. So, to the public that thinks that caps take money out of the process, they don't. What it does do, if applied evenly and thoroughly, is take some of the influence, an undue influence, out of the process and that's part of the goal. It's a difficult situation with a Bill like this in its present form. I assure you that there will be many in the media, many in the public, that will say that if you support this you've supported something that looks like reform but really isn't. If you oppose it, you're not for any kind of reform. I would submit to those and especially those in the media, it's very easy to play Monday morning quarterback; it's very easy to come to Jesus late in the game after being silent for years and criticize whatever we do. I will also readily come to the defense of the Members of this Body and our colleagues across the rotunda. None of us have been the cause or focus of the untoward and unfortunate headlines that have plaqued this state for years, yet we've been painted with a broad brush as if we are part of the problem. I reject that; I do. I look around this room and I see a room full of well intended and hardworking and good

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

and decent men and women trying to do the best that they can for the 105 thousand people that each of us represents. I reject the insinuation that the problems over the last several years have been our doing. I also reject the assertion that simply passing more and more laws will do away with those problems. Good laws will not keep bad people from trying to break them. That being said, we have an obligation to try to put forth the best that we can to and regain public confidence in Illinois respect the work of the government. Ι bicameral commission, or committee that was put together by Speaker Madigan, and President Cullerton, my Senator, to look at a number of issues. I appreciate the work product. As those of us that worked on the pay-to-play ban understand, oftentimes these Bills can take years, not days or weeks or months, years. I'd recognize that the public is tired of waiting and I recognize and appreciate their impatience. That notwithstanding, I would caution us from a rush to judgment to say that any reform that we have passed will simply be good reform because it's better than what we had. What can often be the case is that if we pass something..."

Speaker Lyons: "John, your time is expired. If you could conclude your remarks, we'd appreciate it."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate that. Passing something is not necessarily better than nothing. I understand those of you that feel that this is a good first step. I don't think that this is the time for first steps. I think that this is a time to put an issue to rest. I

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- respectfully don't believe that this Bill does this. Thank you, Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of Black: That being under House Rule 64, I move to divide the question on the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 7. Under House Rule 64, if the question under consideration contains several points, any Member can move to have the question divided. I think there are significant differences between Senate Amendment #1 and Amendment #2 and I would renew my Motion that we divide the question and take each Amendment on a separate Roll Call."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, I've been advised by the parliamentarian we wouldn't have a problem by separating the Amendments, so we will work on, Mr. Clerk, Amendment #1."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And thank you very much, Mr. Parliamentarian."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis on Amendment #1."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor awaits your questions, Sir."
- Reis: "Can we have a verification from the Clerk on what House Amendment 1 does?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Amendment 1. Speaker Madigan, I'd be advised that'd be your question to ask on Amendment 1."
- Madigan: "Amendment 1 is the Bill except for the proposed creation of a task force on judicial elections."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Reis: "Okay. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, several questions we have that I don't think you've addressed yet. What about current campaign war chests the candidates, incumbents or even challengers have on the day that this law becomes... if this were to become law, what happens to those campaign balances?"

Madigan: "They remain as is."

Reis: "So, if someone has \$3 million, they get to use it and then whoever would start running for an office, maybe for the same office, would have to start under the new rules?"

Madigan: "That was the reason for the delayed effective date."

Reis: "Until January 2..."

Madigan: "Drawing upon the experience of New Mexico, where New Mexico adopted caps and then subsequently realized that in adopting caps with an early effective date they had advantaged people who had already been fundraising and they had disadvantaged those who had not yet started. And so they came back with a trailer Bill that provided for a delayed effective date, just as this Bill would provide for a delayed effective date."

Reis: "We all know what happened last November when we passed a Bill to create new campaign finance reforms, certain individual took off for the races, so to speak. Do you think that could happen with this when the people see that this January 2011 date is coming up that they could build strong stockpiles and maybe do things less than legitimate, not just for candidates but also PACs. Will the PACs balances remain the same, too, on January 1, 2011?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Madigan: "The thought behind the delayed effective date was that there'll be a General Election in November of 2010. The expectation is that any candidate in that General Election will pretty well have expended whatever funds they had raised during that campaign. And the imposition of the caps would happen in less than two months' time, well in advance of the next election cycle."
- Reis: "We're very familiar with depleting our funds at the end of an election on our side, so we know where that's at, but we know and sometimes that might create some unhealthy or unethical things during those last two months, so. With regards to in-kind contributions, if a candidate wishes to lick envelopes or stuff envelopes or anything like that, how will the in-kinds be treated to candidates? Will volunteers be able to do that?"
- Madigan: "Volunteer services are not considered a contribution."
- Reis: "Okay. Now, we're going to allow candidates now to create up to four PACs. Is that correct? For individual, for multicandidate, for indivi... constituent services and then a noncandidate PAC."
- Madigan: "No, I think for those holding public office they can create a single candidate committee for themselves. If they wish to raise money for others, they can create a multiple candidate committee and then if they wish to have a constituent service fund, they can create that also. Now, the purpose of the constituent service fund is to supplement the expenditures made in the district offices."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Reis: "Well, those of us that have concerns that this language of this Bill doesn't go far enough, really that creates another income mechanism for the candidate because we all subsidize our com... I shouldn't say we all... many of us subsidize our constituent services with campaign money. Now, this will allow that candidate to earn, under the new caps, money to subsidize their constituent services office so they won't be pulling down their campaign contributions that were made to them. So, we kind of feel that you can earn 10 thousand a year here, 10 thousand a year there, 10 thousand a year at another place each year before an election..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your five minutes are up. If you could conclude your question, we've got a lot of people to ask questions."
- Reis: "Okay. We're just concerned that this really isn't controlling the flow of money into candidates that are running for public office. Thank you for your time."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask Speaker Madigan some questions about the Bill. Will he yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Awaits your questions, Sir."

Tryon: "Speaker Madigan, along the lines of the questioning that I asked in committee, if I'm a candidate, let's say, for State Rep, I can have my own committee and I could have the Party... McHenry County could accept \$90 thousand from, let's say, a caucus committee or another political committee. The township organization that would likely support me could accept from a caucus Leader or the Party

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

\$90 thousand that could be used to elect a candidate and I could have Citizens to Support Tryon and Beaubien which would be a multicandidate committee and they could accept \$90 thousand from a political committee or a labor organization or a... or business organization. And I could have some friends who think I'm doing a good job that want to have citizens to elect a conservative State Rep and they could take \$90 thousand from each of those groups. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Tryon: "Okay. To the Bill. I don't... and by the way, Speaker, so you know, you can't be a Member and come to Springfield and not have the utmost respect for you, not just the office, but you yourself, because when you look at your career and your accomplishments, you have done a tremendous job at many things. But when I look at this campaign finance reform Bill, and I look at the fact that we need to have campaign finance reform after what we've just gone through in Illinois, I believe we can do better than this, because I don't believe that this changes much of anything but empower political Party bosses and caucus Leaders. If... And the people that are in the seat that have the most power are the people that can write the checks for \$90 thousand. If I were a corrupt individual, that doesn't end pay-to-play. I could tell somebody if I was Governor and I wanted to give them a contract, if they wrote a check for \$90 thousand to one of these groups that think I'm doing a good job, I could do that. That's not going to end the pay-to-play issue that's before us. I

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

look at the fact that what we have here is just a shifting of how you raise and donate money and who gets to control that money. I look at this more as a shell game that codifies the current practices that we have today Illinois, rather than something that provides meaningful campaign reform. We have before us in this Body, it's in the Rules Committee, House Bill 24. We have 50 cosponsors follows the guidelines of the Ιt Commission; it follows campaign finance reform that we've seen in other states and even in the U.S. Congress, it's similar to that. It follows the guidelines that have been recommended from the political... Illinois Campaign for Political Reform. I just don't see the reform here that you see. I think we can do better than this. I think in order for us to restore faith in campaign financing, faith the process, faith in Illinois politics, we need something that goes much further than this. I don't want to empower political bosses and caucus Leaders. empower the candidates. I look at this as... I wouldn't want to be... how do you... how does this benefit an Independent or somebody that's not part of a Party that's just wanting to go out and challenge the process and run as a candidate? There are great weaknesses here because of the people who are in power have the ability to raise \$90 thousand checks and to write \$90 thousand checks. And I just don't see the reform that you see. I don't think this is the right step for us to take at this time, considering where we've been in the last... in the last year here and what has been uncovered in Illinois politics in the last 10 years. So,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

unfortunately, this is not a Bill I think I can support. I agree with the three major Chicago newspapers. The Chicago Tribune editorialized that this was worse than doing nothing at all. I still think this codifies the current practices we have before us. I still think we can do better than this. I think we should look at the... the Collins Commission Report which is the commission that Governor Quinn put in place here and come back with meaningful campaign financing reform that works Illinois and restores faith in the process, restores faith and doesn't empower Party bosses and pol..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The Illinois public watched a disaster for our state's reputation last winter. I was overseas and the leading story for two days in a row was that our Governor had been arrested by the This Bill is a reaction to the shame and disgrace FBT. that Illinois faced at that time, but I think the Illinois citizens think they have a target in sight. They're like Captain Kirk at the bridge of the Star Trek Enterprise and they've got their guns ready to go, the phasers are loaded, photon torpedoes on the way and suddenly it disappears. It's a Romulan ship and they used a cloaking device. that's what this Bill is. It's a cloaking device desight... and designed to convince the Illinois public that, in fact, we have some ethics reform in this state. That's a sham. All this does is hand further control over the caucuses, further control over the Party apparatus to the Leaders. Ninety thousand dollars is not a limit, particularly when

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

in-kind contributions are completely ignored. You could fund an entire campaign on in-kind contributions and not one dollar would have to go to that candidate. We had an opportunity with House Bill 24 and with the Collins Commission for some real reform. It may not have been a perfect Bill, but it was a heck of a lot better than this one. No limits and in-kind contributions, why would you bother even writing a check to a candidate when the Party apparatus can make or break a candidate. The Party Leaders will select the people they want to serve with them. This is not campaign reform whatsoever. It's simply a sham. It does nothing other then centralize power in the hands of the caucus Leaders. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Julie Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. First, I do want to congratulate Speaker Madigan because I think we have passed a very comprehensive and thoughtful set of new laws that we can be proud of dealing with government reforms and government ethics. But more than any of the other... more than any, really, of the reform legislation that we have considered, I think that campaign finance reform is the one, the most important issue for the public. I ran an online petition and we, really, within days 3,500 people responded, many of them with strong comments, urging us to do meaningful contribution caps. And what our people... what I heard from people throughout the state that... is that they have learned how to equate unlimited campaign contributions with our pay-to-play political culture. They want meaningful caps to demonstrate that we are indeed

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

ready for change. And that is, in fact, the campaign contribution cap legislation that I had hoped for. limits in this Bill, I think, fall short of that and I don't think that the public is going to be satisfied if, in fact, our goal, my goal, was to restore the confidence of the public. Now, having said that, to me this comes down to a strategy question and it's not unlike the kind of strategy question that we have to decide on many other issues that we work on down here. And the strategy question is this, should we, in fact, decide to defeat this legislation for today and start all over? really, the question is, can we recreate the energy, the interest, the pressure and the momentum for change or is it better to put this on the books and continue to monitor it and watch it and hope someday that we can continue to tweak it and make it better. And I think, and again, not unlike many other Bills that we have to decide on, we don't have perfect Bills in shape the first day. So, I have come to believe after a lot of agonizing about this and not being very happy about this vote that, in fact, we cannot start all over that there is no way to really get that moving again. So, I am reluctantly standing here to urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Elaine Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Campaign finance reform in Illinois has clearly been a very long time in coming and it has, I recognize, been a rather arduous process to get to the Bill we have before us today and as one of only five states with no contribution limits, I believe that this is

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

a necessary step. But I am disappointed with the Bill we have before us. It does have gaping holes and it's inconsistence in its application. Where there contribution limits, they're high and there are no limits for in-kind contributions from a political committee, but there are strict limits if you are a private entity, such as a Chamber of Commerce or a union. And then the enforcement provisions, I believe, are very lacking where the State Board of Elections only has the ability to perform an audit after two consecutive reports have been failed to be filed. So, we have to wait for an inattentive or malevolent candidate or campaign treasurer to fail to do something. I think the state board... is the heavy hand of the State Board of Elections could be if they could perform an unannounced or... an unannounced audit. But I agree with my colleague, that despite the flaws in the Bill, the pressure for this reform is as high as it's going to get. Next year the scandals of the recent past will be another year behind us and the anger will be fading. So, while this Bill is far from the one we need, it is the one we have. We must continue to refine it, strengthen it, and make it better just as we have with almost every other significant piece of legislation we pass here. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harry Osterman."

Osterman: "To the Bill. As all of you know and many of you know, this is not my preferred Bill. I've sponsored this legislation for three years, consistent with House Bill 24. I want to thank all of the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, because those people who signed up as cosponsors and

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

fought for this did so because they want to get rid of the influence of money in our system because they're sick and tired of having their constituents be skeptical of State Government. And I appreciate the efforts yesterday to try to get that Bill called. My preference is that we'd be voting on that Bill today, but that's not where we are. This Bill is flawed, severely flawed. But I look at tonight as a step in the right direction, a step restoring our state's credibility. The reality is that we are going to be judged, all of us and those in elected office, on how we act and how we run our campaigns and how we govern, the choices we make. I think that we need to improve upon this and I think my colleague from Evanston hit it on the head about whether this Bill is defeated will we ever see this again? And I know in this building, whether they're in office or whether they're on the rail, that there are people that would love nothing better than to have this Bill go down in flames, never to see the light of day again. And I've concluded that a better track is to continue to work on this issue. There's a reality we're going to face tonight within about three or four hours and that's going to be that all of us are going to spend an awful lot of time together over these next months. there's another reality is that this Bill takes effect in 2011. And I don't think the pressure is going to let up. I don't think the public is going to accept this as a fait accopl... and, this is the final product. And I will be there with the groups like the Illinois coalition Campaign for Political Reform, CHANGE Illinois! and the Collins

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Commission to keep the pressure up. There's more that we can do, much more that we can do, but we need to work on that in a bipartisan way and with the Senate to improve upon this. We will be judged on what the final product is. It is not tonight, but I stand to support this Bill and more importantly pledge to continue to work on this issue 'til we get it right."

Speaker Lyons: "I think we're back in business, Ladies and Gentlemen. I didn't break it; I didn't do it; I didn't do nothing, Mom. All right. I think we can continue debate. If you're requesting to speak... Representative Ryg, I think you were the next person to have a light on."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Kathy... The Chair recognizes Representative Kathy Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we all began Session with a great deal of talk about reforms that would restore the public's confidence in us, their elected officials. We've all followed the issue of campaign finance reform while the public has been watching with interest and a lot of well-deserved cynicism. Now, we have a Bill before us with no time to offer changes. The Bill is very publicly opposed by the very groups of citizens who have been begging for real campaign finance reform. Those groups include the League of Women of Voters, the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, the Illinois Reform Commission, and CHANGE Illinois! Even the supporters of this Bill recognize that it's only better than nothing. I'd suggest that better than nothing on the last day of

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Session without a budget that works for the State of Illinois and without real meaningful campaign reform, while I would suggest that better than nothing doesn't sit very well with the voters at home. I urge a 'present' vote on this Bill and a request for a real commitment to continuing to work to improve the reform measures that we're attempting to reach. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tom Holbrook."

"Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. House Bill 7 is Holbrook: truly a step in the right direction. However, I think it has one unintended consequence we may not have caught yet and that is, just as when I used to work in my union we would donate a nickel an hour or a dollar a day or a dollar a week towards our political fund. It does support our candidates and support our causes. Our company would collect them in the paycheck, reimburse them to our union, our union would then bundle those donations for maybe four or five hundred people and write a check to our political action committee at the state level. Under this Bill, that check isn't considered individual donations from all those individuals; it's considered one donation and I think then it would cause some real problems with some of the caps in And I would hope that between now and 2011, when this goes into effect, that we correct this and because these are truly individual voluntary donations, just as when I used to make my voluntary nickel an hour donation. And we che... that we... this get corrected for the good of the people that make these in good faith, as what they are individual donations, that at their convenience are then

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

bundled and mailed forward. And I would hope we would correct that when we come back either in Veto Session or first thing next year. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Debbie Graham."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was sitting here listening to the debate and I agree that this Bill doesn't go far enough and we've reached the last day of Session. But President Obama set a precedent, if we want to see further reforms and changes, we don't have to wait for a law to be passed. If you want to have smaller contributions, make sure you send it out on invitations, 'do not send more than x, y, z amount of money'. You can do that for yourself. We can continue this... this process. We can continue next year to continue talking about reforms, but remember, reform starts at home as well. Everyone who is talking and doing the different things, President Obama did set the precedent. We can decide for each one of ourselves how much money you want to accept and what the limits are. You don't need a law to set the limits for you. You can set the limits for yourself. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition, although it's to Senate Amendment #1 sponsored by the right honorable Gentleman. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

House, this isn't campaign finance reform. First of all, it doesn't kick in until the election cycle of 2012 and then... and there... one could say there are sound reasons for But let's just concentrate on two things that I think are the part of the fatal flaws of Senate Bill... or excuse me, House Bill 7. There's no limit, no limit at all on in-kind contributions. Now, that loophole is big enough to drive a bank armored truck on steroids through. means those people who control the committee funds can use unlimited contributions to hire staff, lease computers, pay the rent on an office, buy hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of campaign commercials, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of direct mail costs and hire unlimited numbers of people to direct... to deliver the direct mail or knock on doors or do all of the things, but rather than have volunteers do it, they can hire people to do it. That... that doesn't... that's not campaign finance reform. That's the current system. That's the current pay-to-play. If you can put 600, 700, 800 thousand dollars into a race, you should be able to win the race. The second fatal flaw, in my opinion, to Senate Amendment #1 is there's no enforcement. There's no enforcement whatsoever. House Bill 7 would give the State Board of Elections the ability to order an audit... an audit when a committee failed to file a quarterly report two times in a calendar year. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've served with people in this chamber who didn't file reports period. Some of them were fined a couple hundred dollars, some of them a thousand dollars. So, I... I filed a Bill this year, House Bill 2261,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

that raised the number of members on the State Board of Elections, who do go over this, from 8 to 11. And the Bill said that the other three appointments had to be from other established political Parties. Now, are you surprised that Bill did not get called, would not be posted, could not be heard in committee? Why? Because the current board consists of eight members, four Republicans and four Democrats. So, if you get a Democrat who violates campaign disclosure laws currently, the board meets and decide, how much should they be fined? They haven't reported for the last two years. Well, let's fine them \$25 thousand. let's vote. The four Democrats vote 'no', that's too much. The four Republicans vote 'yes', that's a good amount. Nothing happens. Same thing if it's a Republican. Republicans on the board vote, well, it I don't think we should fine that misunderstanding. The Democrats vote 'yes', we should fine that So, there is absolute... The State Board of Elections has no enforcement capabilities; it's a toothless tiger. So, when all is said and done, and in all due respect to the honorable Gentleman that brings Senate Amendment #1 to us this evening, and even though it doesn't take effect until the 2012 election cycle, this is not campaign finance reform. And for those of you who have gotten up and said that it isn't campaign finance reform and that we can do better and should have done better and could do better with House Bill 24, then you shouldn't vote for Senate Amendment #1. It's not campaign finance reform; we all know it; we all can do better. We've got a Bill

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

that, if we could just simply get it out of the Rules Committee, would close off most if not all of the glaring loopholes in campaign finance in the State of Illinois. We have become a national embarrassment. This does not change that perception. It doesn't even change it in reality. I urge a 'no' vote on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tim Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I do have a couple of quick questions for Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lyons: "The Speaker will be happy to answer your questions."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Speaker Madigan, as we go through this Bill, does this Bill in its current form writ... limit contributions from individuals or corporations to a trade association, a political action committee that it's not affiliated with an individual candidate or a political Party?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Schmitz: "I... That's how we interpreted it as well. My question is, under the First Amendment how do we... how do we limit contributions from a member giving to their association under their right of free speech that, you know, it's not affiliated with any particular candidate of any way, shape or form?"

Madigan: "The answer is that this is money going into a political committee. It's not going into a committee just for general communication. It's going into a political committee."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Schmitz: "So, then to take it, I guess, one step further, Speaker, would this... a relative, a great aunt or uncle passes away and wants to donate a hundred thousand dollars in their will to an anti-animal cruelty who also happens to have a PAC or something, that this would not allow them to will those funds to a... to a political action committee, as well."
- Madigan: "Well, they could... they could contribute to the... the group that you mentioned, but not to the political committee, at least not in excess of the cap."
- Schmitz: "Do you think this... this limiting an individual to donate to their own trade association, that's not associated with the candidate, is infringing on their individual rights as under the First Amendment?"
- Madigan: "Well, again, it's a political committee and that's the essence of the Bill. The Bill is concerned with political committees. And the intent of the Bill is to put caps on the flow of money into the political committees. So, in terms of the general operation that counts with that group, there'd be no limitation on that, but there would be a limit on contributions into a political PAC."
- Schmitz: "Okay. Speaker, I would respectfully have an issue with that thinking that that... this particular portion of the Bill is ripe for a lawsuit when you're not allowing an individual to willfully donate to an organization that's not associated with any particular candidates, it's a general PAC and they gave it to House, Senate candidates, statewide candidates. I think this is the portion that

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

could have some problems should it be brought to court. Thank you for your time, Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."

Unknown: "No."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Leader Tom Cross."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's fascinating Cross: to listen to this debate and all of the folks tonight saying... and I know the spot they're in... but talk about saying one thing at another time and doing another. This is the epitome of running from the reality and the truth of what's going on here. And to hear people say, well, it's a start. We'll get back to it later. We're going to clean it up. And it's not good, it's not perfect. Maybe, you know what, we'll all work on it this summer and we'll make sure... we're going to really work on this to clean up Illinois government and get it done next time. We had a Governor indicted in this state, the second one in a row, if you haven't... in case you've forgotten. We impeached a Governor, our Governor, we impeached him. It started here and then went over to the Senate. And if you recall, and I'm looking at... I'm going to refer to several newspaper articles from the last couple days. Back in... I'm not going to name names... but back about the time we impeached the Governor, a number of us spoke and we said things like, we're all on notice, we need to be held accountable for what comes after; Illinois needs a new business model for doing the peoples' business. This Bill is not a new business model that does anything differently. Another Rep

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

says, there's more work to be done and I want to assure the people of Illinois and the people of this country that we will continue to do that work until that job has been done. The job's not done. This isn't even halfway there. an illusion of change. We fool ourselves if we believe impeaching this Governor is the panacea for the political ills that plaque our state and plaque our republic. last one, I don't want my children and all the children in our state to grow up thinking that our politicians are corrupt. And unfortunately, most of our kids think that right now; he's right. Today, we're taking the first step in taking back our government. It's our duty to clean up the mess and stop the freak show which has become Illinois government. Now, I'm not sitting up here on behalf of our caucus, as many have had and to quote, 'make some political gain in opposing this Bill'. Everybody in this system and more importantly, outside the system... outside the system, says this Bill does absolutely nothing to change the culture in Springfield and the process involving raising AARP, Better Government Association, monev. Chicago Metropolitan... Metropolis 2020, Citizens Advocacy Center, Civic Federation, the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, Protestants for the Common Good and the Sunshine Project recently sent out a letter to a number of Reps who made a rather courageous vote the other day when we moved to discharge. At that time, we moved to override the Chair and 13 Members on the other side of the aisle joined with us to override the Chair on a Bill that actually did something and went far enough along to enact real change in

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Illinois government. These people write, 'the limits are so high and the loopholes so many that no one should consider this measure a reform or any practical limitation on campaign contributions. A vote against House Bill 7 would be a vote for real campaign finance reform. blocking House Bill 7, you and your colleagues can work on behalf of stronger and better campaign limits.' Sun-Times says, 'It's fool the taxpayer time. What they've delivered is in reality squat. What passes for reform will only consolidate power in the hands of Illinois leaders. Lawmakers are going to blow it and that's a travesty. When Illinois... when the campaign limits are passed, Illinois will have among the highest limits in the nation and when limits are so high, they are meaningless.' Chicago Tribune, among other editorials they've written, talks about the reform commission's work. That's the work done by the outsiders, folks, not the insiders. Unfortunately, of its recommendations have been shredded by legislative fan blades. Today, in the Springfield Journal-Register, headline, 'Incumbents take care of themselves. This Bill should be called the Incumbent Protection Act of 2009, an unsurprising development. The Bill would leave intact the system where the Legislative Leaders can dole out unlimited amounts of cash to their candidates. It also seeks to suffocate independent groups, the political action committee, a system that concentrates power so heavily in the hands of four people is ripe for corruption even if those who hold those office today are not'. article in the Springfield paper today interviews an

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

individual by the name of Kent Redfield, professor at the University of Illinois at Springfield. 'It is an illusion of reform. It essentially codifies the status quo because it allows Leaders to raise huge chunks of money and spend it without limit. This would have been an opportunity to do something that would significantly change the nature of Doing something that is kind of a halfway the system. measure delayed that might make... ultimately make Legislative Leaders more powerful'. That is not outcome, I would have polled for it. The Daily Herald says, 'This is by far the best... it is far from the best we can do'. And another article in the Sun-Times by Carol Marin in which she quotes Cindi Canary, who we all know is the executive director of the Illinois Campaign Political Reform, 'I feel scammed.' said Cindi Canary. last but not least, The SouthtownStar, today, 'The people of Illinois are poorly served by this half attempt at reform. We believe more could have been done and frankly, more should have been done', said Patrick Collins, 'what I'm most disappointed by this opportune... by this is this opportunity is not going to come again.' I apologize for spending a little time reading these quotes, but we're not going to have another time. We're going to leave here tonight. We may be back to talk about a budget as we've discussed in earlier debates, but the pressure's on tonight. The pressure's been on all Session. The pressure to do something is at its highest moment, an opportunity to make real change, change where we can be different from the past, change where we can say, we get it. We understand

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

our system's flawed. We understand our system is corrupt in ways and that we indeed need to do better. this package that is not real, that does absolutely nothing to go to the root of the problem, is not change. It means we're going along with those that we are, in fact, trying to regulate and legislate. Isn't there something ironic That we are actually going along with the about that? people who have the power and have the money. And the Reform Commission in the Outsider said, that's what we're trying to get to. That's what we want to change. doesn't do it. I would strongly encourage those on the other side of the aisle who have been very much a part of change and wanting change and talking about change and suggesting they are for change to do what they know... and I don't say this sarcastically... but to do what they know is right and is very, very difficult to do. Given the fact that your Leader's the Sponsor, that is a difficult task and a position to be in, but this doesn't do it. This is not the Bill. This does not change our system and to let this pass and to try to say that we've done reform or maybe we really haven't but we'll get back to it at another time, doesn't cut it. So, Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in opposition. We hope this Bill doesn't make it, not because we don't want reform, but because we want real reform and the only way to get real reform is to scrap this Bill and start over. Thank you for the time."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's hard to follow that eloquent discussion of the Bill. My light had

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

gone off when the power went off and so I'm a little late. Would the Sponsor yield for a question? I think there's only one that I have left that other people hadn't asked."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "On self-funding, if in a municipal or a legislative race, someone funds themselves a hundred thousand dollars. It takes off all campaign limits. Does that mean it takes off all campaign limits for both Parties so that if I want to take off campaign limits and I'm very wealthy, I can give myself a hundred thousand dollars and that removes the campaign limits for both candidates?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

"To the Bill. And I think this is a flaw. Mulligan: Particularly the last one, I certainly think it's a flaw, because pretty soon what you have is only very wealthy people. But I'd like to comment generally on the finance reform and on the ethics part of what's going on in our state right now. I noticed that the newspapers have pretty much failed the very first point of what they should ask. What they should ask the public is, the person that you're backing, do you go out and find out about them? Do you go to a hear... a town hall meeting or campaign platform discussions? Because the basic thing that you need to do is you need to elect ethical people. I don't care what you'll pass. If you don't know what's right and wrong and you don't have a feel for what's ethical, you'll get around Secondly, the biggest problem I have with this Bill is if you're an independent thinker in your own Party or ideologically you're a little different than people in your

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

own Party, you have now given the maze of control to the Party Leaders and not to Independents. You've taken it away from PACs that go for Independent issues that go... give money to both sides of the aisle according to issue. therefore, you've limited who can run to only people that fit a certain ideolotical... ideological position whether it's Democrat or Republican. You've removed Independent voices or someone that may want to be Independent voice, on things that have gone on the last couple days here, you see how important it is to have some people that are Independent. So, what you've done by this Bill is you've removed the ability of anybody that's an Independent in their own Party from actually getting any If you're someone like I kind of campaign contribution. was for a number of years that has both a Primary and then possibly a General, what happens is, you can only raise a certain amount of money in that one year. So, if you have a Primary that's really tough, that leaves you practically no money and leaves you very vulnerable for the General. I think there's a great deal to be said for voting against this Bill. It leaves open flaws for most people. are many other things that have come up that we have had introduced that have been disregarded over the years. of them is, longer terms. We would not have to raise so much money if we had longer terms and we would not be so under the Leaders' thumbs about how we vote and whatever, if we had a longer term and you would be... spend more time legislating and less time raising money. Senator Paul Simon, one of the reasons he quit was because he was

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

tired of raising money all the time. The other issue is, myself have had an Independent treasurer who's a volunteer for the last 20 years. She doesn't get paid. When you increased the amount of time she reports, I'm not paying her; she's doing that on her free time. How many people pay someone, which is quite expensive, to do their campaign, all their reporting. So, you're taking a look at volunteers and increasing those times. The amount of time I have to spend raising money takes away from what I would I'm not a Congressional person that has a large staff that looks at legislation. I'm a person that does my own legislation with help of a Leadership staff that serves many people. There are a lot of issues here such as shortening the length of time that we could put out campaign literature that would save money and be true A lot of campaign reform. those things have been introduced and they've been disregarded. If we wanted to change how campaigns were run and how we finance them, there's any number of things that have come up over the years. But basically the bottom line comes down to, don't take away the Independent voices by only giving money to the political Leaders and second, have the public realize we should go back to teaching civics and we should take a look at candidates who are ethical people to begin with, because they don't need these reforms to know what's the right thing to do."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll say... I said it yesterday, I'll say it again today. There are... to quote

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

another from the Collins Commission, 'there are forces at work here in the Capitol who are going to tweak the system, call it reform and call it a day.' It's a shame. It's a shame, Mr. Speaker. We would expect more of you. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that if this gets the requisite number, that I ask for a verification."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman's request for verification is so noted. Representative... Since no one is seeking further discussion, Representative Madigan to close."

"Mr. Speaker, others who have spoke in debate, debate Madigan: the point which is very valid that Illinois today in its Election Code does not have any caps on contributions. what we've heard over the last several weeks and several months has been that we ought to go to a better system of regulation of elections and that the big item in that suggestion is to impose caps on contributions. The Bill provides for caps on contributions. Some have argued that the caps are too high and I would suggest that if you consult with candidates who have run in elections where there are caps, they will tell you that the lower the cap the greater the advantage to the incumbent. Talk to anyone who's run in a federal election against an incumbent, say, for the Congress or for the U.S. Senate and they'll tell you that in a campaign, especially one against incumbent, they spend their entire day trying to raise money because of the low caps. And so, what this Bill would say is let's take a first step; let's go to caps; let's impose caps, but let's acknowledge that the lower the cap just advantages the incumbents and so, I would suggest

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

that the caps contained in this Bill are reasonable, they're well thought out and they will put us into a system of caps on contributions to political campaigns. I ask that you concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7."

Speaker Lyons: "The Speaker's asked for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7. This is final action. There's been a request for verification, so please vote your own switch. 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... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 46 Members voting 'no' and 8 Members voting 'present'. There's been a request for verification. Mr. Stephens, do you wish to proceed? Staff, please, retire from the chamber to the back of the chamber. And Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Mahoney: "The following Members voted in the affirmative: Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; John Bradley; Brosnahan; Burke; Burns; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Crespo; Currie; D'Amico; Davis, M.; DeLuca; Dugan; Dunkin; Farnham; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Ford; Franks; Froehlich; Golar; Gordon, C.; Gordon, J.; Graham; Hamos; Hannig, B.; Harris; Hernandez; Hoffman; Holbrook."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk. Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Withdraw my request."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman re... withdraws his request for verification. So, on the question, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 46 Members voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

The House does concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 7. And this Bill, having received... Anything further, Mr. Clerk? I believe we still have... we still have Amendment #2, but #1... Amendment #1 is thereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, Amendment #2. Speaker Madigan moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 7. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Michael Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and the second Senate Amendment would provide for the creation of a task force to study the wisdom of going to public financing of judicial elections. The task force would be composed as follows: four appointed by the Governor, four appointed by the Supreme Court, four by the Legislative Leaders, one by the State Board of Elections and the report will be due on January 2012. I would ask that you concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 7."

Speaker Lyons: "The Speaker has made a Motion to adopt... adopt Amendment... to concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 7. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't... I certainly don't want my remarks to think that everybody should vote for this, but having been around for a while, what... what motivated me to be supportive of the Gentleman's Senate Amendment #2 was a few years ago a Supreme Court race in Illinois and the Republican candidate was a man known to many of us in this chamber, he served in this chamber and in the Illinois Senate for some time. That race was off of the radar for a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

while and these Supreme Court districts are rather large. It's not unusual for the district to stretch from the Indiana border on the east to the Iowa or Missouri border on the west. And then suddenly in the last 30 or 40 days of that campaign, the race became somewhat important to a number of people and when the smoke cleared from that Supreme Court race, I believe more than a million dollars was spent on a Supreme Court race. Again, I would think that would put a candidate for the Illinois Supreme Court or any judge in a... in a somewhat difficult position. You're running for election and since we have no limits, somebody gives your campaign for judicial... a judicial post, \$40 thousand, perfectly legal, two weeks before election. Obviously, it has to be reported. And then sooner or later you're on the bench and somebody or a company or an individual contributor is before you. You're only choice is to recuse yourself from that particular case. Although Illinois history, I must say, is I believe ... and wish I could quote some of the cases and I've forgotten The Illinois history is replete with judges who forgot to recuse themselves from certain cases where people had contributed significant funds to their campaign which generally gives someone grounds for an appeal, depending on what side you're on. I... I think it's time that Senate Amendment #2 be adopted, that we at least look into a task There are people who are adamantly opposed to the public financing of judicial campaigns, but I think, again, I wish we could move more quickly and more... with greater efficacy towards real reform, but this may be something

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

that can yield some positive results. It just creates a task force; it doesn't require anything to be done. But let's examine the possibility and how it would work and how it would be financed and how candidates could access the money and how much money and all of the things that we would need to know to make a reasonable and rational decision. I think this is a good idea. I think the task force should study publicly financed judicial elections. Let's get at least judicial candidates out from the sometimes difficult and sometimes embarrassing position of raising money from people who may have a business before them in the years after they're elected to the bench. I rise in strong support of Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Rock Island, Representative Mike Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Amendment 2. Ever since I've been here in the chamber, I've long been a proponent of public financing of all elections, but particularly of those of judicial elections. We have a system here in the State of Illinois that we really ought to be thankful that we haven't had much more corruption than we have in the area of judicial candidates, judges and their decisions. It's really a mockery to have to have judges who weigh on so many important issues that they have to go out and raise money. We've seen that it has escalated to scandalous proportions here in the State of Illinois, particularly in races for the Supreme Court or for Appellate Court. We've seen millions of dollars come in from outside our state by special interest groups, one

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

side or the other, trying to influence the election and elect our people to the Supreme Court, to the Appellate Court. Pretty soon they'll be coming in and doing our Circuit Courts. So, my own personal preference is that we would move as some other states have done and actually have a merit selection of judges. The State of Iowa... I happen to have a brother-in-law who was the first Italian American appointed to the Iowa Supreme Court, a Democrat, by a Republican judge. It takes it out of the area of politics. Now, whether or not that's ever going to happen here in Illinois, the best we can do right now is to move to public financing of our judicial election. Hopefully, this task force will bring us back a recommendation to do such and we can begin to move that area out of this whole area of financing of elections of which we just talked about a number of different measures, some of which are worthwhile and some aren't. But we've seen that state after state, Arizona, Maine, and many other states have now gone to public financing of all their elections. We should take this first step. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Black and Mr. Boland did it very, very well.

Again, a 'yes' vote to concur in the Senate Amendment.

Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 7?' This is final action. 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?

66th Legislative Day

- Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 7. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion, were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 262, Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 268, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1197, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2218."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the Calendar under Senate Bills-Third Reading, we have Senate Bill 1197. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Are there Motions pending, Sir?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1197, Floor Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie on the Amendments."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. This is a technical correction to legislation we already passed. The... the Historic Preservation Agency, by Executive Order, had become part of the Department of Natural Resources. In the operations budget we did, we put the operations for that agency within DNR. Since then there is substantive legislation that restores the Historic Preservation Agency

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

to its own independent activities and this merely makes sure that the operations money that it needs will be available to it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino in the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burns. The Lady moves to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1197. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1197, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House, we discussed this measure at length last evening. This is a measure that would spend the moneys we have in order to fund all those items in State Government that were not funded in the appropriations Bills that dealt with the economic stimulus, work force, federal funds, and the basic turning on the lights of State Government. These are primarily grant programs and unfortunately, the moneys that we have available fund only 50 percent of the Governor's introduced budget. I don't think that's adequate. I doubt anybody in this chamber thinks it's adequate, but I would have to say that half a loaf is a whole lot better than none. And we have a responsibility to send this measure on its way and at least say that if there are layoffs, those layoffs will be limited. They will not be a hundred

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

percent of the programs that we fund through State Government. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I need your support to send this measure on its way to the Governor's desk."

Speaker Mautino: "On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burns."

Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to thank a number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have worked hard this entire Session to find an alternative to the budget document that we are confronted with this evening. Many of them have sponsored legislation like House Bill 174 and have worked to find a solution to this problem. This is not why I came to Springfield. This is not a budget that I believe is humane. This is not a budget that I believe is just. It balances... it is in balance because we are cutting \$5 billion from the operating budget and there will be real consequences for this budget, but the hour is late and at this hour and at this moment there are no other alternatives. It is my hope that we will find a bipartisan solution to this budget crisis, a solution that reflects well on all Illinoisans. A solution that reflects our values and our commitment to people and to helping people achieve their dreams and to provide opportunity to those who are seeking to join the American mainstream. I will vote for this budget, but I want to work with you and others in this chamber to fix a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- fundamental flaw in our state which is the lack of revenue to fund the services that people depend on."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook...

 Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative

 Hamos."
- Hamos: "I... I think I'm not clear, Representative Currie, about something you said because our analysis seems to suggest that... ours says that the amount of what we're appropriating to these various agencies is actually reducing the budgets by 68 percent, if that's the..."
- Currie: "Yeah. Well, yeah, exactly. It may... it may be that that reflects the fact that we were short a billion even with these new revenues. Is that..."
- Hamos: "Wait, wait. There are people who are yelling at me in the back."

Currie: "Yes."

- Hamos: "I think I understand that yesterday we passed two Bills that equaled about a billion dollars. I think I remember that. It's not that hard to forget about a billion dollars when we're this desperate. I want to know why we're appropriating only 3.386 per... billion of that. I think I'm trying to understand that. Where's the billion dollars being appropriated and why does it say that we're reducing these budgets by 68 percent? I think I'm just trying to understand that."
- Currie: "We are checking that out. It is my understanding that we were doing these dollar numbers at 50 percent of the Governor's introduced. So, hang on a second while we double check and make sure the analysis matches the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Hamos: "Well, it also adds up to 3,300,000,000, not 4.5 which is what I add when I take 3.5 plus a billion."

Currie: "Is it... is it possible you have an earlier analysis on your..."

Hamos: "I don't know."

Currie: "...on your machine. Well, we'll check that out for you."

Hamos: "Okay, thank you."

Currie: "Just hold your horses."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Okay. So, Representative Currie, I'm so sorry that we have a wrong analysis and we're a billion off. When we're only talking about four and a half billion dollars, it's kind of disconcerting to see a 3.3 billion dollar thing. But let me ask you this, so you're saying that actually the budgets will be reduced by 50 percent. Is that right?"

Currie: "From the Governor's introduced level."

Hamos: "I think there is a lot of confusion in our... in this Body, seemingly from the side conversations about what that means. Will the agencies that provide human services... they're not the only ones affected, but they certainly are affected, will they be able to spend as they have last year, for six months?"

Currie: "This is intended to be a full-year budget because this is the money we have available for the coming fiscal year, for fiscal '10. We do not have available revenues to make this a six-month and then somehow magically create dollars for the second half of the fiscal year. This is it. This

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

is all we have to spend. When we spend these moneys, our pockets are bare."

- Hamos: "Well, Representative Currie, I think we do understand this. What I'm really trying to understand is the impact of this, because it feels like... it looks like it... well, 50 percent we'll do it today, July 1, you know, they'll start spending and then we'll come back. You know, we're going to come back anyway for Veto Session probably, and we'll just take care of the next six months. Will these agencies be permitted... will they be allowed to sign six-month contracts, do you believe?"
- Currie: "Representative, it will be up to the Governor and the agencies to manage these dollars, but I would be very surprised if they behaved as if this were, in fact, only a six-month budget. I think it would be irresponsible for them to do that and I trust they will not."
- Hamos: "And what will happen, for example, to a program which I know is one of the grant programs, listed in the original group, for MAP, monetary... the Monetary... the scholarship money, Monetary Award Program. What will happen to that if it's 50 percent? What will happen to the hi... the college students who may have been notified by now, since it is July that they're eligible for MAP grants to begin their studies in September. What will happen there, do you think?"
- Currie: "They may have to prorate and of course, there are many times when students don't apply until closer to the beginning of the school year. So, their option would be to

66th Legislative Day

- prorate and their other option would be to begin denying applications that come in after the..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Time has expired, however, since the system was being updated, they'll give you a couple more minutes."
- Hamos: "Hear that. And what will happen to the early childhood programs that, I think, are in the schools. The parents are expecting that their kids will be able to start the Pre-K programs in September. I mean, what really will happen to... if it's only half funded?"
- Currie: "Representative, these programs will not all be able to survive. There will be some that will have to close their doors. That's the problem. That's why I offered a measure just a few hours ago that would help us close the budget gap, but that measure didn't pass. It didn't get 60 votes. And so, we are faced with this problem. We only have this money to spend; that's all there is. There isn't any more."
- Hamos: "And what will happen if we turn down this budget and say, we can't go along with this and why should we vote 'yes' anyway?"
- Currie: "Then there is zero. Then we're talking a hundred percent cut in the Governor's proposed budget in these areas. And I would say laying off 50 percent is better than laying off a hundred percent."
- Hamos: "Well, if our strategy is to put pressure on us to maybe straighten this out, maybe zero percent is better than 50 percent."
- Currie: "Well, I would say it isn't and I don't see that there is help on the horizon. As I say, two hours ago we took a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

vote on a measure that would give us the dollars to close the gap, not entirely but close, and that measure failed and it failed abysmally. So, I think at this stage the only responsible thing to do is to give the agencies what's available, give them what we've got, give them all there is and hope they can manage and hope that when we come back sometime this summer or fall, there is a renewed appetite to fill the funding gap."

Hamos: "What is the paragraph in our analysis about the Illinois State Board of Education's budget? What does all that mean? Since we don't have an updated version of this, it's hard to really understand this."

Currie: "There was... I'm sorry. There is... there is also in this Bill..."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "There is a small supplemental in this program as well.

There were some confusions about the way they applied for the federal stimulus money, so we correct the errors here. It is not more money; it is just a... a technical change. In addition, there is money in the supplemental to pay the full costs at the Court of Claims for soldiers who lose their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of the Lady's Bill. You know, nobody thinks this is sufficient; nobody thinks that it wouldn't be better if we could do better, although, some of the votes on a previous Bill this evening would indicate to me that many of you would like to

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

spend money, but you don't want to put the money in the pot to spend it. For those who say that this is a bad budget, this Bill is less about budgeting than it is about spending what we have. We've broken the piggy bank; we've taken every penny out of it and now we're going to spend it on everything that we can possibly spend it on. For those that say it isn't good enough, sure it isn't good enough. We should have done better on the income tax vote, but this is all we have to spend. And those of you who are going to say that we're short changing this program, the budget's bad, all those things, it's really not about the budget. It's about what we have to spend. And so, since this is all we have to spend and since many of you could not find it in your hearts to do the right thing on the income tax vote, then this is what we're left with. And so, we should support Representative Currie on this Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition, Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "I appreciate your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 1197. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 62 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1197, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, place House Bill 3874 on the board. Out of... Mr. Clerk, take that out of the record. The Lady from Cook, Representative Golar is seeking recognition."

66th Legislative Day

- Golar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, someone actually pressed my button.

 I wanted to be a 'no' vote on the past Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will so reflect."
- Golar: "Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, place Senate Bill 321 on the board. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 321's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. And Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Chapa LaVia on Senate Bill 321, Floor Amendment 3. Out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 268. Representative McCarthy. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 268 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, and 4 have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "On the Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 268,

 Representative Farnham. The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative McCarthy is seeking recognition."
- McCarthy: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do not need to do Amendment #2. We are waiting for Amendment #5 to come out of Rules, so we could do this all at one time, I would hope."
- Speaker Mautino: "Take this Bill from the record. Mr. Clerk, place Senate Bill 321 up on the board and read the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate 32... Senate Bill 321 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. And Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Floor Amendment #3. Representative...

 Representative Chapa LaVia on Floor Amendment #3."
- Chapa LaVia: "Speaker, I removed myself as the Chief Sponsor of this and gave that to Representative Osmond. Is it your wish that I read Amendment #1 and have it voted on?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond on Floor Amendment #3."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment we talked about yesterday and Representative Chapa LaVia was very kind enough to let me take part in this. What this does is allow a hospital which is in Representative Washington's district to apply for a freestanding medical facility... freestanding emergency medical facility in my district. They follow all the rules applying to the CON board. All this does is give them a chance to be able to do it. It extends the date until June 30. And I would appreciate any support I can get. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 321. And on that Motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a brief question?"
- Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Fritchey: "Representative, the simple question is this, there were certain opponents to this legislation yesterday. Do they still remain in opposition?"

Osmond: "Yes, I believe they are."

Fritchey: "Do... do you..."

Osmond: "The problem is that there are other hospitals in the area that feel that perhaps this is not needed. All I'm trying to do is give our hospital the opportunity of applying to the CON board and let the CON make the determination if it's needed or not."

Fritchey: "Okay. And I caught some of this debate yesterday, but didn't they have that opportunity like everybody else did?"

Osmond: "Well, what happened was that the time element for... the way that this original Bill was created two years ago, there was a cut-off time of March... I think it's 30 for the applications. They got denied their application for the hospital late February, so they filed a letter of intent and then they have 60 days from the date of the letter of intent which would be right now. So, this Bill will give them the opportunity to apply for that."

Fritchey: "All right. Let me just ask you a really more of a...
more of a general question and that's this, what trans...
well, I guess, part of it we're looking if they had two...
they had from two years ago until this past February, but I
guess the other question is, do we really want to legislate
special exemptions for anybody that misses a deadline?"

Osmond: "No, no, no. They were applying for a hospital. That hospital was denied in February. They put in immediately a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

letter of intent to have possibly a freestanding emergency room. This... I mean, it's... it's there. It was... I don't... I'm not trying to do anything special. There's also two other hospitals that are in the same area and I believe, a previous piece of legislation earlier today took care of them. I'm just trying to give them the opportunity to come forth and apply just like anybody else would."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate it." Osmond: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Davis, W.: "I will do my best not to prolong this. I, too, have been told or have spoken to some of the opposition to this and so, what I just want to be clear on, does this legislation grant the… grant the freestanding emergency room or are they still going through a process…"

Osmond: "No. All this does is say that they can file their application which they had to... when they put their letter of intent in, they had to file their application within 60 days. We are allowing them to do that because they lost the... the bid or the CON recommended in a tie vote that they not put the hospital there. I'm trying to give the opportunity for them to be able to get a freestanding emergency room. And they still have to go through all of the procedures. All I'm asking is to give them the opportunity to apply and..."

66th Legislative Day

- Davis, W.: "So, it is... so, it is possible that this application is submitted and it goes through a process and the folks or individuals that review the process could say no..."
- Osmond: "Absolutely. I mean..."
- Davis, W.: "...that this is not necessary."
- Osmond: "...just... just like any other application, they would go through the exact same process and the law has been set up for freestanding, so... freestanding emergency rooms, so they would have to, you know, go exactly that way."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. And just for my own... for my own curiosity sake, I understand that the emergency rooms can also be trauma centers as well or are they separate things? And is this going to be a trauma center? If so, is it going to be at a certain level?"
- Osmond: "No, no, no, no. This is just a freestanding emergency room."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, it has nothing to do with being a trauma center..."
- Osmond: "No, no."
- Davis, W.: "...or anything like that? Okay. But again, just so I'm clear, they submit their application, someone can say that this is not necessary, they can be denied and that's the end, correct?"
- Osmond: "Absolutely. They... they'd have to go through the whole process of the CON board all over again."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you."
- Osmond: "Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller."

66th Legislative Day

- Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, is there anything in this language that... that if the... the facility seeking the license has done anything right or wrong in a timely fashion?"
- Osmond: "Well, the question here is, because they had their application in for a hospital and that was denied at the end of February, the time was ticking for them to get in for consideration for a freestanding emergency room. So, they filed their letter of intent but did not file the application 'cause that has to come within the 60 days later. So, what we're asking for is for this... them to be allowed to apply until June 30, which they'll have... you know, they'll go through the whole CON process. That's all we're trying to do is give them a little bit more time."
- Miller: "All right. The... the opponents have spoken to me, too, about this regarding the fact that it does not excuse any delay that... that they may have had within their own... caused within their own... their own group. You know, the way you're presenting this and I'm not questioning your character at all, it assumes that they did everything themselves in a timely fashion and expeditiously. Well, who's to say they did or did not, unless you can add some insight into it."
- Osmond: "Well, all I can say to you is, if it was a perfect world, they would have had their application in on the deadline date of March 31, but because they just got turned down for a hospital that, you know, that shortened the process. So, they could not put their application in; they

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

could only do their letter of intent, because they believed that possibly they would have gotten the hospital."

Miller: "But if they were rejected for a hospital..."

Osmond: "Yes, it was a tie vote."

Miller: "...their rejection..."

Osmond: "I understand..."

Miller: "And once again, I have no... I have no dog in the hunt on this or questioning your character. It still was re... rejected and they're going through an official appeals process, correct?"

Osmond: "Well, I would like to say yes, but on the CON board you can go through the history. There's never been, in an appeals process, an overturn of what... of the decision. So, they have not filed an appeal. They concentrated on getting their letter of intent for this freestanding emergency room to do that."

Miller: "All right. I'll listen to any further debate on this, Representative."

Osmond: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Can you tell me the name of the hospital that wants to do this and whether it is a for-profit or not-for-profit hospital?"

Osmond: "This is Vista and they are, I believe, a for-profit."

Kosel: "Okay."

Osmond: "They pay taxes and everything, yeah."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Kosel: "Uh huh. Okay. All right. You spoke earlier and said that you believe that there was still some opposition to this."

Osmond: "Yes."

Kosel: "And I will tell you, I just got off the phone and yes, the advocate system which has quite a few employees in the northern part of the state, over 25 thousand, is still very much opposed to this."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

"I just want to add to my colleague, this is Washington: something very much needed in my area. You know, I don't have... I have a good mix and though the hospital is in my district, it also will help my colleague Representative Osmond. There's a fixed need for this and basically, this is just a turf war. That's all. And other... some just don't want the competition and I'm hoping that we all will agree that competition keeps the price down low for the consumers who use the hospital services. And I just want to remind my colleague over to the left of me that if you all would pull up on your computers House Bill 1327, I think most of us in this chamber gave a 'yes' vote, including some that have spoke about Senate Bill 321 which was the same consideration for other hospitals. think we did that because we understand the importance of health care and the importance for people to have access. And I got to say this about Vista. Vista is a hospital I

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

know that takes in and absorbs a lot of cost of people who don't have the money to pay. So, this is something we really, really need in our particular district. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Ryg."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Ryg: "Thank you. Representative, I believe you've established that this was outside of the control of the hospital because their first priority was a hospital to meet the needs of an area of the county that's underserved."

Osmond: "Correct."

Ryg: "And all this does is provide them an extension so their application will be considered."

Osmond: "That's correct."

Ryg: "This does not approve them..."

Osmond: "No."

Ryg: "...for their request for a freestanding emergency center."

Osmond: "They have to go through all of the processes that every other hospital would have to go through."

Ryg: "And were other health care providers in the region provided that same opportunity?"

Osmond: "Yes, they were."

Ryg: "So, we're just asking that they get the same opportunity the other health care providers to start a process. We're not making a decision?"

Osmond: "You're absolutely correct. Thank you."

Ryg: "Thank you very much. This is a very confusing issue, but this is the process these health care providers must

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

follow. We've allowed others the opportunity to do this. This is just providing a level playing field, not giving priority to existing providers over those who wish to serve unmet needs. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. I hope you've listened to this debate. I think Representative Washington put it most eloquently. As we say in my district, he put the hay down where the goats can eat it. It wasn't philosophical statement. You know, if you put the hay up real high, the goats'll starve to death. So, he put the hay right down where the goats can chew on it. It's a turf battle. And so, we pit one of our Members against powerful This is one of the problems with the Health interests. Facilities Planning Board. They use those rules to often stifle competition. That wasn't the purpose of the Health Facilities Planning Board. They're supposed to act on... well, heaven knows how we've... how they've acted in the past few years. We don't need to go over that. But if the Lady feels that all she wants is for the application to be able to be refiled and that they can prove there is a need and that they can improve access to health care, particularly emergency health care, where the difference in five or ten minutes can mean you live or die. And I would imagine, I'm not familiar with this area, but I would imagine it is an area of relatively rapid growth and a higher density population than what I would have in my district.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

intend to support the Lady simply because I often come to you and ask to help for certain things in my district that are different and yes, sometimes there are people opposed to it, but we all come down here to try and represent our districts as best we can, knowing that not everybody's going to agree, but when... when I see large corporations involved in a fight against an individual Legislator, most of the time I'm going to side with the Legislator and in this case, I support Representative Osmond. I think she has given honest, truthful, factual answers. I don't think she's hiding anything. I... It just makes eminent good sense what the Lady has said. I think it deserves an 'aye' vote."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Amendment and the Bill. I think the last couple of speakers have helped clean this matter up, but I think many who have spoken have complicated the issue way beyond what the Bill needs to be. This is a simple matter. Under the law, the ability to license these freestanding centers will end on June 30. The Health Facilities Planning Board will not be able to approve these licenses after June 30. And so, all this Bill says is that someone who already has their application in should not be prejudiced by the fact that the board will not have gotten to their application by that date. The law requires that whoever applies for one of these licenses has 17 requirements to fulfill. One of them is getting the license approved on time, but if the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

board isn't meeting and the board doesn't get to it, the board can't approve it. All the Lady is saying is, let them jump through the other 16 hoops and let's make sure they filed their application on time, which they did. Neither the Department of Public Health nor the Health Facilities Planning Board opposes this Amendment. This Amendment does not confer a license on these folks. This Amendment does not give them priority. All it says is, they shouldn't be prejudiced simply because the Health Facilities Planning Board will not have acted on their application by the self-imposed deadline under the statute of June 30. So, all it says, it's a simple Bill, don't complicate it beyond that. This should be an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Pritchard: "Representative, is this issue just dealing with an application in the Yorkville area or are there other health centers that you're concerned about?"

Osmond: "Representative, I'm concerned about the application for Lindenhurst. There are... there are two other applications that fall within this that might have already been taken care of in a previous Bill tonight..."

Pritchard: "So, this one just is with Lindenwood?"

Osmond: "Lindenhurst, Illinois..."

Pritchard: "Or Lindenhurst?"

Osmond: "...in my district."

Pritchard: "Because the earlier Bill did deal with more..."

66th Legislative Day

- Osmond: "Right. And... and it is still in here, but I think it's already been taken care of in a previous Bill that Representative Senger had earlier tonight for..."
- Pritchard: "Well, I would just add to the Bill. This issue is a little bit more complex than what it might appear. I think there was a finite date that was set in law that some of these hospitals have not adhered to. I certainly have one example of that that does affect the Yorkville and the Sandwich area where there is, not a big corporation, but a local county hospital trying to survive and that's the purpose of the Certificate of Need is to try to avoid undue competition and replication of services. And there is a full-scale hospital within 10 miles of Yorkville that is servicing that market, that's trying to survive and I think we have to be very careful about opening up the sunset, if you will, on this kind of legislation that's going to have a financial impact on the viability of other hospitals. I would urge your strong consideration. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a Roll Call vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "Your request will be granted. The Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "To the Bill, Speaker and Members of the House.

 This has a little... a couple people confused. I had a piece of legislation earlier in the year that had to do with freestanding surgical centers and this has nothing to do with that. It did have something to do with the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

application for Rush-Copley and that was taken care of earlier through the House Bill 1327. So, I just wanted to make people totally clear of that. Now, the only issue at hand is the location at Lindenhurst with Representative Osmond and Representative Washington and it is just a time exactly what Bla... Representative Black Representative Lang had stated. So, that's the reason why I'm not carrying this piece of legislation right because the issue that I had with my Rush-Copley has been taken care of in a recent piece of legislation that we passed out of here earlier. It is extremely interesting what happens with the larger groups though and I'm not going to speak to it now. I guess I should talk to the ethics officer, because if something needs... we're not saying that they're going to get an application and then they're going to get certified. You know, this legislation just allows them the ability to go before the board and qualify for those 17 issues that they have to... to get, you know, their application passed. So, I don't understand this 500 pound gorilla that's sitting on... on people in that issue. So, thank you for your time."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond to close."

Osmond: "Thank you very much. I appreciate all the support. I appreciate Representative Chapa LaVia for allowing me to present this to you. Lindenhurst is right next to Antioch. We are in the western part of Lake County. We desperately need medical services to be able to provide to those who are in need. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #3. There has been a request for a Roll Call. And so, all those in favor of adopting Floor Amendment #3 vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 91 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', Floor Amendment 3 is hereby adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you. I think we've had a good debate on the Bill. I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of Senate Bill 321.

All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 94 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', Senate Bill 321, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #5 to

66th Legislative Day

- Senate Bill 288 and Amendment... and a Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 451."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 268. Representative McCarthy. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 268's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Farnham, there's Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 268. Representative Farnham.

 The Gentleman withdraws Floor Amendment #2. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy on Floor Amendment #3."
- McCarthy: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 is a gut and replace. And it was approved for consideration in the Executive Committee unanimously, this morning. It is the Bill. We do have two other Amendments on technical information, but the… Floor Amendment #3 to 268 is a comprehensive foreclosure initiative that seeks to assist all aspects of the current sagging economy and the real estate market. It basically is an omnibus collection of four different Bills that we've already had through here at different times during the year. The first Bill was Representative Yarbrough's House Bill 1195, which talked about creating priority municipal liens. These are for either abandoned homes or homes that are in such disrepair that the local municipality can then come in, I see Mark

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

O'Brien coming toward me, the local municipality can come in and establish a lien on the property that is superior to all other liens, so that... Four is actually a gut and replace as well, so I'll withdraw #3 and go to 4 and 5."

- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman requests that we withdraw Floor Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4 and 5 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy on Floor Amendment #4."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 is the We were going to... we approved Amendment 3, as I said, earlier in the committee today. Floor Amendment #4 was just a correction to #3, but we did a gut and replace so it is the entire Bill. There was a mistake in #3 that that... that we would have one... we would have investigator for every 5 thousand licenses, that's really 10 thousand, with the agreement with the department. also said we'd have one prosecutor for 10 thousand. agreement with the department was one prosecutor for every 20 thousand. So, without that, we'll go back to the entire Bill. As I started to say, it starts off with the liens part, that Bill municipal was House Representative Yarbrough had carried it and it passed the House here 112 to 2 on March 24. The second part of it is an initiative of the Community Bakers... Bankers, no one was opposed and had support from both the Illinois Bankers and It has to do with banker's banks and the credit unions. their investments. A banker's bank is a bank that is

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

established just to do business with other banks. Right now, those banks have a limit of a 5 percent investment in the banker's bank. This would allow them to invest up to 15 percent. Hopefully, they would be able to build up some equity so they could help out as far as with people establishing mortgages. The third Bill was Representative Farnham's Bill, House Bill 705. It was the predatory lending database. I know all of you will remember that Bill because there was a little bit of debate on the floor. At first, we did... the Sponsor did not want it removed from the record. Later he did remove it from the record, which I think was a wise decision. The Bill then passed 98 to 17 and the three counties that were added to the database, of the 10 Representatives that I know personally represent those counties, including Representative Cross Representative Farnham in Kane County, Representative Leitch and Representative Gordon, J. in Peoria County, myself, Representative McAsey, Representative Dugan and Representative Careen Gordon from Will County all supported the Bill in its final form. There was one Representative from Will County who did oppose it in the final Bill, but 9 out of 10 people in the counties affected did support the Bill. The last part of the Bill is by far more pages than anything else in the Bill is the rewrite of the real estate licensing Bill. This is a 10-year extension. The last Bill started in the year 2000 and it's set to expire at the end of this year. So, the rewrite extends a lot of education hours. It also establishes two new forms. Instead of sales person and broker, under the real estate

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

license, it's now going to be broker and managing broker. This is kind of a trend that going across the country and we think it... more adequately defined what we're looking for when we go to a real estate business. The broker is actually a person who does much more than what a sales It also lists the new requirements. increased the requirements very much in order to obtain these lessons and to retain the lessons... licenses when you go back for your... your... to get your new license. mentioned about how the department is going to have a lot more prosecutors and investigators than they have today. During the past... in the last two years, there was one time where only one investigator was there for 80 thousand realtors if there was a complaint. The way the Bill is written now we'll have 8 investigators and 4 prosecutors paid for out of the real estate fund and this is a fund that was not... Okay. This is a fund that was not swept and is a very, very healthy fund, I want to tell you. So, I'd appreciate your support and would entertain any questions."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 268. And on that, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Did Representative McCarthy explain Amendment #4, close on Amendment 4 and thank everybody for voting for it? What..."

Speaker Mautino: "At the very least."

Black: "Good grief. It went on for about 10 minutes. Will the Gentleman yield? He spoke so long I can't remember the question. Actually..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "...yeah, it comes back to me now. Representative McCarthy, you might want to ask staff. I've looked at this and I don't have a problem with Floor Amendment #4, but it looks to me like we're in a... we could be in a single subject clause legal effort. I..."

McCarthy: "I'm sorry, Representative."

- Black: "You've got four different provisions in this Floor Amendment, two of them seem related to me, but municipal powers for abandoned property, I suppose you could say it's in the same Act, maybe, and the Real Estate License Act. Is there a potential problem with the single subject clause in this Amendment or they all come from the same chapter?"
- McCarthy: "Well, as you know, like you I'm not a lawyer, but I have been advised that there's not a problem with that. All of them have to do, we think, with the foreclosure problem and the predatory lending problem that we have in our country that has greatly affected our economy over the last 18 months. So, we think putting them together makes the approach to the problem much more comprehensive."
- Black: "So, when we go to court, we'll say to the judges, it's a complex issue that has affected our economy for the last 18 months and that kind of makes it altogether, right?"
- McCarthy: "You'll say that that was the legislative intent, ves."
- Black: "The legislative intent. All right. I would like to ask you a question on the municipal powers for abandoned property. Is this only for minor offenses like weeds,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

trash, graffiti, broken windows? Is that... those the kinds of offenses you're going to allow the first lien?"

McCarthy: "You did describe it pretty well. I could really write back to you basically what you read out of the analysis there. But it's..."

Black: "Okay. I have..."

McCarthy: "...basic... garbage, debris, graffiti..."

Black: "All right."

McCarthy: "...and also things..."

Black: "Yeah. I... Thank you very much, Representative and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Amendment, particularly on the municipal powers for abandoned property and I... I'm working on this currently with LRB and others. And I know many of you, I think, are in the same boat. any of you have abandoned property in your district that may be a eight-story building, a multifamily apartment house, maybe with 150 apartment hou... apartments where the owner has just walked away from it? Then they create a dummy corporation and the only asset that corporation has is the abandoned building. So, they tell the city, well, I... we don't have any assets. We don't have any money. We can't tear it down. We can't make the improvements. So, we'll give it to you, city officials, and then you can pay to tear it down. I mean, I not only think this should be a superior lien and as I said, I'm working on even trying to go further. I think corporations and individuals are abandoning their responsibility to many of our communities around the state when they just walk away from property, as they have in my district, and then create a... for lack of a

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

better word... what I said, a dummy corporation, they transfer that abandoned building to that corporation as the only asset and then either declare bankruptcy or just say, well, we don't have any money. But if you'd like the building, we'll give it to you for a dollar and then we'll let you, the taxpayer, spend a half a million dollars tearing it down. I... I hope we can work together on that, Representative, and take this even a step further because I know in my district it has cost the taxpayers over the years in excess of a million dollars to remedy or remove property that should have been the responsibility of the property owner and they somehow managed to get out of it. So, I... I think that's a very important first step and I hope we can expand it. Thank you."

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

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

Representative, a couple of quick questions, one of which I

may have already answered. There's a number of rewrites

here to the real estate licensure..."

McCarthy: "Yes."

Fritchey: "...provisions. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Fritchey: "Including an extension of the sunset date I think by... from 2010 to 2020, correct?"

McCarthy: "Correct."

Fritchey: "There's presently an exemption for members of the...
for licensed members of the bar to some of those

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

requirements. That exemption stays in the Act. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "I'm sure that that still exists in the current version of the Bill and... so it will continue."

Fritchey: "I think, with respect to the predatory lending database, you know, you and I are some of the ones that were around when this got done the first time and it was a heated measure the first time. It's still been the source of significant concern by some people in the lending industry within Cook County. This is now seeking to extend that database beyond Cook into Kane, Peoria, Will Counties. Is that correct?"

McCarthy: "It is. Yes, it is."

Fritchey: "How were those counties selected?"

McCarthy: "I think that was one of the questions that came up the first time the Bill was on the floor for debate and it was like local initiative of Representatives who represented that area and knew that the foreclosure... I know like in Representative McAsey's case, she has one of the highest levels of foreclosure of any district out of the entire House of Representatives. So, she asked for Will to be included in the counties."

Fritchey: "Okay."

McCarthy: "When Representative Farnham had taken the time to take the Bill of the record, as I said earlier, 9 out of the 10 Representatives that represent those three counties, all voted 'yes' on the Bill and agreed that..."

Fritchey: "Well..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

McCarthy: "...they were happy to have it in. I think one of the things, John, is that we all thought this was going to be a real imposition. You know, the mortgage brokers who are still opposed because of the... when we first did the Cook County provision, it was thought of it was going to be this overwhelming, you know, problem, but as it turned out when we got the report the first time that came back from the... the reporting agency, less than 2 percent of the people who applied for mortgages had to go through with the counseling."

Fritchey: "Well, most..."

McCarthy: "So, now we see that it's not going to be as much an imposition as we thought it might have been two years ago."

Fritchey: "Well, I think... I think part of the concern is well than that it's put mortgage brokers on a different footing than other lenders and hasn't really served to protect borrowers, per sé, as it has simply to shift borrowers from a mortgage broker, perhaps, to a different type of lender that would not be covered under the database. And I'm not going to do this to the Body at 9:00 on the last night, but there was significant questions by those of us in Cook County as to whether this accomplishes the goal and when I look at the proponents, I see the company that runs the database listed as a proponent and that makes sense because they're going to get a lot of business from this Bill. But I don't see a lot of the other groups that would purport to represent or advocate on behalf of the consumers who are being protected, being listed as proponents of this Bill and I just find it to be somewhat of a glaring omission.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

I'm not inferring anything. It just strikes me as kind of odd."

McCarthy: "Well..."

Fritchey: "I had significant concerns with this legislation when it came through the first time, based upon feedback that I'd gotten from both lenders and borrowers within Cook County as to the fact that this database may have been unwittingly doing more harm than good. I maintain those concerns. And while I don't represent people in Kane, Will, or Peoria Counties, I don't want to potentially subject them to some of the hardships that borrowers and good faith lenders have had in my neck of the woods where I do represent people. I'll respectfully object to the Bill.

I appreciate your efforts on this..."

McCarthy: "Yeah."

Fritchey: "...but it's just something that I have some serious concerns with. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative McCarthy, Representative Black asked you about the single subject. This is when it usually happens at the end of Session when you cram everything into one Bill and then the Supreme Court has ruled in the past that some things aren't pertinent to the rest. I was looking at this. I don't know if the real estate license rewrite would be pertinent to the others. I can see something with the others as far as mortgage and banking and lending, but that one I can't. Are these provisions severable? I tried

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

to look for a whole Bill and I could not find it, so that if one of them is struck down out of that, the rest of them would still go forward."

McCarthy: "I didn't hear you. What... You said right at the end there. I think your concerns are genuine, but some of the new restrictions we put into the real estate licensing Act I think will help us, you know, as far as watching over the foreclosure rates and other things. So, we feel and our legal team has advised me that we think this will pass the single subject test. You know, but like every Bill we send through here that has this as a question, that will be decided later."

Mulligan: "All right. So, the common theme is banking or mortgage lending?"

McCarthy: "The common theme is we're trying to progress... to try and better protect the home purchasers of our state."

Mulligan: "All right. And are the provisions severable, if one should be struck out?"

McCarthy: "Representative, they are severable. It is written on the second to the last page of the Bill, I believe."

Mulligan: "All right. I just couldn't find a complete Bill that said at the end they were severable, but I guess that's because you put it together kind of late. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Final question? The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

McCarthy: "Yes, Ma'am."

Kosel: "Now, during the conversa... during your debate here on the floor, you mentioned that one of the Representatives had the highest number of foreclosures in her district of anyone in the House. Can you tell me what the source is for that kind of information and is it available for all our districts, because I've tried to get the number of foreclosures for my district and have not been successful in getting that. So, I guess I'm looking at how that happened and how you got it."

McCarthy: "I don't have the info for my district either, Representative. Representative McAsey shared that information with me and so, I don't... I don't know of her source, but I'll... after the debate's over, I'll certainly get it and bring it to you."

Kosel: "Thank you. Because I would really... and I'm sure many Members of the House would like to have those kind of figures for their individual districts and as hard as I've tried, I've not been able to get that information. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 268. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative McCarthy."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is truly a technical Amendment that says the… the part about the municipal liens becomes effective 60 days after the effective date of the Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 268. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 268, a Bill for an Act concerning foreclosure. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "I think we've had a pretty good debate on this. And I would just say that we all know that foreclosure is a very serious problem across our state and across our country. And we'd hope that these measures will help prevent some of those in the future. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 268. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take... Representative Winters or Brady, wish to be recorded on this Bill? Take the record. 98 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', Senate Bill 268, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Mr. Clerk, page 11 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2218. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2218, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. I believe that Amendment 2 was recommended for a..."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have both been approved for consideration."
- Currie: "So, this is the... this is the budget implementation Bill. It includes a large number of items including setting the foundation level at the level that it was proposed in the stimulus application from the State Board of Education and the... and the Governor of the state. And it makes various changes with respect to the federal stimulus money so that, for example, some items can be paid for... in ways that were not otherwise eligible in the state. And in addition, there are... is recognition that we did lump sum budgeting so that, for example, requirements that universities line item their budgets would not apply for this fiscal year. There are a variety of items. I'd be happy to answer any of your questions, but maybe you'd rather that than listen to me drone on to cover all of these items."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Eddy: "Representative, not to belabor this, but you... there were some minor changes or you took it out of the record earlier."

Currie: "There is..."

Eddy: "Those specific changes..."

Currie: "...there's a third Amendment that we'll get to..."

Eddy: "Oh."

Currie: "...that is totally technical..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...as is most of this."

Eddy: "All right. We'll wait for that then. Thank you."

Currie: "No, no, no, but yeah... Okay. I mean, but this is

Amendment 2 and I'd like to adopt Amendment 2."

Eddy: "That's fine."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2218. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Mautino: "On Floor Amendment #3, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a technical Amendment. A couple of numbers were wrong in the original, so this corrects them. And I'd appreciate your adoption of this Amendment, as well."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #3. And on that, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, the numbers that were wrong, anything substantial, they're..."
- Currie: "It..."
- Eddy: "...just something out of place, technical, minor?"
- Currie: "It had to do with the… the funding for the University of Illinois hospital under the Medicaid program. And then there was a DNR issue, an indemnification issue was technical in nature."
- Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much. We're fine with it. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2218. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment 3 is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All Mo... no Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Place this Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2218, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Senate Bill 2218, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I think we've... I explained it pretty well on Second. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan is seeking recognition."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Mulligan: "Representative Currie, would you give me the exact change of the amount of money for the University of Illinois hospital?"

Currie: "I believe it went from 24 million to 30."

Mulligan: "Are there any other changes in the Amendments besides..."

Currie: "Yeah. There was... there was a change in respect to some language in the Department of Natural Resources having to do with indemnification, technical."

Mulligan: "All right. I would just like to point out to the Body that this also includes the school formula change and ones we talked about before is the inclusion of veterans' spouses in the veterans' health care program. Also, there is one part here, Representative, that I'd like ask you about that allowance for the stimulus plans for the TANF program to be spent. Is it going to be spent on the TANF program? I just want to make sure."

Currie: "Yeah. This... this would mean that if there were any dedicated moneys from the stimulus package for TANF, we could spend it."

Mulligan: "For the employment and training fund for TANF?"

Currie: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2218. And on that question, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Dunkin, do you wish to be recorded on this roll? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2218, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 451. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On Senate Bill 451, it has been read a second time, previously. The Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill. A Motion to Table has been approved for consideration for this Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook has filed a Motion to Table Committee Amendment #1. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. That was an Amendment that shelled the Bill. I want to take the Amendment off. I'd appreciate your support for the Motion."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady... the Lady moves to table Committee

 Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The

 'ayes' have it. And Committee Amendment #1 is tabled. Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All... no Motions filed." Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 451, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a trailer Bill to (inaudible) legislation that... the cigarette tax increase that we did a year ago. We used, when we did it, model federal legislation, but unfortunately, that didn't necessarily track with the way we do business in Illinois. What you have before you are a variety of technical changes

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

to make sure that the Department of Revenue, the distributors, the retailers can all work together to make sure that the taxes that were the subject of that Bill are properly collected in the State of Illinois. I'd be happy to answer your questions. As I say, this is a very technical Bill and I'd appreciate your support so we can actually collect the money that was the subject of that tax hike."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 451. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, for clarification on our side. There was some... to the underlying Bill, there was some objection, but we're fine with this. There... there is... that is... the negative votes are all removed from that? I just wanted to make sure our side understood that."
- Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition, the Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 451. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114... excuse me... 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 451, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 256. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 256 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #2."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the Bill... Members of the House. This is a measure that would say that going forward that electrical... electricity would not be treated as tangible personal property for purposes of the investment tax credit under the personal property replacement tax. It never used to be and we think it shouldn't be and so going forward, if that tax is reinstated, this will clarify that this commodity is not

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

I'd appreciate your support for this cleanup Bill."

tangible personal property. I know of no objection.

Black: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Yes. I'm sorry, Representative, did you... did you call me? I heard you say Bill. Were you calling me or..."

Currie: "It was some other Bill."

Black: "Oh. Well, you know, I've always been so happy that my mother and father named me Bill because so many people call me that. So, you weren't really calling me. You were saying Members of the Bill."

Currie: "That's..."

Black: "I'm... I'm in the order of the Bill. And now that I have your attention, Floor Amendment #2 has opposition from other... I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I... This is our newest staffer and Yul Brynner, let me talk to him here for just a second. I... I apologize, Majority Leader Currie. If we

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

could have a couple of extra floor passes so our staff could get up here a little earlier, we... we could get the updated information. Staff ensures me that this is fine now. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Eddy, the Gentleman from Crawford."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, as amended, does this affe... does this affect in any way the corporate personal property replacement tax that's collected by the state?"

Currie: "Yes. It would not change any revenues. It just clarifies that going forward electricity would not be considered tangible personal property and therefore, they would not be entitled to the investment tax credit and local units of government would continue getting the money they have had for the last 30 years."

Eddy: "Okay. So... so, the corporate personal property replacement tax that schools receive that affects the..."

Currie: "Yes. This helps protect them."

Eddy: "That protects that. There was a court case that kind of put that in doubt and now this would take care of that and solidify..."

Currie: "Going forward. This would..."

Eddy: "Okay. Going forward. Just..."

Currie: "...change that going forward."

Eddy: "All right. The one court case, obviously, it can't do anything about. Thank you, Representative."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking further recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 256, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Walker."

Walker: "This is a good Bill. Let's pass it."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 256. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Schmitz, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 256, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 20 of the Calendar is House Bill 3874, under Motions in writing. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. For technical reasons, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3874 was adopted."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House reconsider.

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

Mr. Clerk... Representative Phelps, Reitz, Senger, do you
wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Motion passes. Representative Lyons. On Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 3874."

Lyons: "Hi. Hi, everybody. How are you doing? It's getting late. Sorry about this, folks, but House Bill 3874, the original Bill was, of course, it dealt with the... those who serve in governmental sector to be able to take the private alarm contractors' examination and that part of the Bill stays the same. Amendment #1, put on in the Senate, was language agreed to by the Fire Marshal's language, technical in detail. And I'd appreciate, once again, your favorable consideration on Amendment #1. I'm voting to... All right. I want... The intent was to vote to concur with Amendment #1 and to nonconcur with Amendment #2 which has a technical error in it which will be my next Bill next year when we come back. All right."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves... We're going to deal with #1... with the nonconcur on Senate Amendment #2, first."

Lyons: "Right. All right. Nonconcur with Amendment #2."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3874. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2. Now, on Senate Amendment #1, the Gentleman wished to move the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3874. Mr. Lyons, is that correct?"

Lyons: "Correct, Mr. Speaker, which is a technical language change agreed to with the Fire Marshal's Office."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "This also will require a Roll Call. So, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3874?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3874. This measure, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 262. Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, read... read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 262's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #2."

 Representative Jackson on Floor Amendment #2."
- Jackson: "Yeah. We just got the wrong name. The language of this Bill has already passed out of both Houses as Senate Bill 1293, but was amended and filed as House Amendment #2 for the purpose of clarifying that the bonds must mature within 25 years rather than 30 years."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 262. On that question, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Franks."

Franks: "Close enough. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Franks: "Thank you."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Mautino: "And yes, he will yield."

Franks: "The hour's late. Representative, House Amendment #2, is that what we're dealing with now, House Floor Amendment #2?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

Franks: "And... and what does that do, because our analysis indicates that it'll allow for the issuance of bonds for the Belle Valley School District 119. Is that what this Bill does?"

Jackson: "That is correct."

Franks: "Okay. And it's forty-seven and a half million dollars for school constructions?"

Jackson: "Beg your pardon? Repeat again."

Franks: "Okay. Why do we need to do this now because it's... our analysis indicates that the issuance of bonds would be subject to voter approval on... I'm sorry... it'd be after April 7, 2009. So, this is basically to allow for a referendum for the issuance of bonds?"

Jackson: "That's correct."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise to support the Gentleman's Bill. This was something that we did earlier, but the number of years exceeded the number of years I think that have been consistent with the amount of time for issuing bonds. You went 30 years; the voters said 30 years is all right, but we've got kind of a policy here that 25 is the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

cap. So, you had to find a vehicle, put your language on, bring it back to 25 years."

Jackson: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. And I think a lot of folks supported this before.

I hope you look at your vote. If you supported it before,
you should support it now. This is something we do from
time to time to help districts. This was a mine subsidence
issue in the Belle Valley District. Isn't that right?"

Jackson: "It was a mine subsidence issue and the populace voted to... for this referendum."

Eddy: "Yeah. This is all front door. We're just authorizing the bond length beyond statute."

Jackson: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. Playing cleanup. Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 262?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Jackson."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Jackson: "This is a mine subsidence issue and the citizens of Belle Valley voted on April 7 for a referendum. And I'm asking for an 'aye' vote at this time."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 262?' 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 87 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration', 'recommends be adopted' is Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 932."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 11 of the Calendar on the Order of Second Readings, we have Senate Bill 1936. Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1936 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 4, offered by Representative Mautino, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino on Amendment #2."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that we withdraw Amendments #2 and 3 and go to Amendment #4 which is a gut and replace."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative... Representative Mautino, could you state your request again."
- Mautino: "Yes. I would withdraw Amendments 2 and 3 and move to adopt Amendment 4 which becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "So, Representative Mautino asks leave to withdraw Amendment 2. Amendment #3 is still in Rules, so it will remain there. All those in favor of withdrawing... Okay. Leave is granted for withdrawal of Amendment #2. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4 by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino on Floor Amendment #4."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Floor... Floor Amendment #4 reflects agreements on this Bill and it basically deals with the special service areas in bonds in allowing them to do bond refunding, another way to say refinancing. What they will need to do, if they wish to... on the refunding bonds, they will have to certify whenever they want to go and do this that the refunding bonds are going to save money. The principal on it can be no higher than the issued original bonds. And that's what it does in effect. I ask for adoption of Floor Amendment #4. We can put that on the Bill and then ask for passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin, for what reason do you rise?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Durkin: "To the Bill. I just rise in support. This is a good Bill. It's been worked out with William Blair and other… a number of individuals who have interest in special service areas. This is a… it makes sense. It takes away a lot of the redundancy that goes into these special service areas when they have to refinance bonds and it doesn't… you don't need to renotice on this because you're not exceeding any of the debt service and you're not extending the terms of the bonds. And also, it will consolidate some properties for purposes of the taxes and that… to me that makes a lot of sense. So, I rise in support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the ques... the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1936?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "...from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would simply ask for passage of the Bill. I appreciate Representative Durkin's comments. I think they adequately reflected what our intentions were. Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1936?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to go to the Order of Resolutions. Page 16 of the Calendar... Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to the Order of Resolutions while we wait on some Bills to come over from the Senate. So, it's... these Resolutions are very important and we want to get... we want to get those out of So, while the Senate is busy debating the business that we sent to them, we will go to the Order of Resolutions. And on page 16, the first Resolution we will deal with is Representative Coulson on House Joint Resolution 56."

Coulson: "Oh, that's how you wake us up. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution is a workforce Resolution for physicians in the state. As we all know that we have a shortage of physicians and we would like to develop a task force, an institute actually, to look at the whole picture of why and how we can create more physicians in the State of Illinois. And I can answer any questions. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 56?' 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, 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, we have House Joint Resolution 57."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution sets up a task force on farmers' markets. And you might look at me askew and at this time of the night I wish you would. The purpose of this is simply because we've had a... a real brouhaha over a recent ruling by the Champaign County Health Department that at their farmers' market, which is a very big one, you cannot sell home-baked goods for more than a few days and it was a big fuss about this. And as I looked into it, some farmers' markets let you sell home-baked goods, some don't because of a administrative rule passed sometime ago by the Department of Public Health. All this does is say, hey, create a task force, study that ruling... that administrative ruling and figure out what is the law or the policy of the State of Illinois. That's... and ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Joint Resolution 57?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Will Davis. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Burns, we have House Joint Resolution 66."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 66 is an initiative of the City of Chicago and the Chicago Park District. Basically, according to State Law, in order for the Chicago Park District to make improvements in the 31st Street Harbor and the Gateway Harbor a Resolution has to be approved by both chambers of the Illinois General Assembly. I know of no opposition to this Resolution. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 66?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Soto, we have House Resolution 44."
- Soto: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. I concur with House Amendment #... No, no, that's not it."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto, take your Bill out of the record for a minute."

Soto: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burns, we're going to go back to House Joint Resolution 66. I think we may need to take a recorded Roll Call vote."

Burns: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "And so, the question now is, 'Shall the House pass House Joint Resolution 66?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- record. On this question, 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill... this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Soto on House Resolution 44."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Amendment #1... Oh, I'm sorry. Speaker, can you give me a few minutes. I'm sorry. My computer's got the..."
- Speaker Turner: "All right. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. On the previous... on Mr. Burns's Resolution and I didn't catch it until after we'd voted. I don't think it makes any difference, but his Resolution said authorizes the Chicago Park District to construct a floating... I don't know... a water world or something. And I don't... Wally World, whatever. But my point is, a Resolution can't authorize anything. Maybe it just wasn't drafted properly. You can request, but I don't think a House Joint Resolution can specifically authorize the Chicago Park District to construct a marina or am I... did I miss something?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burns, for what reason do you rise?"
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to answer the Gentleman's question. According to State Law, to make harbor improvements along Lake Michigan there's... a Resolution has to be approved by the Illinois Gen... by both chambers of the Illinois General Assembly. It's a law from the turn of the last century. The Governor's Office and the Department of Natural Resources has said to CPD..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Black: "Okay."

Burns: "...that this Resolution has to be adopted before the Park

District can continue with the improvements."

Black: "All right. So, the Resolution is sufficient then because of a longstanding law or a ruling and as Mr. Brown said, Chicago doesn't own the lake bottom, the state does, so you have to have the Resolution."

Burns: "Correct."

Black: "It's much more clear to me now. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Miller on House Resolution 50."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 50 simply states that... resolves that we try to make it a priority that Illinoisans obtain at least two years of post-edu... secondary education."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 50?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Soto on House Resolution 44."

Soto: "...you... thank you, Speaker and Members of the House.

House Resolution 44 urges Members of Congress to introduce and consider legislation that is comparable to the Patriot Employers Act of 2007. The Patriot Employers Act was introduced in August 2007 by Senator Barack Obama then, now President Barack Obama. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopted House Resolution 44?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Rose on House Resolution 66."

Rose: "No."

Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. Representative Franks.

Out of the record. Representative McGuire on House
Resolution 139. The Gentleman from Will, Representative

McGuire on House Resolution 139."

McGuire: "But anyhow. We got the mike screwed up here.

Anyhow, House Resolution 139, myself and Naomi Jakobsson on
the Internet sales taxes. And I'd appreciate your
advancement."

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

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative..."

McGuire: "Okay."

Reis: "...your Resolution urges Congress to enact legislation requiring Internet retailers to collect sales taxes.

What's the reasoning for your Bill or Resolution?"

McGuire: "The reason did you say?"

Reis: "Yeah."

McGuire: "We need the money. The state needs the money."

Reis: "Well, I think we've made a statement on that today.

With that, I ask for a recorded vote."

McGuire: "I don't know."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 139?' All those in

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

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 should... The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 57 'ayes', 60 'no', 0 'presents'. And the Resolution fails. Representative Mendoza, we have House Joint Res... House Resolution 352. Out of the record. Representative Careen Gordon, House Resolution 411."

- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 411 declares Erik Blomstedt Day. Mr. Blomstedt is... is going to retire from the Three Rivers Library District after serving as the director for 31 years. This man has touched so many lives in my area that people can tell story after story about him. We're going to have a special presentation for him on June 20. And I would ask for your vote. It's truly something special and I can guarantee that Mr. Blomstedt is such a wonderful man, if he was here I'd promise you he would thank each and every one of you individually. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Resolution."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 411?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Jehan Gordon on House Resolution 413."
- Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Body. House Resolution 413 simply encourages Congress to look at establishing a veterans' hospital in Peoria, Illinois. Currently, we have 5 veterans' hospitals located throughout

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

the state with 14 outpatient clinics. I'd like to ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution...' I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. While while this Resolution has no force of law, I question the expenditure of federal tax dollars to build a Veterans Administration Hospital in Peoria. It does not meet the federal standards on density of population. I happen to represent the community of Danville where the current Veterans Administration Medical Center is located. We have an outpatient clinic in Peoria. It's been expanded several times. Every city in the state cannot have a Veterans Administration medical facility. If... if anybody should have this Resolution, it should be somebody in Chicago where you have the population density to support a Veterans Administration Hospital, but as far as I can tell from the administrator at the Vermilion VA Medical Center, we do an adequate job... they do an adequate iob of serving the Peoria area veterans with their outpatient clinic and transportation to the Danville VA Hospital, if that's what they need."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Lady's Resolution. And I do so because I have read that our new President, Barack Obama, has stated that when we send men to war we should also be prepared to take care of

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

them when they're injured. Very frequently, many soldiers have come home and found a lack of medical care and medical services. Those veterans living in Peoria deserve to be taken care of just as those in Chicago will be taken care of. And I praise and honor this young lady for bringing this Resolution forward. And I know that Barack Obama does not intend to continue the practice of sending men into war and not having the medical facilities available to care for them when they come home injured. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall we... the House pass House Resolution 413?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Jerry Mitchell on House Resolution 418."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Resolution you saw la… yes… last year. It forms the Ronald Reagan Commission to commemorate the 100th birthday of President Reagan in the year 2011. I'd just recommend passing this Resolution. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no question, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 418?' 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 109 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. The Re... the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Lady from Lake, Representative May, we have House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 63."

May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As... as you may well be aware, I was the Sponsor and have worked on for three years the clean cars Bill trying to get our cars to clean up their emissions and to get better gas mileage. Well, happily, we have an agreement at the federal level that was an agreement by the auto manufacturers, the auto dealers, the United Auto Workers, environmentalists to bring us clean cars so we don't need to do it state by state anymore. Get 30 percent reduction in carbon and great savings for our citizens."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall...'

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think we should support revised CAFE standards. I couldn't get any breakfast downstairs at the Rathskeller this morning, don't know if they're open this afternoon or this evening. But on a more serious note, Ladies and Gentlemen, what are we doing at this hour of the night with a budget that literally won't keep the lights on and we're urging Congress to support the revised Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards. That's up to Congress. Let them figure that out. We can't even figure out our own budget. So, we're going to tell Congress... Do you know what Corporate Average Fuel Economy means? President Obama has said by 2016 every car in the United States of America must have at least 35 miles a gallon on the highway. Other Democrat

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Presidents knew what would happen when the government started running car companies. I am not interested in buying an electric-powered roller skate to get over to Springfield. I like my Buick; I'm not giving it up. If I can pay to put the money in it, I don't care what the Federal Government tells me it ought to get for mileage. All this thing is going to do is drive up the price of automobiles by his own estimate at least \$1300 a car and kill off, finally, kill off what's left of the domestic automobile market. Let those of us who buy cars buy what we want to buy. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy means that if I want to buy an Escalade or a Buick or a Mercury or a full-size car, the company I buy it from has to buy... has to build enough go carts and roller skates and electric cars that can get me 40 miles from home so that their Corporate Average Fuel Economy will be 35 miles per gallon in less than six years. I ask for a Roll Call vote and for once in your life, instead of being so wrapped up in environmental gobbledegook, before General Motors is gone and they will declare bankruptcy in six hours, Chrysler is already gone, Ford may be gone tomorrow or the next week or the month after, let the marketplace decide what cars will sell and what cars won't sell."

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

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very proud to drive an American made car and that there's probably a reason that Ford is the only one American made car... American car maker that's doing as well because they make one of those roller

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

skates that the last Representative... the last Representative referred to. And it gets 31 miles a gallon in the city, so I'm very happy with the domestic car that I drive that will... that I think will go a long way to meeting these standards and the American car companies need to be driven in this direction and this... the President has taken the initiative to do that and brought together the 15 states that have already passed this standard to make it a reality. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further quest...' The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"

Franks: "I want to follow up with what I just heard. And you know, we are the greatest country on earth, we're the richest country on earth. We have 5 percent of the world's population, yet, we use 25 percent of its resources. It's unsustainable to continue to do what we're doing. I... we all have to conserve. Obviously, GM is going to be filing bankruptcy tomorrow. They worked it out with their bondholders. They have to go in a different direction. Let's help them get in the right one. I want our beautiful country to be around for our future generations and have the proper standards. This is a no-brainer. Everyone should vote 'yes' on this Resolution."

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

Biggins: "Well, I'd like to speak to the issue, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "To the issue."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Biggins: "The same President just took a plane to go to dinner last night. The economic... the cost to the taxpayers is today is reported at \$40 thousand to take his wife to dinner. Flew up... flying, polluting the skies and then using taxpayer money to do it, because he promised he'd take her to dinner after the election, but he didn't promise me that he was going to make you and me pay for it. So, why don't you get some economic sense in this guy; he needs a lot of help."

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

Bost: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "This question has been put. Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Joint Resolution 63?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Grundy, Representative Careen Gordon, what reason do you rise?"

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... on House Resolution
418 I was recorded as a 'yes' vote. I would like the
Journal to reflect I would like to be recorded as a 'no'
vote, please."

Speaker Turner: "House Resolution 418?"

Gordon, C.: "Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Turner: "The rec... the record will so reflect."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Page 19 of the Calendar, we have Senate Joint Resolution 64, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 64 is both Representative Phelps and I have carried this last year. It simply renames a pond for a gentleman that was here visiting last year. And in the way things normally happen, when we moved it over to the Senate they didn't get their work done last year. So, we recarried it and that's what this does. It renames Lovett Pond after Gene Korando."

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

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I just want to... the other day I was telling my friend Jim Reemer how honored the Korando family are to have this pond renamed in Gene's honor. And I... just for the record, I want to thank Representative Mike Bost for all his hard work on this. I just ask for Senate Joint Resolution 64 to be adopted. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no... The Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, has there been an environmental impact study on this pond? I mean, changing the name could upset

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

the aquatic flora and fauna balance of this pond area by renaming it."

Bost: "Well, the amount of shot that's been fired over the years at ducks has not changed the balance on it. I don't think anything... the name would change it."

Black: "Oh, good heavens. You mean, they've..."

Bost: "Yes, we have."

Black: "...they've shot ducks on this pond?"

Bost: "We... we've shot a lot of ducks on this pond, yeah."

Black: "Did they use steel shot... lead shot?"

Bost: "That was a long time ago. They did, yes."

Black: "Well, I think the pond should be a superfund site.

Drain that sucker and let's get it cleaned up. Let's not rename it."

Bost: "It may have mercury in it."

Black: "Mercury?"

Bost: "Yeah, yeah. We had coal deposits seep up through."

Black: "I owned a Mercury once..."

Bost: "Yeah."

Black: "...and I... I..."

Bost: "Well, that's... that's... but..."

Black: "...I never felt good the entire time I owned that Mercury."

Bost: "Mercury... mercury, they quit making them now, but at least Ford is still around. Now, they did make the Mercury."

Black: "That's true. Well, I'll tell you, I just called my dealer who's on the list, the Chrysler dealer in Danville has to go out of business and I thought it was kind that

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

the Federal Government gave him three weeks to do so, but he has told me that I can get a broom to go back and forth to Springfield on this broom and it gets a hundred hours to the gallon. So, I'm trading in my Buick. I'm going to get a broom, since most people think that's how I get back and forth anyway, but that's not the point. I'm worried about this pond. I... it's contaminated with lead and by the way, I'm... I'm related to Lyle Lovett. Does Lyle know you're renaming his pond?"

Bost: "I don't know that Lyle does, but the Korandos know that we're renaming the pond."

Black: "Who was Lyle Lovett's wife? Is she behind this... exwife? Movie star, as I recall."

Bost: "I don't know. I don't remember."

Black: "Oh, <u>Pretty Woman</u>. What was her...? Julia Roberts. Is

Julia Roberts aware that you're renaming Lyle Lovett's

Pond?"

Bost: "I don't know, but she's a Pretty Woman."

Black: "Well, just... just between you and me. Did Julia Roberts ever swim in this pond?"

Bost: "Not that I know of."

Black: "Oh, that would cast a whole new light on my vote.

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is what it's come down to.

No budget, a lot of things left undone, but I want to rise with Representative Bost and Representative Phelps, although I am related to the Lovetts, I guess we have no choice but to rename Lovett's Pond, Kincaid Pond and I'm sure there'll be a song out next week about that. Look for

66th Legislative Day

- it. Silver bullet, number 10 on the charts, but number 1 in your heart, <u>I Found My Love at Kincaid's Pond</u>. Woop."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Joint Resolution 64?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. 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 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mary Flowers, we have House Joint Resolution 62."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 62 asks for a joint committee on the status of minorities in education in order to access and address the need of minorities to ensure that the continuum of equality in our educational system. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you have in regards to House Joint Resolution 62."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Joint Resolution 62?' 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? Washington. Bassi. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers, we have House Resolution 233."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 233 is asking the United States to look at the affordable quality health care because so many people are lacking health care here in this country. And if we were to have a single payer in this state, the U.S. could save over \$350 billion annually on just efficiency. And we know how many people are dying every day because they lack access to quality, affordable health care and we know one of the biggest burdens on our state budget is the funding of our health care system. Insurance companies have a conflict of interest. They have a fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders. We need something to be responsible for the people of the State of Illinois and we should expand Medicare and Medicaid. And so, therefore, we're asking again for Congress to look into having a... supporting the House Resolution 676 in the 110th Congress that will provide universal health care insurance to all the people residing in the State of Illinois. Thank you. I'm..."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 233?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Moffitt, we have House Resolution 421. Read the..."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 421 urges the Department of Ag in conjunction with the Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association to create a way to identify what products have

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

been aerial sprayed. This came about because of a child in my area who came in contact with some aerial spray. The parents are trying to find out what had been sprayed. There's no opposition to this. Fertilizer and Chemical Association is neutral. We're just trying to be proactive. It would speed up the process of being able to find out what... what chemical a human being came in contact with. No opposition. Appreciate your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 421?' 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 117 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Resolution, having received the Consti… is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Mitchell, J.: "Speaker, what is the determining factor on what we vote on and what passes simply on a voice vote? The difference between a Roll Call vote and a voice vote. I mean, there's several things I'd loved to have had a Roll Call vote on, but... but it just zips through with a voice vote and we don't vote on them. I'm confused as to why some things go one way and some go the other."

Speaker Turner: "Resolutions that require the state to spend any funds, say, establishing a commission or task force,

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

any one... any Resolution that requires the state to spend funds require a Roll Call vote."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Winters, we have House Resolution 420."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... it requested the state to deal differently with security in the Thompson Center, not requiring a state-issued ID, but simply to run people through a metal detector test. The ACLU informed me during... after the committee hearing that in Congress they had tried to do this and they lost a court case that citizens have the right to redress without ID. And I think this is a... something that CMS ought to consider. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, I would daresay that there are probably more people that are unhappy with State Government and State Government employees tonight than there have been in quite some time. Why would you want to lessen security at the Thompson Center?"

Winters: "For... the main reason was that a certain State Representative was held out of a committee hearing for almost a half an hour 'cause he didn't have his state ID, would not accept a business card or the voucher of Representative Jefferson. I felt that it was overbearing on the part of the State Police and found why are we trying

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

to say to our citizens, you don't have access to the State of Illinois center in Chicago without a state ID. Why not another form of ID? It makes common sense that if you run them through a metal detector, they're not going to be a security issue. They should not be a security issue, so why are we requiring ID? Have them sign in, if you wish. But why do they have to have a state-issued ID?"

- Fritchey: "But this says to access any of the state offices located within the building. So you're saying that any individual will be able walk into any office in the building?"
- Winters: "As long as they... they're restricted where they can't even get to the elevator bank without going through metal detector already. Is that not secure? Otherwise, why don't we apply that to the State Capitol and say that everybody ought to have a state ID to get into the State Capitol? We are just as much at risk, so why is the Thompson Center locked down..."
- Fritchey: "Oh, I... I would... I would argue these days we're more at risk. But be that as it may, I don't mean to make light of it. You know, in the past we've had questions and I think rightfully so of, you know, you and I remember a time when there weren't metal detectors to get into this building nor security. You know, we had a couple tragedies which necessitated implementing that. I get where you're coming from. I was not aware of the story underlying it, but at the same time, I think will we need this..."
- Winters: "Well, the other point… the other point is that it's already been tested in court on the federal level and the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Congress cannot restrict access to the Halls of Congress based on having to have an ID. You're simply run through a metal detector and then you have access to address your Member of Congress or a bureaucrat that you're dealing with an agency..."

- Fritchey: "Is the Thompson Center controlled by CMS or Secretary of State?"
- Winters: "I believe the Secretary of State has the security there, but a State Police was actually the overriding authority."
- Fritchey: "Has anybody reached out to whoever the overriding authority is and asked them about their policies?"
- Winters: "I simply dealt with the people that were there in front of me. They said this is our policy and we have no authority to..."
- Fritchey: "No, no, no. But I guess what I'm getting at is the Reso... is the Resolution the right way to go here?"
- Winters: "It simply asks them to reconsider... and now if they reconsider and say we really think that we've had 14 threats this week. We have some specific need. Then fine, they've reconsidered. All this does is ask them to consider the policy they have in place. I don't think that they properly considered it when they put it into place."
- Fritchey: "Well, does it ask them to consider or does it actually to ask them to terminate the policy?"

Winters: "I'm sorry?"

Fritchey: "It doesn't ask them to consider, reconsider the policy; it asks them to terminate the policy, no?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Winters: "Let me find the language. We urge the management to terminate its security. All that does is urge them."

Fritchey: "Well, let me... let me ask you another question."

Winters: "It leaves it up to their... to their power ultimately."

Fritchey: "We... we've urged the management. It's not the management's policy is it? I...I... but..."

Winters: "That's where it's coming from. It's not... it's not in statute; it's not in rules. It's... it's the management of the Thompson Center that's..."

Fritchey: "Well, under... I mean, here and I don't really want to spend time with this, but I'm not sure we're getting anything else to be doing otherwise. But I believe that the Thompson Center is likely managed by CMS, enforced by the SOS, and from what you're saying, it's the ISP that has actually the enforcement. So, who's ever managing the building may not have the authority to terminate the policy anyway, correct?"

Winters: "I have no idea. The rules of authority are there of whether the Secretary of State or CMS is by statute required to use the State Police. That I don't know. I'm asking they reconsider. I'm asking this Body to urge them to remove the state ID requirement."

Fritchey: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Black: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative Winters, is a driver's license a form of state-issued identification?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Winters: "It is."

Black: "Do you have one?"

Winters: "I do. Normally, on me."

Black: "Okay. You're in. You're in."

Winters: "I'm not. I did not have one that day. And I did not drive..."

Black: "Oh. Well, then you're in violation of the law. You have to have your driver's license at all times. How did you get there?"

Winters: "There is no law that I have an ID. I was not..."

Black: "No, no. You have to have your driver's license on you.

How did you get there? Did you drive?"

Winters: "I rode with Representative Jefferson who drove and I took AMTRAK..."

Black: "All right."

Winters: "...to Springfield. I did not drive a vehicle without my driver's license."

Black: "Secretary White, if you're listening, it's David Winters not carrying his driver's license. I think that's against the law, all right. You might want to check on that. Now, Representative Winters, let's not get our shorts in a knot here..."

Winters: "I'm not."

Black: "...you know why this is required. You're... you're a man from an urbanized area, very intelligent. Where is the James Thompson Center located?"

Winters: "In the City of Chicago."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Black: "I rest my case. It's the City of Chicago. I'm surprised they don't make you have a City of Chicago-issued ID."

Winters: "Well..."

Black: "Things are different in Chicago, Representative."

Winters: "I had Representative Jefferson to vouch for me."

Black: "I know. Well, and Representative Jefferson had his driver's license, so he's okay. Couldn't he vouch for you and get you in?"

Winters: "They would... they would not accept the word of Representative Jefferson that I was also a Member of the General Assembly. This is..."

Black: "Couldn't he have said you were his brother?"

Winters: "Pardon?"

Black: "Couldn't he have said you were his brother or his uncle?"

Winters: "Might have, might have worked."

Black: "Jesse White is... I remember years ago, Jesse White took me into Cabrini Green and told some people who didn't like the fact I was there that I was his cousin and I've always thanked him for saying so. But I don't think this is a real issue. I mean, I know it is to you 'cause you're up there a lot, but I just expect things to be different when I go to Chicago. And I'm just glad that I don't have to have an ID card issued by Representative Fritchey or Representative Monique Davis, especially Representative Monique Davis, 'cause she probably wouldn't give me one. Well, I... it's all clear to me now. It's in the City of Chicago."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

 Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Gordon, C.: "Representative Winters, I had an office in the Thompson Center as a... when I was working for the Attorney General's Office and are you aware of how the offices are set up in the Thompson Center? You've been back in those offices, correct?"
- Winters: "Well, yes. There's a central bank of elevators that either the first eight or nine floors and then if you want to go higher, there's a different set of elevators."
- Gordon, C.: "Right. And so, specifically, with the Attorney General's Office we would definitely get maybe disgruntled people not only potentially victims who maybe weren't happy with outcomes of cases or with how they were going, but also families of defendants who weren't necessarily happy with the fact that a member of their family were being prosecuted. I can tell you I was very, very happy that people were being checked for ID and... and everything else."
- Winters: "I believe that was done on the floor that the Attorney General's Office was, that the former way they operated and the Governor's Office also was done that way with metal detectors at the office level, but the... the vast majority of the offices were not screened in any manner at that point."
- Gordon, C.: "Okay. But now, you have people who are... there's also offices there regarding tax payments. There's offices there for a lot of things and you and I both know that

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

sometimes people get things in their heads that it's someone… just some random state worker's fault that's causing all the problems in someone's life. Would you agree with that?"

Winters: "I don't see how ow... having a state ID makes any less of a threat than not having a state ID."

Gordon, C.: "Because if you have some form of identification, they can check to verify who that person is and keep them from getting..."

Winters: "But they weren't..."

Gordon, C.: "...into the back of the..."

Winters: "But that is not the way it's being handled."

Gordon, C.: "That's how it was handled when I was there and we were..."

Winters: "Well, they've changed it."

Gordon, C.: "...able in situations to keep people from getting into the back of those offices."

Winters: "Well, the point of it is, the way it's being managed today is not providing even that level of security and it is a hassle for the vast majority of the public and it also questions... it calls into question their right to approach state bureaucrats or their elected officials, in most cases they wouldn't be talking to the elected officials, but simply a bureaucrat. It calls into question the right of a citizen to deal with his government. That was what I was particularly annoyed by is the idea that the public doesn't have access to a state building."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, I respect what the Gentleman's doing, but I

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

think if you look at the actual text of the Resolution and I realize this is a Resolution and I realize perhaps, you know, that it's not necessarily binding and it's urging and it's doing, but would... an open and transparent government and how to get to the different state agencies this isn't necessarily the way to approach it. Because in this day and age, perhaps... If Representative Black could show some respect for the rest of the people in the Body, Representative Black, please. There are some of us on the floor who would like to talk to this Resolution. Speaker, if we could hold Representative Black to the same respect that he holds the rest of us to. But this is not necessarily the way to approach what Representative Winters wants to do and this is not necessarily something that I would want to have happen to the rest of our state employees who, I think, deserve protection. We've seen what's happened here at the Capitol and we should definitely think twice about Rep... what Representative Winters is doing. Thank you very much."

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

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will yield."

McCarthy: "Representative, are you aware that many nice people do not realize how they're perceived by other people?"

Winters: "I am aware of that."

McCarthy: "Okay. Are you aware of the fact that you come across as very scary to a lot of people. So, you being

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

left out of the Thompson Center doesn't seem like a bad idea to me, so."

Winters: "Point well-taken."

McCarthy: "I'd like a Roll Call vote on this Resolution, too."

Speaker Turner: "Your request will be honored. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I understand that you were personally aggrieved 'cause you forgot your wallet one day, but I'm just wondering, if you are an expert in security."

Winters: "I am not."

Lang: "And so, since you're not an expert in security, who the heck are you to tell these security experts..."

Winters: "Well, I..."

Lang: "...how to run the Thompson Center?"

Winters: "I would simply point out that at the City Hall of Chicago requires no ID to go in and check with your offices that you might want to... you might want to visit. There's no requirement there. There is no requirement in any other state office building. There is none in the State Capitol. Why have we targeted the Thompson Center for this, what I feel is a slap in the face of the citizen."

Lang: "Well, I don't know the answer, but I don't think we have done that. I think the security company we hired to do the work did that. Now, if you have some concerns about that security company, perhaps your Resolution ought to deal

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

with the security company. I don't think we should be in the business..."

Winters: "Pull it out."

Lang: "...of telling these folks what to do."

Winters: "Pull it out."

Lang: "You're taking it out of the record, Sir? It's a good choice."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman takes the Resolution out of the record. Mr. Clerk, can you make the committee announcements... committee schedule, please. Here you are."

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately.

The following committees will meet immediately.

Telecommunications Committee will meet in Room 118. Health

Care Availability & Accessibility Committee will meet in

Room D-1. Human Services Committee will meet in Room 115.

Revenue & Finance Committee will meet in Room 122B. And

State Government Administration Committee will meet in Room

114."

Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will stand in recess for 20 minutes while the committees meet. We will come back to the floor at 10:35, 10:35. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you rise?"

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Reboletti: "Has there ever been a trophy awarded on House… on a House Resolution?"

Speaker Turner: "I don't believe in my 30 years that I've...
we've issued a trophy on a House Resolution yet."

66th Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "Well, I asked Representative Winters to put it back in the record, then."
- Speaker Turner: "After the rec... after the recess, if he's daring and his heart's willing, we will entertain him again."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "So, the House will stand in recess for 20 minutes. Committees will meet immediately. Tim Mapes, Mr. Mapes. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Clerk Mahoney: Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' with a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1345, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Brosnahan, Chairperson from the 4046. Committee on Telecommunications, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1421. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 397. Representative Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May

66th Legislative Day

- 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 88. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Accessibility, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 810."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Order of Resolutions on page 19, we have Senate Joint Resolution 4. Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 4 merely extends the deadline date of the nuclear power task force that was established unanimously last year by this Body and by the Senate. Unfortunately, former Governor Blagojevich delayed quite a while before making his appointments. It only had one meeting and then we got into the impeachment thing, so we need an extension to complete that work. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass SJR4?' I'm sorry. The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos, for what reason do you rise? Representative Nekritz, the Lady from Cook, for what reason do you rise?"
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask for a verification on this vote."
- Speaker Turner: "We were going to do voice vote."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Nekritz: "I would like to ask for a Roll Call vote and ask for a verification on it."

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

Reis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, could you tell us a little more detail what your Resolution does?"

Fortner: "Yeah. The... when we started this ides, the Body may remember that we had some questions come up. There, in fact, was a... a Bill that proposed a moratorium, raised a lot of questions. We realized we really hadn't looked at the issues... any of the issues related to nuclear power. This is an industry that provides the majority of electricity to our state. We, as a state, rely more on nuclear power than any other state and we had a chance to really catch up and see what was going on. The Resolution asked that we look at a number of specific areas and then be able to make a full report to decide whether or not lifting the moratorium or any other option was appropriate as a means to go forward."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Resolution. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to have to figure out. We hear green and green and green and carbon free. We're going to have to figure out how we're going to meet our electrical needs for the future. Other European countries and other countries are using nuclear power almost solely as their source of electricity. Nuclear technology has come so far

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

since an accident that has unjustly caused this industry to look bad in our country. Other countries are doing it. We're going to have to figure out if we're not going to allow coal, it takes seven or eight or nine years to get a coal plant permitted in this country, you know, we're using wind, we're using other technology. But what's wrong with simple task force that will look at lifting the moratorium on nuclear power plants so that we can use that as an alternative source of electricity. It's clean; it's There's very little that goes into our... any landfills or anything like that. So, if we want to talk about clean; we want to talk about green technology, at least let this task force move forward so that we can see if we should remove the moratorium and begin lo... at least looking at building nuclear power plants here in Illinois. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I know pretty soon we'll have about 15 people on our side of the aisle that want to talk on this, while we gather Members back here. If, at almost 11:00 at night, we're going to start verifying Roll Calls, then we're going to be here a long time debating and discussing Roll Calls while we find Members. Now, we've got... we've got 20 people over here prepared to talk about this for the next hour, if that's what the Representative wants us to do, if she's going to verify a Roll Call vote on a Resolution at 11:00 at night before we adjourn. Will the Sponsor yield?"

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, could you explain again exactly what your Resolution does?"

Fortner: "All the Resolution does is extend, until the end of this calendar year, the report that was originally expected at the end of the last calendar year that was interrupted by the impeachment process."

Eddy: "So, at 11:00 at night on the last day of Session, we're going to have a verification Roll Call on whether or not we're going to do a study?"

Fortner: "An extension."

Eddy: "We're going to extend a study that's already passed?"

Fortner: "Unanimously."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not sure... I'm not sure we have time for this nonsense."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady... the Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Mr. Speaker, this is... Can I speak to the Resolution?"

Speaker Turner: "You already spoke."

Nekritz: "What?"

Speaker Turner: "You already spoke on the Resolution."

Nekritz: "Okay. Then... then I'm going to make it stand."

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

Biggins: "Mr. Spea... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman says he will yield."

66th Legislative Day

- Biggins: "Representative, would you... does this Bill have anything to do with... is there anything about global warming in this Bill?"
- Fortner: "Not in this Bill, no. Not in this Resolution. This Resolution is simply... extends the date for the report."
- Biggins: "Oh. Well, thank you for that. I have no more questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Nekritz: "Mr. Speaker, this commission has been in existence for a year and has met once. So, I think, you know, we're extending the time on it, but if it's going to meet another time, one more time in the next year, then, you know, we're going to be back here again. I'll remove the verification."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady removes her verification. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Verschoore, for what reason do you rise? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Holbrook, for what reason do you rise?"
- Holbrook: "To the Resolution. There's no fault of anyone here that this report isn't done other than the Governor didn't appoint his people. We've met once. This is a standing task force. Give them time to make the reports. We've only been able to meet once and it was not due to the Legislature's delay. The Governor just didn't appoint the people. Let the report be made. This is silly."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further... seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass SJR4?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'aye'... 102 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is adopted. On page 10 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1421. Representative Bradley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1421's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bradley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley on Amendment #2."
- Bradley: "Thank you. This is an agreed Bill between the telecommunication industry, the Citizens Utility Board and the Attorney General's Office. Basically, it requires people that try to put charges on your phone bill, the third party verify those to make sure that they're accurate before they go on your phone bill. It's a proconsumer Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1421?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "It's the same as the Amendment. People can't believe that I talk this fast. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1421?' All those in favor say 'aye'... no... 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, 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, Representative Hamos, we have Senate Bill 397. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 397's been read a second time, previously. Amendment... Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lyons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons on Amendment #1."
- Lyons: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is on behalf... this is a gut and replace, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the behalf of the... the Hemophilia Care Act. It rightly changes that the... the... advisory board is under consultation and collaboration with the director of Insurance and identifies the director of Healthcare and Family Services versus the Department of

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Public Health and it takes out later in the Bi... in the... in the legislation, takes out that the Members who are appointed to the district. It strikes a sentence that says, no more than a majority of the voting members may be of any one political Party. Well, there's no reason to have any reference to political Party in this. There's about seven members that are appointed. They're all volunteers. There's no salary involved with this thing and part of the reason I'm amending this is 'cause we're having a hard time people to get appointed to this board. So, I'd appreciate your favorable consideration on this Amendment and on, ultimately, the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House... Senate Bill 397?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the... the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 397, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Appreciate your favorable consideration on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 397?' All those in favor 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

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

are 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 88. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 88. Senate Amendment 1 does three things. It creates the Lieutenant Governor Vacancy Act which transfers all the powers and duties of the Lieutenant Governor to the Governor, if the Lieutenant Governor's position becomes vacant, as I noticed that it is today. It also reverses two executive orders: one relative to the Historic Preservation Agency and another one relative to the Main Street Program. Senate Amendment 2 is technical."

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

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Miller: "Representative, what are the powers of the Lieutenant Governor?"

Lang: "Well, you'll note in our analysis that in 1981, Jim Thompson's Lieutenant Governor Dave O'Neill resigned because of boredom. I think, he does the Rural Affairs Council, the Illinois River Coordinating Council, oversees the Illinois Main Street Program and according to my most recent reading of the Constitution, becomes Governor if the previous Governor's been impeached."

Miller: "Thank you."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 88?' This is final action. 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 107 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 88. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cur... Representative Pihos, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 810."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 810. Senate Amendment #3 becomes the Bill. includes... it amends the Alzheimer's Special Care Disclosure Act to include among the facilities listed in the Act, supportive living facilities. Such facilities who market the provisions of specialized care for persons with Alzheimer's disease or related disorders would be required to disclose the availability of such special services and units. The other small caveat in this Bill is upon written request not only would they have to present it to the client but a representative of the client may request such information, as well. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Black: "I wish I could remember, Mr. Speaker. But I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "My analysis says there's Senate Amendment #1 and Senate

Amendment #2, but it doesn't say anything about Senate

Amendment #3. So... Oh, I'm being told it's a typo, a typo

on my analysis."

Speaker Turner: "Somebody forgot."

Black: "Oh, whatever. So, now I've got Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #3. Where'd #2 go?"

Speaker Turner: "Somebody forgot."

Black: "So, we're going to adopt 1 and 3? And 3 becomes the Bill?"

Speaker Turner: "That's correct."

Black: "I'm being told we have to do it this way. I don't have to do anything any way. I'm a senior citizen. Anybody yells and screams at me, I can charge you with a hate crime. Okay. I don't under... Does anybody understand what we're doing an hour before adjournment? Well... If we ought to... if we ought to do anything, we ought to have the Federal Government mandate the House of Representatives Corporate Average Fuel Economy because I think we ran out of gas about six years ago."

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

Feigenholtz: "Representative Pihos, very quickly, is this an initiative on the part of the supportive living providers?"

Pihos: "Actually, this Bill... this Amendment was brought by Senator Haine. Apparently, there had been occurrences in

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

facilities, supportive living facilities, with false claims of the kinds of services they provided to Alzheimer's patients. So, this was to keep that from occurring in the future."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 810?' This is final action. All in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; 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 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 810. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland, for what reason do you rise?"

Boland: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. On House Resolution 139,

I was recorded as 'no'. I'd like to be recorded as 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect. Representative Colvin, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1345."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have for the House to consider... I would like to Motion to Concur with Senate Floor Amendment #2 which extends four TIF districts within the City of Chicago. The four TIF districts in the City of Chicago all do with major economic development projects and it is the city's intention to extend these four TIFs for the next 12... for an additional 12 years. The four TIFs are

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

on the south side of Chicago, one in my district. This is another step in helping Finkl Steel relocate their plant and move 30... 330 well-paying jobs to the south side of the City of Chicago. I ask for acceptance to the Motion to Concur. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1345?' This is final action. All those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed by voting 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall... the Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 89 voting 'aye', 28 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 1345. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Deborah Graham, on the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 4046."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 which provides that a property or any leasehold interest property that is owned by a municipality with Home Rule powers that is contiguous to a municipality of a population over 500 thousand inhabitants is exempt under the Tax Code."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brosnahan. Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 4046?' All those in favor... I should say this is final action. And all those in favor should vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. The Clerk shall take

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 4046. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rita, on the Order of Second Readings-Senate Bills, we have Senate Bill 1833. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1833 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1833, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1833 has two components dealing with funeral processions. One, currently, if you're in a funeral procession, you need to use your headlights. This adds that you'd have to have your hazard lights and it also adds a component in the ab... in the absence of law enforcement that a funeral director and/or his or her designee may direct traffic. Ask for a favorable..."

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

Brady: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker? Here he comes."

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, regarding this legislation, who wrote the Amendment that went on this Bill?"

Rita: "I believe a funeral director did submit..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Brady: "I'm sorry?"

Rita: "I believe a funeral director put this together."

Brady: "Oh, okay."

Rita: "No, this was you."

Brady: "Well, I... I don't..."

Rita: "Well, Representative Dady... Brady, I happened to work with the Senate Sponsor and put this Amendment together."

Brady: "I put the Amendment on as per request for Senator Crotty, did I not?"

Rita: "Yes."

Brady: "And Representative, I might ask you, I... I will support the legislation, but I don't know that we really have a runaway problem with funeral processions in the State of Illinois. But I would like to ask you, a piece of legislation of mine, House Bill 815, if you could tell me the status of that Bill?"

Rita: "You'd have to... I don't know where... where's that 815 at?"

Brady: "I'm sorry?"

Rita: "I have no idea."

Brady: "I'm sorry. I still can't hear you."

Rita: "I have no idea."

Brady: "Okay. House Bill 815 was a piece of legislation that had some significant reforms when it came to funeral preneed trust and other problems in insurance in the State of Illinois which came to your committee earlier this year and then was put into a subcommittee. And I asked, at that time, that we try and move that and hold it on Second Reading. That did not occur. However, Representative, in

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

the spirit of cooperation, I... I will support your legislation, but I just have to say and let the Body know, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have much larger problems regarding the funeral industry and preneed in the State of Illinois, than funeral processions, right now, in the state. So, I would seriously ask, Representative, that in the future, we try and see if we can't work together in a better bipartisan spirit for the people of Illinois. And I would ask your cooperation in that."

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

Black: "Yes, Sir. Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker? Representative, if Digger O'Dell is out there directing traffic in a busy intersection, and as a result of the Digger being out there in his dark suit, two cars crash into each other, who's liable?"

Rita: "I don't know."

Black: "I've got a hunch it isn't going to be the city."

Rita: "Yeah."

Black: "And it isn't going to be the police department. It might be the old undertaker. My... my sheriff told me that he did not think that this was a very good idea. It... it no longer... it used to be... years and years ago when I was a young lad... police officers as a matter of courtesy, particularly in downstate smaller communities, would escort a funeral procession. Those days are gone for any number of reasons. I'm not sure that this Bill, number one, exempts a funeral director from any liability in directing traffic. As the sheriffs told me, they're not trained to

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

direct traffic. So, I, you know, what they usually do is to stop the escort car in the middle of the intersection for a few seconds and then, depending on where you live, the funeral procession can proceed on to the cemetery with... with some very limited interruption and again, that would depend on where you live. Does this ... would this preempt I mean, it... I can't imagine the City of Home Rule? Chicago wanting a funeral director to get out and direct traffic on some of the streets in the City of Chicago. just... I don't want to belabor the point. The hour grows I don't understand the liability. understand how we can do this that might fly in the face of city ordinance. And I know the State Police had... had expressed some concern that the Illinois Chiefs of Police have about this particular Bill. I... Well, it could be interesting. I... I always try to stop for that traffic anyway, but I think most of us, if we see somebody without the proper equipment or vest or what have you trying to direct traffic, our first reaction is to drive around the individual which, of course, may be just the opposite of what we should do in a funeral procession. I intend to cast a courageous 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman... the Lady from Cook, Representative Graham, for what reason do you rise?"

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was listening to some of the previous speakers' comments and maybe where they live they don't have issues with funeral processions, but where I live there are a lot of funeral processions in the City of Chicago and people traveling to bury their

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

loved ones on a hundred and something or out in the western suburbs or the south suburbs. There have been numerous accidents with people not respecting the processions. A lot of people have called my office or I, myself, have been in a procession where folks will not pay attention to the traffic light if it is a long funeral procession. So, sometimes when there's a long one, it's not a short one, people get impatient and they do not want to wait for the light to change or the procession to go by. We have been fighting for issues regarding gun violence, you know, in the City of Chicago, so it's a lot. So, where you live it may not be that big of a issue, but where we are there is a lot of funeral processions on top of just regular, that's heart attacks and all of that, but violence there is a lot... a lot and the funeral processions are very long. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Tryon: "Representative Rita, I certainly rise to support your Bill. I think times have changed over the years and we find even more need to have some kind of traffic control during funeral processions. Certainly, there was a day people used to pull over in respect for a funeral procession. They no longer do that. But for the record, I just wanted to get this in the record. It came to my attention from a funeral director that the federal Department of Labor actually will require funeral directors

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

that are going to be responsible for traffic control to take a training class and to also wear reflective clothing during the time that they're performing any kind of traffic control function. And I just wanted to make sure that you may be aware of that. Are you aware of that, Representative?"

- Rita: "No, I wasn't aware of that. And basically, from what my understanding was, it tells us just gives the authority so they can do it… can direct traffic."
- Tryon: "Well, once we give them the authority and they take that on themselves, they will be required by the Department of Labor to have some kind of training and wear reflective clothing."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1833?' 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 108 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', and 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Zalewski, for what reason do you rise?"
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to change my vote in the House Journal on House Resolution 418, Representative Ramey's Resolution relating the Reagan Tollway. I have a lot of Reagan Democrats in my district, so I'd like to be a 'yes' on that vote."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The record... the record will so reflect your wish to change. On page 18 on the Calendar, Representative Brauer, we have Resolution 424."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 424 declares June 6 and 7 as Batten Disease Awareness Weekend in the State of Illinois. The reporter down here in the box in the white shirt has a son that's afflicted with this neurodegenerative disease and it's out of tribute that we have this Resolution. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 424?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Bellock on House Resolution 428."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this was was what everybody was a part of last week and thank you very much for the support of it. It was just announcing that May 21 was Disability Day in the State of Illinois and the Freedom Quest Riders were all here to celebrate that. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 428.' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Brauer on House Resolution 437."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 437 is a congratulatory Resolution for Linda Meyer retiring."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 437?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Rose, we have House Resolution 443. Out of the record. Representative Rose, we have House Resolution 444. Out of the record. Representative Mulligan, we have House Resolution 447."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 447 requests that the Illinois State Board of Education seek further funding resources to further enhance economic education for students in Illinois and to continue to fund the Illinois Council on Economic Education and urges the Federal Government to spend stimulus funds promoting educational opportunities to further education for students on economic principles."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 447?' 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 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having... this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, we have House Resolution 65."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was falling asleep, I'm sorry."

Speaker Turner: "17."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Ford: "All right. HR65, this simply states that we require that the Department of Public Health establish a comprehensive plan to slow the spread of HIV and AIDS by the year 2010."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 65?' 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 118 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill having... this Resolution, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, for what reason do you rise?"

Cross: "Quickly, Mr. Speaker, in a point of personal privilege.

I... I know we have a little work to do, but I want to just...

before we get down to the wire and people get running out

of... or start running out of here, I'd like to thank

everybody for Session and especially those on our side of

the aisle. It's been a rather unique Session. I don't

know if it's over. Who... and... It may be or may not be and

whatever happens happens, but many people in this chamber

worked hard and did many good things. Some other things

didn't get done, but that's how it works around here. I'd

like to thank people on our side of the aisle like our

Chief of Staff Matt O'Shea and Scott Reimers and Kent

Gaffney and Lisa Guinan and Sara Wojiski and Vicky Crawford

and all of our staff for really working very, very hard

this Session. I'm mazed... ma... amazed at how hard they work.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

They... I don't know when they sleep and their work is incredibly, incredibly talented and they spend long, long hours helping all of us and Brad Bolin in the Clerk's... Clerk's Office and everybody else associated with the Clerk's Office. So, thank you all and hopefully we won't see each other for a while. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "On page 3 of the Calendar are Senate Bills-Third Readings, we have Senate Bill 932. Representative Fritchey. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 930..."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "On Senate Bill 932, Floor Amendments 1 and 2, offered by Representative Fritchey, have both been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd request to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Turner: "On Amendment #1. Say that again."

Fritchey: "I'd request to withdraw Amendment 1, please."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2."

Fritchey: "If we could just adopt the Amendment and discuss this on Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House... to Senate Bill 932. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 932, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. This was a Bill that had some extensive debate yesterday before pulling it off the record... or out of the record. Amendment 2 addressed an issue raised by Representative Eddy with respect to the requirement of a digital two-way radio. That's been removed. The criminal penalties for the bus drivers for failure to walk the bus has been removed. We know of no objection to the Bill. The IFT, which had concerns, is no longer opposed to the Bill. This came out of the Senate as an agreed Bill. There's no opposition in the House. I would simply request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 932?' 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 89 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Will the… Representative Chapa LaVia on House Resolution 470."

66th Legislative Day

- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House.

 House Resolution 470 urges Congress to quickly pass HR2059

 which would amend the Federal Law to provide for the payments..."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 470?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Dunkin. On page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Dunkin, you have House Resolution 425."
- Dunkin: "Oh, yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House at this hour. House Resolution 425 designates the day of May 20, 2009, as the Second Annual Phi Beta Sigma and Zeta Phi Beta Day at the State Capitol. This represents the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Incorporated and the Zeta Phi Beta Sorority in sponsoring... recognizing this and sponsoring our second annual legislative visit right here at our State Capitol. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Resolution 425?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 499, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 501, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 502, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 503, offered by Representative Monique Davis.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

House Resolution 504, offered by Representative Rose. And House Resolution 506, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're still waiting on the Senate to act on two Bills, and so we cannot adjourn or leave until the Senate concludes their work. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and In the Resolutions that were just Gentlemen of the House. adopted, I believe there is a Death Resolution for Terry Barnich who was killed in Iraq. There are some Members here who remember Terry, had a distinguished career in State Government, was head of the Illinois Commerce Commission. His death was most unfortunate as is the death of anyone, but he was a young man. He was getting the job done and it's a real loss for his family and friends and those who had the opportunity to work with him here some time ago. I would just simply ask and we don't need to read the Resolution, if the House could just stand for a brief few seconds of silence in memory of Terry Barnich. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. He was a good and decent man doing good work and it's a shame that his life ended prematurely."

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

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Biggins: "Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I had a question and I just received my answer from the fine staff that you have up there working in the well up there. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "That's good. The Lady from Cook, Representative Mell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Mell: "I'd just like to take this opportunity. I came to this job in a very... probably the most unique circumstances in the history of Illinois. And I just want to thank everyone for welcoming me and it has been a privilege to serve with you and to be in this historic building. And while here, I hoped that I've served my constituents well and I've at least tried to do that. And you know, it hasn't been an easy year and I really value my colleagues and what we try to do down here for the people of Illinois. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ford on House Resolution 468."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 468 simply urges that social justice be the guiding principles in the decision making in the House of Representatives. I move the passage of that Resolution. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no... The Gentleman from Morgan,

 Representative Watson, for what reason do you rise?"

Watson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Watson: "Representative Ford, I notice that this is... this is strange. It's social justice, yet Representative Stephens is on this Bill. Is there..."

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

Stephens: "I believe the question was directed to Representative Ford actually, but my name was used in debate. And..."

Speaker Turner: "And your light was on."

Stephens: "...and I know little about social matters and very little about justice and I agree with Representative Watson."

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

Ramey: "You say that the Sponsor yields?"

Speaker Turner: "He will try."

Ramey: "I'm sure he will. Representative, we voted this out of committee. I told you I was going to beat you up on this piece of legislation. Just one quick question. After all this time we've spent together, do you believe that I am not helping you with social justice?"

Ford: "Rush Lim... I mean, Ramey, no."

Ramey: "A right wing knocked you out of the close. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 468?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. The Lady from Cook, Representative

66th Legislative Day

- Collins. The Gentleman from White, Representative Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"
- Phelps: "A point of... a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I could have your attention, please. Tonight I would just like to recognize one of our staffers that, if you didn't know it or not, five minutes ago was her... the last time she's going to be here to join us. Sara Harbin, the chair... she's a committee clerk... staffer for Ag & Conservation. She's going off to nursing school. So, I would like for all of you to help me and join her. We're going to miss you, Sara. So, thank you all, having please to have joined me. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Reitz: "Just... I'd like... Brandon talked about Sara, but I think we'd be remiss if we left without thanking all the staff on both sides of the aisle, the doormen and everyone in this place that just keeps this place running and tries to make all of us look good."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank everybody. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Members of the… your side of the aisle. I know you will, in fact, miss Sara. She has done a very good job for you and as one of your Members said, she makes your Members look good and

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

if she is, in fact, that valuable of staffer to make Mr. Reitz look good, I think you ought to double her pay so she'll stay, because it's not easy to let, you know, make some of you on that side of the aisle look good. But on behalf... quite frankly, on behalf of one of our staffers who has a... I don't know what the word would be at my age... what a... perhaps a crush, puppy love, a romantic interest in Sara, he is crushed that she's leaving and hopes that she'll reconsider and I don't know what this means, but find it in her heart to forgive him. Just passing it on from staff."

- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1348 on the Order of Third Readings. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin on Senate Bill 1348."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1348 amends the Community Integrated Living Arrangement Licensure and Certification Act. It provides that the Department of Human Services 'shall' instead of 'may' conduct an investigation upon the receipt of a complaint to ensure that a community mental health or developmentally service agency is in compliance with the Act. It also provides that in connection with the operation of an agency without a license or permit, the department 'shall' instead of 'may' investigate, notify the agency and make referrals to the investigatory or law

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

enforcement agencies. It's effective immediately and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Reis: "Are we on June 1 or are we still on May 31?"

Speaker Turner: "May 32."

Reis: "So, have we adjourned and do we need to start a new Session and will this take 60 votes or 71? I'm just killing time, Representative Lang. The Senate's in Rules Committee. I was wondering if we're going to have a second prayer."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1348 has been read a third time."

Speaker Turner: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis, regarding your inquiry, this Bill will need 71 votes. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, what's the purpose of trying to define a
 'frivolous complaint?'"

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, the department asked me to carry this legislation."

Eddy: "Representative, your voice... your voice changed. I don't..."

Dunkin: "Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Eddy: "I don't know. What was that?"

Dunkin: "I was trying..."

Eddy: "Was that telepathy?"

Dunkin: "...I was trying to figure that out myself, Representative. We wanted to simply make sure that there are no frivolous complaints against a nursing home facility or community assisted living and we wanted to make sure that we're clear in the Act here, going to codify that and we want to make sure the department 'shall' instead of 'may' investigate or notify the agency and make the referrals to an investigatorial law enforcement agency. So, I mean, you get a... I would imagine the department is receiving a number of complaints, some serious, some probably not so serious based on a number of variables and we're trying to strengthen or tightening up the clarity on this particular aspect."

Eddy: "So, DHS has apparently been inundated with complaints and they feel that some of those complaints aren't worthy of an investigation. They would like to identify what complaints are frivolous so that they can simply ignore those complaints and move on to more serious business regarding complaints of substance."

Dunkin: "I would ima... I would assume so. That's probably why they want this Bill sponsored. I mean, it... this Act simply provides that the department shall prioritize and address the complaints according to the potential noncompliance with the provision of the Act as necessary to manage within its existing resources."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Eddy: "Do you know what standard they're going to use for frivolity? What will be frivolous; what's the criteria; is there a rubric? Will be the scor... some kind of score involved in assigning a complaint a frivolity rating?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I am a colleague of yours. As a State Legislator, I'm not... what for those... I'm not in the agency, so I don't have the particular standards here to discern one way or the other on sort of what exact finite criteria. So..."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I might suggest that this entire piece of legislation is frivolous at this point."

Dunkin: "I wouldn't suggest that, Sir."

Eddy: "Well, I don't know. I... I think that's going to be up to the Body here momentarily to decide the frivolous nature of... of this Bill. Representative, do you know if the Senate is done yet?"

Dunkin: "Come again?"

Eddy: "Do you have any idea if the Senate is finished yet?"

Dunkin: "Do I know if the Senate is done yet?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "I do not know if the Senate is done yet,

Representative."

Eddy: "Well, I... You know, if they're not, maybe we should vote 'no' on the Bill, present you with the trophy. It'll take a little time. You'll get the trophy. We'll get rid of a frivolous Bill and we'll be able to waste a little bit more time while we wait for the House of Lords to finish their business. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Oh."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1348?' 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... Clerk shall take... Representative Dunkin. Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "...I... I would like to..."

Speaker Turner: "Take the record."

Dunkin: "...take it out of the record."

Speaker Turner: "On this question, we have 14 voting 'aye'... 14 voting 'aye', 100 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill fails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand not only did Mr. Dunkin win the trophy, but that was actually his first Bill of the Session. And that having been the case, I have absolutely no desire to reconsider that vote at all."

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

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Miller: "How many times can you receive the... the trophy?"

Speaker Turner: "You are eligible as often as you can. Is that a threepeat now for Mr. Dunkin? Oh, twopeat, two rings. Okay."

Miller: "Twopeat. It's still early."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stephens: "I hope that the Gentleman from Morgan is listening.

 This is social justice."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor for consideration' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3606."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... If we have a little time, I think it would be instructional if Mr. Dunkin would read all the names on the Century Trophy to us, just as sort of a historical record."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Dunkin, would you care to share with us the Members of your fraternity, the Century Club."
- Dunkin: "Ha, ha, ha, ha. You know, just for clarification, that was pretty serious Bill. Honored Members of the Illinois House of Representatives Century Club include: Roman Kasinski, Bob Churchill, Cal Skinner, his very own, Lou Lang, John Dunn, Phil Novak, Ted Leverance, Pat Lindner, Ellis Levine, Dave Winters, Mr. David 'statewide' Miller, George Scully, Bobby Molaro, Steve Davis, Ken Dunkin, and Dan Reitz. Oh, one more, one of our more prominent Members here, Mr. Paul Froehlich."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Collins, for what reason do you rise?"
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, you know, they brought up social justice and you know, we just passed a Resolution for social justice and I just kind of wanted to read it so that we all understand what social justice was. So, it's for a personal privilege. Is that all right?"

Speaker Turner: "No."

- Collins: "Yeah. Thank you. So, it says... the House Resolution says,
 - WHEREAS, During these turbulent and difficult economic times, it is more important than ever that the concept of social justice, the view that every member of our society is deserving of equal economic, political, and social rights and opportunities, be given the highest priority by elected State officials; and
 - WHEREAS, Assuring social justice is a key element of the Illinois Constitution as shown by the Preamble which states, in part, that 'We, the People of the United States (sic- State of Illinois)... in order to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the people; maintain a representative and orderly government; eliminate poverty and inequality; assure legal, social and economic justice; provide opportunity for the fullest development of the individual; ... do ordain and establish this Constitution for the State of Illinois'; and
 - WHEREAS, Our American ideals recognize the value and importance of the equality of opportunity; and

66th Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, Recognizing that when justice is achieved in every aspect of society, rather than merely in the administration of the law, individuals and groups will be afforded fair treatment and an impartial share of the benefits of society; and
- WHEREAS, It is proper for us to consider how we, as a State, treat the most vulnerable among us and how our decisions will affect those most in need of equal opportunities; and
- WHEREAS, Differences of gender, race, ethnicity, age, disability, health, religion, economic condition, or class should not stand in the way of equal opportunities in education, health care, or employment; and
- WHEREAS, The inequality of educational opportunities in Illinois is well known and thoroughly described in studies, test results, and statistics assembled by the State Board of Education; and
- WHEREAS, The toll of violence, the troublesome number of school dropouts, and the loss of life, hope, and opportunity extracted from the victims of violence and the lives of our school dropouts tear at our communities; and
- WHEREAS, Disparities in the availability and quality of healthcare throughout Illinois highlight the lack of equal opportunities for those in need of health care; and
- WHEREAS, Rising unemployment in all sectors of our economy and the human price paid by communities that experience high unemployment rates make it more important than ever that there truly be equal opportunities in all phases of employment; therefore, be it

66th Legislative Day

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that the House, as a body, will endeavor to give a high priority to social justice and allow that important principle to direct our choices in matters both large and small and guide our decisions in matters temporary or permanent; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to each member of the House so that it may serve as a tangible reminder of the commitment each member has to this noble priority. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mell: "A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Mell: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm sure it was an oversight, but that civil justice Resolution did not include sexual orientation. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "I have to introduce to the Body a very special person, under most unusual circumstances, Mr. Ken Baker, raise your hand. He's on the Republican side. However... however, Mr. Baker will be leaving. He's going to Georgetown University and it'll probably be another 20 years, guys. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

66th Legislative Day

- Biggins: "Well, I appreciate Representative Davis's comments again reminding her and the Body that the Party that the President that freed the slaves in America was the Republican Party over the objection of the Democratic Members of the Legis... State Government... from the national government at that time. So, it's... welcome her comments and we'll all continue to work and go forward for equality in America under the law."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk. Supplemental Calendar #3, we have

 House Bill 3606 on the Order of Concurrences.

 Representative Currie. No? Representative Hannig, B."
- Hannig, B.: "The hour is late and I have not gotten my second wind like some of you seem to have, so this will be brief.

 This Bill is now the same Bill as Senate Bill 39 which Mike Bost passed on the 29th with 112 'yes' votes. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do move... I support the woman's Motion to Concur with House Bill 3606 Amendment #2.

 This is the omnibus Bill for pensions. We'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I, in no way, want to defeat this Bill, but I would again like the record to reflect that I have a firefighter in my district that retired in July of 1977 and for all of those years... and he started work in... back in July of 1946... and he

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

still isn't covered under that compound plan. He'd get a whopping \$50 a month. He's 87 years old. I hope he lives long enough and I live long enough to maybe in the fall Veto Session take care of some of the oldest firefighters in the State of Illinois that for some reason on your side of the aisle one person says 'no'. It's not right. I hope this thing passes and I hope you understand that my 'no' vote is based on what I think is a very unfair interpretation and does not show proper respect to some of the oldest retired firefighters in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3606?' This is final action. And all those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ryg, May, Jakobsson, and Hatcher. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 109 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 3606. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Yeah. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your question."

Biggins: "Did you say something?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, I did."

Biggins: "And did I miss it or is there something we're supposed to know that we're doing or..."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Speaker Turner: "You missed it."

Biggins: "...do we... Can we quest... can we guess or something?"

Speaker Turner: "You missed it."

Biggins: "Is it a period of silence? Is there something... a moment of silence that we missed or... It's... what... what... like, what's going on in here?"

Speaker Turner: "We're waiting on the House of Lords."

Biggins: "Oh, good. Well, thank you. I'm... I'm very anxious and... and maybe as excited as you are to receive that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 67, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Monday, June 1, 2009, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until the call of the President."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye'... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee schedules. The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley, for what reason do you rise?"

Bradley: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Bradley: "I'd like to direct everyone's attention to the west balcony and like to welcome award-winning author David Ellis to the gallery."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome, Dave Ellis."

Bradley: "And also we'd like to announce that he's got a book coming out this summer."

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

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say, well, of course, we're proud of all of the staff who's helped us throughout the year, but we have a staff member who has a wonderful occasion coming up in her life and that's Miss Kelly Newman. She will be getting married. Kelly will be getting married. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We all wish her well and great success with that wonderful occasion."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis, do you know what her new last name is going to be?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry, I don't. Someone here may know."

Speaker Turner: "Yeah, I do."

Davis, M.: "Do you? What is it?"

Speaker Turner: "Turner."

Davis, M.: "Is that right?"

Speaker Turner: "... me, but Turner."

Davis, M.: "So, we'll have another Turner in the House."

Speaker Turner: "Another Turner in the House."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "With more to come."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

66th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 31, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for consideration' a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 313 and a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 2424."
- Speaker Turner: "On Supplemental Calendar #2, we have House Bill 2424 under the Order of Concurrences. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move for concurrence on Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 on House Bill 2424. Let's just make this real simple. This is the capital 'bimp', vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1...' The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2424?' This is final action. And all those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is 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', 1 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2424. And this Bill, having

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 313. Representative Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the appropriation and reappropriation Bill for the capital projects. The total is \$3.1 billion in new spending. I'll be happy to answer your questions. Please vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House Concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 313?' This is final action. And all those in favor should vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'nays', 2 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 313. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are prepared to adjourn. And I want to thank all of you and all of the staff for the very hard work that you've given to the people of the State of Illinois over the last several months. We recognize that this has not been an easy Session. It's been extremely difficult, contentious, arduous and probably not yet finished. The plan is that the Governor and the four Leaders will meet tomorrow for continuing discussions about the budget, but the Members can go home subject to the call of the Chair. So, with that in mind, let me thank all of you again.

66th Legislative Day

5/31/2009

Representative Currie moves that the House does stand adjourned 'til the call of the Chair. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. I hope you all have a great summer. Thank you."