115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 11:00 having arrived, the House shall be in order. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops. Turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be read in... led in prayer today by Reverend Keith Harris, who is with McKinley Memorial Presbyterian Church in Champaign, Illinois. Reverend Harris is the guest of Representative Jakobsson. Reverend Harris."

Reverend Harris: "Let us pray. Oh, God, the citizens of Illinois call You by many names; God, Yahweh, Allah, Brahman, All Glorious, Goddess, Sat Nam, Wankantaka, Ahura, Mazda, our Ground of Being, Father/Abba, Mother/Amma, even the Void of Nirvana to name a few. These names are planted and transplanted here. The Greek traditions of the world now growing in our own garden of Illinois. We are joined together as our crops are joined with the plains while it reaches upward beyond itself. We are joined together this day as the rivers and streams are joined, as they travel to the oceans of our planet. So, we are joined together in this chamber with the citizens on whose behalf You hold offices of trust. You, who from ancient times have joined us all together in community, covenant, and constitution is by me... as means by which we all may co-create a more humane, educated, and prosperous society. You, the Spirit of all generations, bless all those here and everywhere serving You and the public in peaceful and just ways. this new day, accept us anew as we join again with the calls to stewardship, liberty, justice, righteousness, and love, Amen."

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by the Lady from Cook, Representative Deborah Mell."
- Representative Mell et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call... Roll Call for Attendance.

  Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please, let the record show that there are no excused House Democrats today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Black, Durkin, Myers, and Tracy are all excused on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 answering the call, a Quorum is present and the House is prepared to do its business. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Resolutions for Rules Committee is House Resolution 1018, offered by Representative Stephens. House Resolution 1020, offered by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 1022, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 1024, offered by Representative Feigenholtz. And House Joint Resolution 112, offered by Representative Tryon."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We also need to put Representative Stephens on that excused list, as well."

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. The Chair is prepared to go to the Order of Third Reading. And Mr. Clerk, on page 22 of the Calendar is House Bill 5330, Representative Beiser. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5330, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Beiser."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5330 amends the Vehicle Code that would require IDOT to provide vehicle accident reports to certain federal, state, and other local agencies. It's passed in committee. There were no... no opposition that I'm aware of. And I'd be happy to answer any question and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5330. All those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 5330 is declared passed. On page 23 of the Calendar is House Bill 5783 on Third Reading. Representative Burns. Out of the record. Page 26 of the Calendar appears House Bill 6205, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Representative Currie, on page 23 of the Calendar is House Bill 5833. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5833, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

115th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I was confused about the numbers. This is a measure that would say that businesses that have tax liability of 20,000 or more during a calendar year, would be required to file with the State Department of Revenue electronically. Today, that provision applies to those with 200,000 in liability. This does not apply to individuals. It does apply to businesses. I know of no opposition. It's a way of streamlining and making more cost efficient Illinois State Government. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and would appreciate your support for the Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 5833.

  No one seeking recognition, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 5833 is declared passed. Page 20 of the Calendar is House Bill 4582, Representative Monique Davis. This Bill is on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4582, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4582 amends the Chicago teacher article of the Illinois Pension Code by requiring the state to contribute to the public school teachers of Chicago, twenty percent of what is contributed to the Illinois Teacher's Retirement System beginning in

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

fiscal year '10. The Illinois Teacher's Retirement System will receive over \$2 billion. So, if this Bill were to become law, the Chicago Teacher's Fund would receive less than 500 million. Since 1988, the state has contributed only 65 million to Chicago Teacher's Retirement Fund, and we're just asking that this become law today. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 4582.

On that question, the Gentleman from Crawford,

Representative Eddy."

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

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, your proposal would represent a significant increase in state spending at a time when the state obviously is facing an economic and fiscal crisis. How... how do you propose, under any circumstances, or even if you could make a case, how do you propose that the state come up with the revenue?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part."

Eddy: "Well, let me ask you this way. What is the projected fiscal impact of this change?"

Davis, M.: "Well, I think the TRS system will get over a billion dollars for fiscal year... for this fiscal year, and the amount that was proposed for Chicago was cut totally in half and these pension payments should have some fairness between the Chicago system and the TRS system. So, you know, we're going to have to pay these pension funds regardless."

115th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Representative, let me ask the question a different way, because may... maybe you didn't understand what I was asking you. The question I asked was, what is the fiscal impact to the State of Illinois if this change were to be made?"
- Davis, M.: "It would be \$420 million."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, this would... this would cost the State of Illinois \$420 million in GRF?"
- Davis, M.: "That's correct."
- Eddy: "Where would you propose that the State of Illinois come up with \$420 million to fund this change when the state is \$13 billion in deficit?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, where are we going to get the one point sum billion for the TRS system? Where's that going to come from?"
- Eddy: "Representative, the... the system that we have in place to calculate the state's share in payment is something that... that we've been struggling with. However, to add \$420 million to the state payments for any purpose at a time when the state is \$13 billion in deficit, how in the world does this make any fiscal sense?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, it will certainly help the Chicago Public School System."
- Eddy: "I'll give you that."
- Davis, M.: "You know, it will. It will reduce the deficit for which they suffer, and by the state putting in a larger share than they ever have, it will reduce the requests that Chicago has to make in reference to its deficit. I think it's important to realize, Representative, that for years

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Chicago never got any money into their pension system until 1988. And then it was just... was it \$65 million?"

Eddy: "Representative, up until 1995 there was a dedicated source of revenue for the Chicago Pension System in the form of a levy. Correct? Was a nickel levy?"

Davis, M.: "Yes, that's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. That nickel levy was removed as part of an omnibus agreement that... that allowed for that money to go into what might be best described as just a general education operating budget for the City of Chicago with the understanding that that pension payment would be made when that money became available for more flexible use. That happened in 1995, correct?"

Davis, M.: "Yeah."

Eddy: "Do you have any idea if the dedicated levy that was in place in 1995 would have... would have remained in place for the specific purpose of the pension system, how much money that would have generated?"

Davis, M.: "If we still had the levy in place, we would be over 90 percent funded."

Eddy: "So, although a decision was made, an agreement was made that that pension system would be funded even though the flexibility would be provided by removing the nickel levy, now, about 15 years later, the City of Chicago has not managed the agreement they made in 1995 effectively. And instead, they're coming back to the state and saying, please bail us out. We've mismanaged the agreement. We've… we've eliminated a nickel dedicated levy that would have provided us with a funding level of over 90 percent.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

We didn't do well. We messed up. State of Illinois, we want \$420 million at a time when the state is \$13 billion behind. Representative..."

Davis, M.: "Well... I don't..."

Eddy: "I... I understand..."

Davis, M.: "Rep... Representative..."

Eddy: "...the importance of..."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Eddy: "...the City of Chicago and their deficit and their issues.

Everybody is facing those issues. But I... I cannot understand at a time like this, we... we're even considering the possibility of adding \$420 million. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, \$420 million in additional general revenue at a time when we cannot make payments to Chicago Public Schools, or any other school district in the state for mandated categoricals. Representative, I'm sorry I'm having trouble understanding why now?"

Davis, M.: "Because the TRS system will get over a 1,500,000,000 regardless to the economic conditions or the state deficit. And, Chicago should not be treated like a step-child. It is so unfair."

Eddy: "Representative, I... I can... I can agree with the statement. They absolutely should not be treated like a step-child."

Davis, M.: "When they have to use their operational money to put into the pension, it's not fair. We... they have to use part of their operational..."

Eddy: "Representative, they..."

Davis, M.: "...budget."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Eddy: "...they made that choice in 1995 when they decided to... to use that as operational money. They had a dedicated levy for the purpose of funding the pension system, and that ... that was part of an agreement that they made. So now, I... I don't... I agree with what you're saying. Let's... let's talk about a couple of those ways Chicago is treated, quote, like a step-child. Special education funding for the City of Chicago's Public Schools. Everybody else in this state has to follow a formula whereby they receive extraordinary funding based on the number of students in education. Chicago... the City of Chicago receives a block grant that last year, paid them \$235 million more than the same funding for other schools in the state. I don't think that's being treated like a step-child. Two-hundred and thirty-five million additional dollars, that block grant also provides them with additional funding in other areas, where if they were held to the same formula, they would get less money. I think we've been pretty good at a time when we're cutting hold harmless to every other school district in the state, we've been pretty good with the City of Chicago by providing them additional funding beyond. if we want to talk about per pupil funding in the state, if you want to go there, there are a lot of school districts in this state that receive a lot less money per pupil than the City of Chicago. So, with all due respect, I don't think it accurately characterizes the support the City of Chicago gets for public funding for education to state that they're treated like a step-child, I think that's erroneous."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative."

Eddy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very quickly to the Bill. Take a look at the analysis, \$420 million is the request in General Revenue Funds to go to a pension system that up until 1995, had a dedicated levy that according to the Representative, would have resulted in the system being funded at over 90 percent had they just simply kept the levy dedicated for that purpose. I understand the City of Chicago Public Schools are in trouble. This is no way to help them. This cannot happen. Ladies and Gentlemen, you need to vote 'no' on this."

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

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Sponsor a question. Would she yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, she will."

Tryon: "Representative, could you tell me what the tax rate for education in the City of Chicago of all schools... all school funds is per \$100 of assessed valuation?"

Davis, M.: "I don't really know the tax rate for all schools."

Tryon: "Well, I know it. Its \$2.58 per \$100 of assessed valuation. In my district, the tax rate is \$4.80. We both have the tax cap, and if I take my house and I calculate my tax bill, I'm going to pay just about \$5000 to education on a \$345,000 piece of property. And if I take my house and I put it in the City of Chicago, I'm going to pay about \$1375. And a \$1,300,000 house in Lincoln Park is going to pay what I pay to education. Now, that's just wrong. In fact, last year you taxed \$2.58 per \$100 of assessed

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

valuation, and in '08, you didn't even tax to the maximum that the tax cap would allow you to take. If fact, in '95, '96, and 2008, you could have got more money in your tax levy under the terms of the tax cap than you actually took. That's wrong. It's wrong that... that your... you come here and ask us to pay for the pension system, but you're not willing to raise property taxes on yourself. district, the reason we have that disparity because when you got the tax cap in 1994, your tax rate was \$4.32. right. Now it's \$2.58. Our tax rates were about the same in 1994, but we ran referendums. We raised our tax rate. We went to our voters and said we needed more money. don't you go to your voters and ask to raise the tax rate like we went to our voters? Because you haven't ran a referendum since 1983, and that's not right either. we're being penalized because the City of Chicago is under a tax cap and the declining rate is going down, but the fact is, you haven't taxed under the tax cap what you're entitled to, nor have you talked about having a referendum to go to your voters. I can't support this because I believe this is up to the taxpayers of Chicago to support. That's the way it started out. That's the way it should be, and until to ask for a referendum, until those tax rates are higher, I can't support giving your school district that kind of money. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, I did support this Bill in committee, but expressed my reservations at that time about the \$420 million price tag. And I... you know, I do recognize that there are fairnesses... fairness issues and equity issues as between the various pension systems across the state, between the... the Chicago Teacher's Pension and the state pensions. But I think at this time with the... with our significant budget gap, I just can't in good conscience add another \$420 million to that, so I just wanted to explain that. Thank you."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. At... we've got to use some commonsense. are facing the worse budget mess that we've had, at least in the 16 years that... that I've been here. Representative Davis and I worked on many issues on education for Chicago, and I've supported her many, many times. But, when all pension systems are in crisis, when the education budget for the State of Illinois, not just Chicago but every single school dic... district is in crisis, we simply can't do this. If we're ever going to catch up pension systems that... that are in dire need of funds, it's going to have to be in good economic times when we have full employment, when everybody is working hard and we can afford it. Folks, today, regretfully, we simply can't afford this Bill. And, Mr. Speaker, I would request verification of the Roll Call vote if we so have the vote. Thank you."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Chair will acknowledge your request. The Lady from Cook is seeking recognition, Majority Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Currie: Bill raises basic issues of morality, parity, and fair play. I live in the City of Chicago. My tax dollars go to support the pensions of the Chicago Public School teachers. I'm really lucky because I get to pay for the pensions of the public school teachers in the districts of those people who have just spoken before us. Chicago has been a stepchild from the very beginning, and when Representatives talk about, well, they gave up the levy, that was a local And if you're concerned about the cost of this program, maybe you ought to think about how your districts ought to be levying more money for the public school pension... teacher pensions in your own neighborhoods. has been a problem for years that Chicago has been left out. Chicago is a step-child. Now, I don't know that this is the right solution, and I don't know whether the dollar amounts make this something that we can't quite think about doing this year. Although, if we're going to spend 2.4 billion on the downstate system, I'm not sure why we can't take a small piece of that \$400 million and spend it to help the citizens of Chicago pay for the pensions of their public school teachers. So, I think we've heard a lot of hypocrisy on this Floor. My nickel levy doesn't compare to what you're doing in other parts of the education system. For years the state has said we'll take responsibility for the downstate teachers. Chicago you get to help us with

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

that, but when push comes to shove, Chicago, you're taking the responsibility for your teacher's pensions on your own backs. Again, I'm not sure this is the best solution, and I know these times are tough, but I think that the Sponsor has done a good job of bringing to us a very important issue of morality, morality in our public policy, fair play, and parity. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just simply must say that we must bring some parity in reference to the pension There is a substantial, additional cost for the state, however, as they have ... there's a funding requirement that 90 percent of the pension be funded by 2045. This is not an increase in any benefits or any expenses of the pension fund but defines an obligation that the state put in place in 1995 that remains unfunded. The downstate TRS system in 2005 received 906,000,000. In fiscal year '08, 1,041,000,000. In '09, the TRS system got, listen carefully, 1,451,000,000 and in 2010 it's almost doubled for the TRS system, \$2,089,000,000. To so the TRS system is almost getting double and all Chicago is asking is for a 20 percent... 20 percent pension payment for the state. We never got anything until 1988. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you urge people to not force us to use our operational dollars to fund our pension. It's only fair, and it's only just. We're not asking to take anything away from the 2 billion and more from the TRS system. We're merely asking for a small amount to pay into our system, which will bring us totally on par by 2045. I urge an 'aye' vote."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 4582.

There has been a request for verification from Representative Mitchell. 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. 42 voting 'yes', 71 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill is declared lost and the request for verification has been withdrawn. The Gentleman from Morgan is seeking recognition."

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

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, when we talk about pensions and morality, the only thing I want to add is in 2003, and it's important to notice this, in 2003 our unfunded pension liability was \$35 billion. Today, it approaches \$100 billion. You want to talk about morality, how about living up to the commitments that you make to folks. We... we owe Medicaid providers, and we owe DD providers, and we owe all kinds of providers in this state billions of dollars. You want to talk about morality, start living up to your obligations."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Republican Leader Tom Cross, is seeking recognition."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. I...
maybe you could help us get an answer to this question. I
sent a letter to both Speaker Madigan and President
Cullerton back on February 23, and it involved the issue of
Constitutional Amendments and Resolutions that we may face
and see for votes in the next week or two. Obviously,
there are a number of those that have been filed this year.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

I think there are five that have been filed and we have the issue of recall on the ballot right now, the recall light that people talk about. But, there are only three spots, or three articles that can be amended and the concern is that we are going to run out of space for some of the most important ones. Mainly, the issue of redistricting. Now, four of the Constitutional Amendments have been released and are on the floor. One involving redistricting is buried in the Rules Committee. My question of the Chair is, what is the intention of the Speaker, and the President, and the Speaker's Office as to prioritizing Constitutional Amendments and making sure redistricting gets a fair hearing and gets placed on the ballot for a vote? As we all know Governor Quinn, your Governor and also your nominee for Governor for the next election has said we should do redistricting. He has said we should have a Special Election on redistricting, and we certainly believe that we should do redistricting. So, could you give me an insight as to what the Speaker intends to do about making sure that redistricting is going to be placed on the ballot this year?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir. In... in response, I'm not familiar with the letter that you have sent to the Speaker or Senator Cullerton, however, I will make that inquiry."

Cross: "Okay. When can I get an answer from... from the Chair?"

Mautino: "I'll make the inquiry of the Speaker and then get a response back."

Cross: "All right. I... I think in light of the fact, and with all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I want to move forward

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

on a Motion to Discharge HJRCA 56 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status. I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge under Rule 49, and Article IV, Section 8(c) of the Constitution, any vote shall be by record vote whenever five Representatives shall so request. I know there are five Members... I know there are five Members on our side of the aisle, thank you, requesting, and there are at least five Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge the measure from the House Rules Committee. So, I move to discharge HJRCA 56 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the... to discharge House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 56. And on that Motion, the Lady from Cook, Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "The Motion requires a unanimous consent.

There has been an objection and therefore, the Motion fails. Leader Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We specifically requested a Roll Call vote on our Motion pursuant to rights granted in the Rules and the Constitution. This breach of the rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion to Discharge, and under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair, that there be no recorded vote to discharge HJRCA 56 from the House Rules Committee, and

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

certainly want an opportunity to speak on my... my Motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Motion is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' And, we will follow within rules of the House where there'll be two minutes to discuss your Motion, two minutes for response, one minute to close. Leader Cross."

"Mr. Speaker, I... I'm going to speak here in a second, Cross: but I'm curious on this significant of an issue why we want to stifle debate. This is an issue involving how we draw legislative boundaries and I know there's several Members on my side of the aisle that wish to talk. I hope they'll be given an opportunity and to support my Motion, and the Resolution. I... and we'll get to that in a second. idea of redistricting, Mr. Speaker, is not one that is... or the concept of change is not limited to the House Republicans or to Tom Cross. Every major newspaper in the State of Illinois has editorialized in favor of Constitutional Amendment on how we legislatively draw boundaries. Many of the better government groups, for lack better term, such as the Better Government Association, the League of Women Voters, the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Farm Bureau, and many members of the Illinois Reform Commission, as well as Governor Quinn have all said we ought to change the way we draw legislative boundaries. The current system is a system where politicians pick their The current system allows all of us in the own voters. system to decide what our legislative boundaries are. there's one thing we have learned in the last few years is,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

our... it is our inability to regulate ourselves whether it comes with campaign finance, whether it comes with recall, and certainly when it comes to legislative redistricting. In the last nine years, those of who... those of us who have run for political office in the 630 legislative races, we're talking about only 11 times did the incumbent lose. Ninety-eight percent chance... there was a 98 percent chance that you were going to re... get reelected to a legislative office in this state because of the way we draw legislative boundaries. There are Democrats in both the House and the Senate have said, enough's enough, we need to redraw legislative boundaries in a different way. State Senator Susan Garrett was quoted recently as saying the process used in the past to determine legislative districts is extremely political and arbitrary. The best part of this process is that we won't be decided upon by key Legislative Leaders but instead by voters and citizens who providing this input. This will result in a much more Democratic process. That is what Susan Garrett, a Member of the Democrat Party has says we ought to do, and we ought to change the way we draw legislative boundaries. What's puzzling to many of us on this side of the aisle and the independent groups in this state is what's going on with the concept of legislative redistricting here in Illinois chamber... the Illinois House. There is... there's one or two things going on: either the Speaker is just going to say, like he often does, I don't like the idea of redistricting changing; I like the current system; I like fact that Legislative Leaders draw legislative boundaries

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

and pick their voters; I'm not going to change, and so I'm going to keep the legislative redistricting initiative and Constitutional Amendment buried in a Rules Committee so nothing changes. And what's ironic about that is the whole concept and theory of legislative redistricting is, every person is... is represented and the concept we hear about is one man, one vote. If you take the Speaker's theory on this, he is going to be one man that decides for twelve and a half million people whether or not we're going to change the way we do legislative boundaries. But what is really questionable to all of us is this all of a sudden interest Constitutional Amendments. There are Constitutional Amendments on the House Floor. There is one on the ballot. And all of them, while they may have some merit, you have to question why all of a sudden is your side of the aisle interested in Constitutional Amendments. Over the last 40 years, over the last 40 years... there have only been 16 initiatives put on the ballot to change the Constitution. And this year, you're talking about five and not even willing to look at legislative you're redistricting. Is your sudden interest in Constitutional Amendments because you want to make some changes and you firmly believe that we ought to do that? Or is your sudden interest in Constitutional Amendments there because you want to block legislative redistricting because, as we know, we're limited to three Articles that we can amend and if you load the ballots up, we can't dress... address redistricting. It certainly begs the question, what are your motives? So, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my call for

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

discharge of this Bill... or this Constitutional Amendment... Resolution out of Rules. Four of the five this Session are on the floor, all of yours. The fifth is stuck Everybody in this state says we need to do in Rules. something differently. Every interest group says we need to do something differently, that is of an independent Every newspaper says we ought to do something differently. Republicans think we ought to do something differently. Democrats think we ought to do something differently. The Governor thinks we ought to do something differently. The Governor's reform commission says we ought to do something differently, and one person, one person says, nope, ain't going to happen 'cause I don't want it to happen. So, the question today is, Are you for reform? Are you for legislative redistricting change? you with the independent groups? Are you with newspapers? Are you with the public? Are you with the voters? Are you with your Governor, or are you going to be with the one man who says it ain't going to happen, not on my watch? And I, again, would ask for those of you voting today to rule... to vote to override the Chair. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Motion before us is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' On that Motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey is granted two minutes in response."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I don't believe I'll need the whole two minutes, even. I... I would point out one... one issue from a procedural matter that the other side has

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

seemed to forget time and time again. The debate on these issues is supposed to be the debate on the Motion to Discharge, not on the underlying piece of legislation. We can engage in this time and time again. It really is out of order, in my opinion, Speaker, but sobeit. I... I would remind the Minority Leader, who I have a tremendous amount of personal and professional respect for, this chamber has taken up the issue of a Constitutional Amendment to revisit the issue of redistricting. Representative Brosnahan, prior to his departure, had an Amendment which would have denested the Representative districts from the districts. It would have created a commission to review how we do the redistricting process. That Amendment was passed by this chamber, by a democratically controlled chamber and sent over to the Senate that did not take action. We've done our job in the past and I don't think that this is something that can be laid at our feet. Different people are going to have different views on what they think the priorities need to be time and time again. And this may well be a priority. I think that the Motion is premature until we see which Amendments have even been passed by this Body. We are really having a hypothetical debate right now about a... an Amendment that may or may not wind up as one of those three. That's all I have to say. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Motion before the House is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' Representative Cross to close."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to make sure I understand something. I wasn't sure what

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Representative Fritchey said. We're limited to the Motion, or are we able to go beyond the Motion? I wasn't sure I was following him correctly. Can I talk about the issue? Thank you. If I could have just a little order, Mr. Speaker. I... I want to clear up a couple of things. The... the Constitutional Amendment that he refers to was a typical scam that goes on in this chamber. It was done at the very last minute in the House. It was in the General Assembly before this. It happened back in 2008. you know, several weeks away from the timeframe, if not, and I should say several months in order to get this, but that issue back in 2008 had no chance of passing. Senate would have had to stay in additional days. It was never going to happen. It died in the Senate. It went to Rules. It was DOA when it got over there. For anyone to suggest that going to the... that we are redistricting in any aboveboard way, Representative, is a... is a bit disingenuous. This is our opportunity to put it on the ballot. We can pass it out of the House. We can pass it on them over to the Senate, and we can put it on the ballot for 2010, if we're committed to it. If we don't do redistricting change this year, we will not do it again until 2020. We will not do it again until 2020. That will be the next time we redistrict. Everybody talks every day about the need to reform. Governors have gone to jail. Governors are going to trial. Se... Special Elections we don't do. We appoint people to the United State's Senate. This is an opportunity for reform. I would, again, ask for

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

an 'aye' vote on our Motion to Discharge, and to not support the Chair. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' 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. Mitchell, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 69 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the Chair is sustained. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner is seeking recognition."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege. I... I think it's... I had a very unique experience that's a timely one to talk about after the debate we just heard. Back on the beginning of this month of March, I had the unique opportunity to be invited out to the State of Ohio, to the City of Columbus, to their Capitol for a couple of events. As many of you know, I've been very interested in the subject of redistricting, testified, in fact, before our own Senate committee last fall on some ideas I have and certainly support the work of Leader Cross, that he's done. What was very interesting is that the State of Ohio had me come out for two things; one, the... the Democratic Secretary of State, Jennifer Brunner presented me with an award to recognize the work that's being done on the kind of reform that's being talked about in things like the Constitutional Amendment proposal in HJRCA 56. Second of all, them the Democrats who control the chamber there said, you know, is a really important timely matter, would you testify. And I testified before the Ohio House Ethics and

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Elections Commission on, again, this exact same subject of the matter of redistricting reform. Reform that says that though we are used to seeing the Legislature draw the maps, that is really not the best way to serve the people, and one needs a model where with a commission or some other mechanism, we need to have a reform that will provide for independent body governed by specific standards to draw a map that will be fair and impartial to both political parties. I raise this now in light of the debate that just happened and point out this unique experience I had because there is a matter of timeliness. I appreciate the fact that in the 95th General Assembly we discussed Constitutional Amendment and voted on it. I thought that was appropriate then because it was timely. Well, it's only once every 10 years this issue really comes to the Floor , and the time is now. We have... had we gotten on the 2008 ballot, that would have been effort for reform. don't have that opportunity now and the time for hearings, for discussion alternatives... the Senate of this state has had hearings. I find it amazing that, on the House side, we have not had equivalent hearings to talk about these types of reforms. Things that take the pen away from the Legislators, give it to the people through independent bodies, so that we can have a map that's fairly drawn, drawn at a timely fashion, so that as we go into the 2012 elections we'll have districts where we are going to be competing on an equal footing without regard to what political Party was able to gain advantage. So, based on

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

my experience, seeing what another state is doing for its perchance..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has expired. The Chair is now prepared to return to Third Readings. Page 15 of the Calendar is House Bill 5764. At this time, we're on the Order of Third Readings. At this time, we're on the... Mr. Bradley. On Third Reading appears... we're on the Order of Third Readings right now. Representative Bradley, on the Order of Third Reading is House Bill 5764. Do you wish to call this Bill? Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5764, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation, which may be referred to as Seth's Law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to draw the chamber's attention to the east balcony, and I'd ask... like to ask Sergeant First Class Maureen Sanders to stand up. This Bill is in honor of her son. Her son had just returned from tours of duty overseas representing our country as a veteran, and when he got back to a hospital here in the states, he became... he became incapacitated in a locked bathroom in the hospital. They were unable to get to him. Had there been a procedure in place to actually obtain access to that hospital bathroom, her son would likely still be alive. This is going to be called Seth's Law. The Hospital Association is voluntarily doing this. And all it says is that we're going to have a policy and procedure in place to make sure that there is some kind of procedure for this situation in case of locked bathrooms in

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

the hospitals. So, again, I'd recognize Sergeant First Class Sanders. Ask for an 'aye' vote. I'd also ask for a round of applause for Sergeant First Class Sanders."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has explained the Bill and moved passage. And on that Bill, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, just for a clarification of what we're doing here. When you talk about having a policy and procedure in place, are we talking about a statutory requiring that all... that all the locks be changed or..."

Bradley: "No. No. We're leaving it up to the hospitals. They just have to have a procedure in place at the hospitals, so what they do in case the bathroom's locked, they can get in."

Fritchey: "And... I fully understand and support what you're trying to do. I just want to make sure..."

Bradley: "Yeah. We're not telling them what to do..."

Fritchey: "...that... that we did it here, but you know, the tragic situation that you refer to, my understanding, is that they couldn't find a key to get into the door. So, I guess my concern is if a hospital isn't maybe as diligent as they should be, their policy is... well, our policy is that we have a key located somewhere on the floor. I mean... I'm just... I'm wondering if we're maybe even giving them too much leeway to prevent something like this from happening again."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Bradley: "No, we're... I think this is the way to do it, to let the hospitals come up with a procedure so they think about this ahead of time, and in case this situation occurs, they have something in place. I'm not going to tell them exactly how to do it 'cause they know better than we do. But let's at least have something in place so that if this happens, they can get in."

Fritchey: "So... so, the goal ultimately is by them having a policy procedure in place, it'll raise awareness of this issue by the hospitals and, hopefully, that awareness in and of itself will reduce, if not fully prevent this from happening again?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you, John."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5764. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns, Currie, Davis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5764 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost is seeking recognition."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I can have the attention of the Body and actually have it. Just so... so you know, it has been the procedure in this House that if your Leader stands up, the elected Speaker of this House, that the place gets quiet, and people actually listen, and the conversations move to the back of the Chamber so that they

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

can be heard clearly. And it has been a policy, but it's also been a policy that our elected Leaders stand up that people take note, that things quiet down, and you listen to what they have to say. Unfortunately, we keep going down a path where the respect for the individual Members, even our Leaders now has eroded to the point that, I guess, no one is worth listening to. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a certain standing history in this House that if it's your Leader or if it's ours, that you give them the respect. You don't have to agree with them but that you give them the respect, and you quiet down, and you pay attention. only ask that this Body return to that which is was, which is one of respect in the chamber, in our committees. only right. Mr. Speaker, I ask that be done and be handled correctly, and that whoever is in the Chair, makes sure that that occurs, as well."

Speaker Mautino: "Point well-taken, Sir. Following... continuing on Third Readings, Representative... Representative Biggins. On Third Reading appears House Bill 6148, Representative Biggins. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, House Bill 1702. Representative Brauer. Senate Bill 1702, sorry. Out of the record. Representative Mathias, on page 26 of the Calendar, under the Order of Short Debate is House Bill 6271. Representative Mathias. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6271, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 6271 requires the Department of Central Management Services to establish and

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

maintain an Illinois new employee portal on its official web site, and it specifies the information to be included on that searchable database concerning state... new state employees hired after the Bill's effective date to try to make sure that the public can discover the information contained in the Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6271. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, do you have any estimate on the cost associated with creating a database for all state employees and categorizing the information that you set forth here?"

Mathias: "Again, this is for all new employees as they come on.

We have an official website already to just to... to add this... I don't have the information. I don't have that."

Fritchey: "But... but that's... that's not how it works. The fact that there's an existing website has nothing to do with the fact that a database would have to be created. And to the extent that it's solely for new employees, you're going to be picking up 10 or 20 people out of tens of thousands of people, and I don't know that it accomplishes your goal."

Mautino: "Well, eventually, everyone, hopefully, as there's turnover, it certainly will take a while, but..."

Fritchey: "But, there... there would be cost associated with the creation of the database. There'd be..."

Mathias: "Right."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Fritchey: "...an employee, if not employees, required to maintain and update and establish the vari... the veracity and accuracy of the database. We've heard a lot of comments from your side of the aisle with respect to figuring out how we are going to pay for these things when we are looking at laying off teachers, when we are looking at cutting essential services, and I understand what you're trying to do. I'm just curious how you're going to prioritize paying for a database like this as opposed to the other costs currently facing the state?"

Mathias: "I think this is well within the capabilities of the department to do at minimal cost. I don't have a figure for you, but I think the public's right to know outweighs that cost just like we passed the Freedom of Information Act, that we make the... our local units of government pay. We don't fund them for that. It's an unfunded mandate, but as a matter of public policy, we felt that information should be available. And I'm thinking if we're going to make other units of local government pay for that information, then I... I think that we should at least apply it to ourselves."

Fritchey: "From a... from a policy standpoint, I fully agree with you. I don't think that you've addressed the cost issue or the prioritization of the cost issue, but thank you for answering the question, or trying to at least."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6271. 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

115th Legislative Day

- record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 6271 is declared passed. Representative William Davis, on the Calendar, page 22, is House Bill 5289. Out of the record. Representative Dunkin, page 22 of the Calendar, on Third Reading is 5281. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5281, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  House Bill 5281 simply provides that the fee required by
  the community assoc... condominium associations be reduced,
  or ended, or concluded in four years. And I would ask for
  a favorable vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5281. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."
- Coulson: "Representative, we had some discussions in committee related to this Bill, and I just wanted to clarify exactly, are you increasing or decreasing fees here?"
- Dunkin: "We are stopping this Bill… excuse me. We are really decreasing it over four years. In four years, this will be over with."
- Coulson: "In... excuse me. In four years, what's going to be over with?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Dunkin: "The fees of condominiums over ten... with over ten units or more."

Coulson: "When we..."

Dunkin: "Currently, well..."

Coulson: "Yeah..."

Dunkin: "...last year the..."

Coulson: "...that would be a good place to start. Tell us currently what occurs and then what the Bill does, please."

Dunkin: "Last year, the General Assembly passed and the Governor signed the Bill to license property van... managers of condominiums, townhouses, and homeowner's associations. You know, there's estimated about 60 thousand such And in order to cover the cost of the associations. administration of this new licensure law, all condo associations are required to pay \$50, plus a \$1 per unit, per year. And as the division of Professional and Regulations is unable to predict the cost of the administration, the various condo and homeowner's association have agreed to pay \$50, plus the \$1 per unit for four years, instead of making it as infinitum. So, it's... right now, this is about to start, and we're looking to make sure that we cap it at four years other than having it go on and on just because there are condo association managers, and townhouse associations."

Coulson: "And is this to be reevaluated after four years? Is there anything in the Bill that does that?"

Dunkin: "Correct. It... it would have to be re..."

Coulson: "I... and I guess..."

115th Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "You... you would... you would have to bring in new legislation to bring it back, but it's the intent..."
- Coulson: "Well, there's nothing... nothing currently in the Bill that asks for a reevaluation or..."
- Dunkin: "Correct."
- Coulson: "...looking into how this is being managed or maintained?"
- Dunkin: "That is correct."
- Coulson: "I am... I understand that this is essentially a fee decrease over time, correct?"
- Dunkin: "Yes, ma'am."
- Coulson: "And I think with the... the Body needs to be aware of that. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Sponsor has moved the passage of House Bill 5281. And on that question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why are these... Will the Sponsor vield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."
- Rose: "Why wouldn't we just repeal these fees now, Representative?"
- Dunkin: "Can you repeat... Can you state your question again?

  It's kind of loud in here."
- Rose: "If this... if this is a fee decrease... if this is a fee decrease over time, why not just repeal them now?"
- Dunkin: "Well, the department wants to evaluate how much it'll bring in."
- Rose: "They want what? I'm... I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Dunkin: "They would like to evaluate over time, how much it'll bring in and... and therefore, assume the costs of administering such a program."
- Rose: "But then they're not going to have the money to administer the program when it sunsets."
- Dunkin: "Well, it's a... it's a new statute today. What this does is, in four years, it stops the fees, or the assessed fees, on condo associations and townhouses and by that time, the administration should have a good sense of what the cost of such a program to licensed managers."

Rose: "How much money you going to make off these fees?"

Dunkin: "You know, that's... the department doesn't know. No one knows because the Governor just signed it into law and so..."

Rose: "Well, now we're..."

Dunkin: "...there's no way to really gage..."

Rose: "now we're setting a sunset clause for fees that we don't know how much they cost?"

Dunkin: "That... that's why it's in four years."

- Rose: "So... so, we're going to act on, we don't know what it is we're sunsetting right now, but we won't actually sunset 'til four years, at which point in time maybe we'd want to keep it."
- Dunkin: "Well, Representative, are you for a fee increase? You want to sustain the fee increase?"
- Rose: "No. I'd be for no fee increase which is why I'm surprised, Representative, that your Amendment just doesn't get rid of the fees altogether."
- Dunkin: "Well, in affect, it does. In four years, we'll stop the condo association manager fees..."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Rose: "In four years, but in the meantime..."

Dunkin: "In four years."

Rose: "...we don't know how many fees we have or don't have."

Dunkin: "That is correct."

Rose: "So, why not get rid of them now?"

Dunkin: "Well, we tried that. We tried to eliminate it completely, but if the department didn't support that, and the Governor, as you know, just signed this legislation into effect, and the committee didn't support it."

Rose: "So... so, basically, we're voting to put a sunset clause on to something that may or may not have any money in it at some point in time in the foreseeable future?"

Dunkin: "That's a possibility but there will, obviously, be money. There... there's over... there's estimated over 60 thousand..."

Rose: "Which... which is a possibility? That it may or may not?"

Dunkin: "Come again?"

Rose: "Which... which is a possibility? That it may or may not have any money in it at some point in time in the future?"

Dunkin: "Well, currently, the program has no money in it. It has not even started and so..."

Rose: "So, we're now sunsetting what we don't know what it is?"

Dunkin: "No. There will be dollars in this particular program, clearly. You're assessing a well over 60 thousand condo associations and townhouse associations."

Rose: "Are there any... so then, what's the estimate on what that'll bring in?"

Dunkin: "You know, the department doesn't know."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Rose: "Well, Representative, I... I'm not exactly sure what you're doing because..."

Dunkin: "Representative, are you for an increase?"

Rose: "...we don't know... we don't know what we're doing."

Dunkin: "You want to... are you for an increase on townhouses?"

Rose: "Naw. And Representative, I... I'm... I guess my point is, why don't you get rid of them altogether."

Dunkin: "I would love to do that."

Rose: "Well, then, bring an Amendment that gets rid of them right now."

Dunkin: "I think this is an adequate Amendment that is better than having it for 10 and 20 years. Stop it in four years, because I, you know, with 60 thousand..."

Rose: "That's the problem, Representative, 'it', we don't know what it is by your own admission, we don't know what it is. So what..."

Dunkin: "By... by the department."

Rose: " ...so, what are we stopping? We don't know."

Dunkin: "We tried that. We tried to eliminate fees on condo association managers."

Rose: "In four years?"

Dunkin: "No. We tried... I tried to do it..."

Rose: "But not in the meantime."

Dunkin: "I wanted to do it immediately, effectively, immediately."

Rose: "But this Bill doesn't do it immediately."

Dunkin: "This... I couldn't get the support to do it immediately because you need votes in the committee, as well as this chamber to pass out. So, you are not..."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Rose: "Well, I would vote to eliminate it immediately and then we don't have to worry about fees. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. What the Osterman: Sponsor is trying to do is to reduce some of the financial burden on condominium owners and associations in dealing with a law that was passed to benefit them, ultimately, by licensing the managers and the organizations that manage those condominium properties. I think that this is an issue. It's an important issue that was passed last year. Many of us voted for it. He's simply trying to reduce the fees over a long haul and give the state the ability to figure out, over the next four years, how much they need to keep that program going in an effective way but in a way that is cost effective for the association, and ultimately, the condo owners. So, I think this is something that's financially a wise thing to do for condominium owners. And I think we all should support this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, and I apologize for having my back to you, but it's just a matter of logistics here. When you brought this Bill before my committee, you had discussed coming back with an Amendment."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Dunkin: "This is the Amendment, Sir."

Fritchey: "Oh, this is... this is a Third Reading Bill here?"

Dunkin: "We came back. I originally wanted to it to be an assessed fee for \$50 every five years, and it... this was adopted in committee if you check the... check the analysis and the rules, there was no opposition."

Fritchey: "Let... let me just say this, and to... to the Bill. concern that I have, Ladies and Gentlemen, reluctantly, is that we have a law that hasn't even taken effect yet. was just passed. We don't know if the fees that are set are too high, too low, or just right. The department has said as much itself. I... I think that it's premature for us to be amending a law that hasn't even taken effect, and we don't know where this is going to go, right now. We could find out that the department's going to come back and say that the fees do not pay adequately for implementing this law, or we could come back in a few years and say, oh, you know what, this is right where it needs to be. But right now, I... I think that, you know, for lack of a better phrase, it... this just... it isn't soup yet. I understand what he's trying to do. I understand that the Sponsor is trying to relieve a burden, but we're talking about a \$50 fee that had originally been payable every five years. was not excessive. It was part of the deliberative process when the law was passed by this Body last year, and I just really think that we should wait to see if we did the right thing or not before presuming that we didn't. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Final speaker. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Ramey."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Ramey: "Representative, as I look at the history of this legislation, I see that you voted for the enacting legislation last year. Have you had a change of heart?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir, Representative."

Ramey: "And since this Bill hasn't even come into effect until July 1, I certainly support you and since I didn't vote for the fee increase to begin with..."

Dunkin: "Thank you. I'm glad to have your support, Representative."

Ramey: "Absolutely. Well, I... I'm always for getting rid of fees. Why did you vote for it to begin with and now you want to take it away?"

Dunkin: "You know, I don't recall. We went through a number of Bills here. I'm not sure how valid that is, Representative, but I simply don't recall."

Ramey: "You don't recall? Well, I certainly appreciate you bringing this Bill up, Representative. I certainly will try to help support you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of 5281.

Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In this time... in this harsh economic time amongst a number of our fellow citizens here in the state, I think this Bill is timely. If we can reduce fees on any bodies, any individuals in their homes, in their condos, this is the right legislation to... to deal with. This simply is going

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

from 50... \$50 a year to sunsetting the fees. I think this is the type of legislation we should be focusing on during this economic time. Thank you. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5281. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Saviano, Representative McAuliffe, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 80 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 5281 is declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, 20... page 22 of the Calendar on Third Reading is House Bill 5428. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5428, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm now in my sixteenth year down here in the General Assembly, and Kevin Joyce counts every day. And I know that a lot of us often struggle with issues that are personal to us, but none are more personal to me than this one. You know, each time I drive out of town after we adjourn, I drive down Jefferson Street, West, and I pass the Office of Vital Records at the Illinois Department of Public Health, and that is the place where all people go to get a copy of their original birth certificate, but not me. It's hard to describe to you what it's like not being trusted with the facts of my own birth. It assumes as an

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

adult, I cannot handle the truth and I can't be trusted to be responsible with it. In the eyes of government, I am either a perpetual infant or a potential stalker. Because Illinois Government refused to provide me or my family with the information we needed, we were forced to search out my birth relatives to get that information. My birth mother was never asked whether or not she wanted to be protected from me. The absurdity of it all is now I can trace my roots back to the 1400s, but when I go to that line at the Office of Vital Records and ask for my original birth certificate, I get nothing. Why do I need my original birth certificate? It's not like I'm about to take on another persona. That bell has rung and that ship has sailed. I want the true document of my birth and I need to be trusted with that document. I've done nothing to deserve being put in a suspect class of citizens who have to reveal their personal life to anyone to obtain a document that complete strangers have control over. need to ask ourselves what kind of culture we are in that there is such a thing as a shameful birth that needs to be kept a state secret. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 5428 would finally allow adult adopted persons to have a copy of his or her original birth certificate, which is a basic human right available to nonadopted persons. It is a very well-balanced Bill in that it includes provisions that respect the wishes of the small minority of birth parents who wish to remain anonymous both retrospectively and prospectively. It is not a Bill about search or reunion. It is not about open adoption. It is simply a Bill that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

would allow me, like you, to walk through the front door of Vital Records to obtain a noncertified copy of my original birth certificate. I believe that this Bill has been worked on for a very long time. It is supported by both the Chicago Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association, the Child Care Association of Illinois, preeminent adoption agencies around Illinois. And I would be more than glad to answer any questions that any Member might have about it."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 5428. And seeking recognition, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Sommer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I great... greatly respect my colleague, Sara Feigenholtz and her passion for this legislation. I want you to also know that there are many other people who are passionate and concerned about this legislation, myself and many others across this state. What this legislation may do is reverse the many years that birth mothers have been able to rely upon the confidentiality of the surrender of their dear child. I stand with those women today, whether they're 20 or 40, or even 80. Yes, there's language in this legislation that will allow a birth parent to deny access to records with their name upon them, yet that process is really incomplete. Outlined is a process to educate the public and to make them aware of this legislation by certain mailings, by public service announcements, by, and hopefully, media stories. In this business, we know that the general public doesn't often know exactly what we do,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

or what the ramifications are of what we do. I'm afraid that these many years having, what, 200 thousand birth mothers who may have obviously changed residences, changed names, no longer live in Illinois. By this legislation, we mandated that they be... they follow this legislation, yet they may never be aware of it. Never aware that they have the opportunity to deny access. We do have a process now in Illinois using the adoption registry, by which birth parents who want that connection can come forward, provide information then, perhaps, through intermediaries, have connection with that child they surrendered. interesting to note that in the years that that legislation has been in process and been a law in Illinois, I believe between one and two percent of birth parents have come forward. That tells me two things are happening. Either they don't want to come forward, they want that confidentiality to remain, or they don't know anything about that process. But yet, today, we have a piece of legislation that builds upon that process that we're going to notify these people, yet realistic, we know that's not going to cover everyone, touch everyone. Additionally, though the laws have changed somewhat over the years, I'm of the age that if my mother had been one of these birth mothers giving a child up for adoption, she would have no rights under this legislation. Birth children that would have been surrendered, my age, that birth mother has no rights under this legislation, cannot file a denial. I've heard comments that, oh, that's a small number of people at that age. When do we stop caring about a minority of

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

people, a small number of people? The women my mother's age, or maybe your mother or grandmother's age for those younger, would be in their upper 70s or 80s affected by this Bill. They would have no rights of denial. like to cite some comments made by others. Chicago Tribune, an editorial, editorialized against this Bill saying in part that the provisions that allow birth parents to file a denial with the adoption registry, that in effect legislation would reshift responsibility for maintaining anonymity from the state to the birth parents. But that hardly guarantees birth parents that they will hear about the change in law. Some will have moved, and those peer parents don't hear about this new responsibility and react. The proposed law would presume their consent to release the birth certificate. The possibility of a birth parent being blindsided tips the balance against this Bill. It's interesting to note, there are diverse opinions against this Bill. As a conservative Republican, I was a... a bit surprised that in committee the ACLU came forward, testified against the Bill, felt that the shifting of responsibility to the birth parent was inappropriate. Also, Illinois Cit... Citizens for Life were concerned. addition, I don't know if Representative Feigenholtz mentioned it, the Catholic Conference has talked extensively about this..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman will be given another minute to close."

Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I don't often take this opportunity and I appreciate your relinquishing that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

minute. The Catholic Conference, though not officially registering against this Bill, has recommended that such legislation be prospective by focusing on clarifying the rules on confidentiality for those born after the effective date of this Act. Though there may not have been written confidential... ally agreements, particular in older adoption cases, it is commonly understood among all the parties that there would be confidentiality based on this premise of client confidentiality. I know Representative Feigenholtz is very passionate about this, but I stand here today for the 200 thousand women in Illinois who may be affected and who have no real voice. I urge you..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has... has expired. Go ahead and turn your lights on, if you do wish to yield time. I hear you're not seeking recog... The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like, if possible, to yield my time to Representative Sommer."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman yields his time to Representative Sommer."

Sommer: "Thank you. I urge you to think seriously about this. Many times we are... those who oppose something are asked, well, what do you offer. I would suggest that the efforts being proposed now, as far as education, be extended to the Illinois Adoption Registry Act. Put our energy into informing the birth parents of their rights. Encourage those who want contact, and who have these records open, to come forward. Let's not just do it halfway. So, I stand here today with the women from Illinois who have given a

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

tremendous sacrifice in giving up their child. I, therefore, ask you to vote against this Bill or vote 'present' because I think it's a work in progress. Please stand with these women. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "And with the number of people seeking recognition, we'll place this Bill on Extended Debate. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Jakobsson: I want to remind people that this Bill is about adult adoptees. the parent of eight children, six of them are adopted, I've discussed this topic with many people, including children. And have done considerable research on this topic and can attest to the fact that there's a growing body of evidence that strongly indicates that something as simple as allowing my adult adopted children to access copies of their original birth certificates will provide them with both comfort and identity validation. This is something my children want. This is something that other adult adoptees want and this is something that I want for all of them. I can also tell you that there's an equal amount of evidence that indicates that adopted persons don't necessarily use this information listed on the original birth certificate to search out their birth families. For many adopted persons, this is simply about knowing who they are and where they come from, about having the same rights and privileges that you and I have, and that everyone else has. It's not necessarily about searching. I'd also like to emphatically state that the notion that the identity of a birth parent is confidential, that parents were given

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

anonymity is patently false. The identities of the birth mothers and in some cases the birth fathers of every child my husband and I adopted in Illinois appears on their adoption decree. And as an adoptive parent, Illinois law gives me the right to access a copy of this document without show of cause at any time. It doesn't extend the same right to my adopted children. Until 1970, we never asked birth mothers what they wanted. After the 1970s, most agencies have asked because of an Illinois requiring to do, and these agencies report that 90 percent their birth mothers choose some form of openness. Remind you, this Bill is not about adoption. It's about adult adoptees being allow... allowed the same access to their original birth records that you and I have and all other adults have. Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage. And next to speak on this will be the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, Mr. Speaker, you know, I... if God gives me help, two more years from now, I'll be here. I've served in this position for 10 years. I mean, I look how fast the time has grown, and I've gotten to know some of you better than others and issues that I thought I had a position on. Sometime, I've had to change that, and I try never to practice having tunnel vision and knowing that I have it, but this particular issue, I thought I was clear on it. I was leaning toward it until I heard Representative Sommer say some things that kind of made me think of some things that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

I had forgotten. And I walked over to get Jim Sacia's opinion because I value that opinion, and he and I both were kind of just in the middle. I just want to say that I was thinking about father and mother is, is what father and mother does. And you know, I didn't have the opportunity of being reared by my biological father, but as I stated, father is what father does. And I know people have a right to know, and I think for me this particular issue is going to be hard-pressed to make a decision. It's like six in one hand and six in the other. And I know knowing is ... is important, but then again, I've thought about the 200 thousand or more women, for whatever reason that they found themself having to make probably a heavy decision for a woman to carry life for nine months, and for whatever reason, having to disconnect and to walk away, that has to be not an easy task. So, I'll listen very intently with this debate. And I'm not sure where I want to go with it because it's an issue that I didn't think that I would be confronting in a lifetime, but I think it's very important that we listen intently to the arguments being waged on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I rise in support of this Bill. I, too, am an adopted father. My son has been in my home for some time, but I give him the right to know who his parents were, his biological parents. So, the Freedom of Information Act that we're referring to here along with all the things that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

are incorporated in this Bill, I support, and I just want to encourage each and every one of you to do the same thing because we, as people, as individuals, need to make sure we're doing everything we can to support these adopted children. They don't choose to be in those positions. They need care just like your biological children would need care. So, I would encourage all of you to support this Bill and vote 'yes'."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I, too, rise in support of this very, very important piece of legislation. You know, as an uncle of adopted children, and certainly one who sits in this Body every day considering what we call human rights, can we imagine what more basic human right could there be than having the opportunity to know who you are and where you come from. Back in the early days, I suppose there was a greater concern for anonymit... anonymity with respect to the birth parents. But, in this day of communication, in this day of modern science, in this day of genes, how could we say to one who might have the opportunity to know if they have a disease that will be evident in their future? could we say to that person, you can't know where you come You can't know who you are. You shouldn't be allowed to know your beginnings. This, to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a basic human right. I think this matter should con... be considered very importantly, and I can't imagine how anyone could sit in this Body and not support

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

this piece of legislation as a basic human right. Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Zalewski: "Representative, just to be clear, you mentioned the Catholic Conference was neutral on this Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Zalewski: "Have they indicated to you that they wished for there to be any changes with the Bill as it exists right now?"

Feigenholtz: "No, they have not."

Zalewski: "And did they... did they testify in committee about the Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "The Catholic Conference wrote a multipage... a very, very thoughtful explanation of this Bill. And I believe that what they did was, they went and spoke to the frontline workers at the various diocese around the state to see what their experience was with the birth parents that come forward searching for the adult children that they relinquished to see how they fared, and also the adoptees that... that were indicating a need to learn more about their origins. And I believe it was those particular workers who were quite persuasive about how important and how humane this was. I think that they felt that the overwhelming majority of people wanted some form of openness and contact, and I believe that a lot of social workers, currently, will look at the practice and see that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

it is quite outdated, antiquated, and actually, almost inhumane and barbaric. Representative Zalewski, I think the reflection of adoption today is a correction, if you will, of some of the errors that were made when I was a I think that Julie Tye of The Cradle, a very, very well respected adoption agency in Cook County used to say, we used to call a good adoption where the adoptee could not remember the first time they were told they were adopted. Today, a good adoption is one in which the adoptee can't recall the first time they met their birth parents. So, I believe that the reason that the Child Care Association, which is comprised of the Baby Fold, Bethany, Lutheran Social Services, and every licensed child welfare agency... and these are the agencies, Representative, that actually worked with the birth parents when they were signing And they are the ones that said, it was a consent. presumption in the 50s. It was a presumption in the 60s that women wanted protection. I believe that in the attempt to protect women from the societal stigma of an out-of-wedlock birth, they also protected... thought they had to protect them from the child that they were relinquishing and essentially, that was not the case. When I met my birth mother, I asked her, when you gave me up for adoption, were you ever offered an option whether... when I became an adult, whether you wanted contact from me or not? And she laughed, she said I was never even asked that. And I believe that the Catholic... I believe that all social workers, including the Catholic Conference had that experience."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Zalewski: "One more question, Mr. Speaker."

Mautino: "As is owed to you, yes."

Zalewski: "Is it... do you... Representative, do you know of any other states that have a similar statute like this?"

Feigenholtz: "There are eight others states that have... that allow adult adoptive persons to have acc..."

Mautino: "Go ahead and... you may finish the question."

Feigenholtz: "Eight other states."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that for some this is a difficult Bill. I understand that there are heartfelt feelings on both sides, and it's good to have a real debate on an issue rather than some of the things we do around here from time to time. I've heard some things on the floor going through this debate that I think I should just address briefly. First, it really doesn't matter what the Catholic Conference thinks or the Jewish Federation. is not a religious issue. It's an issue of human rights. Feel how you will about it and no religious denomination has a corner on this. Second, one Gentleman commented that this is not a fair Bill because all of the prior birth mothers won't get information about the law. I don't find that particularly compelling, although, I do find it interesting. It's not compelling because we pass Bills every day on this House Floor that the people of Illinois don't know about. We pass all kinds of Bills, all kinds of criminal laws, all kinds of laws all over every statute in our state that affects people's lives every day and they

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

don't know about them. They find out about them when they break one of those rules or they find out about them when they hire a lawyer to talk to them about one of those rules. So, it's not compelling that people don't know about it. What is compelling is that people should have a basic human right to know where they came from. talk to our constituents, and between all constituents and the people we know in our daily lives, we know all sorts of people with mental health issues because they have parents who they know that they don't get along with or they have parents who they know that they've never been able to communication with, or they have parents that they know and... and their lives are not intermeshed in a way that makes them comfortable. And so these individuals in our communities have mental health issues even if they know their parents. Imagine how much exponentially more difficult it is for a person who has no connection, and no ability, and no opportunity to know where they came from. Now, as you heard Representative Jakobsson say not now every one of these folks, when they get the information, is going to go seek out that birth mother. Sometimes just knowing who it is closes the loop. We have thousands of people in our state in this situation, and they have issues in their lives because they have not been able to know where they came from, what they're all about, and they feel They feel an emptiness. They want to get this a void. information so that they have a better feeling about themselves. So that they will be more comfortable in their own skin. So that they can have a greater relationship

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

with their own children. Let's not deprive people of the understanding about who they are, what their background is, what they're all about, because if we do that, we render these people with a hole in their lives that they can never fill and makes it completely more difficult for them to be the kind of parents to their own children that they would like to be. Representative Feigenholtz has worked on this Bill a number of years. She's worked on it, she's amended it, she's changed it. This is not about who thinks this is right or wrong. This is about whether we think this is right or wrong. Each one of us individually, needs to come to grips with the issue of, would I like to know. like to know who my mother is? Would I like to close that loop in my life? And so, this is an excellent Bill. It's about basic human rights. It's about the need for people to know who they are. What more basic need could there be? I strongly urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Brady: "Representative, I was looking in... in the Bill and I just want to make sure, are we talking about the ability for a certified copy of the birth certificate or a noncertified copy of the birth certificate?"

Feigenholtz: "This is a noncertified copy, Representative Brady."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Brady: "So, as a noncertified copy of the birth certificate, is there going to be any charge to the individual who is attempting to obtain that birth certificate?"
- Feigenholtz: "The... the charge will be the same, \$15, that is the same amount of money anyone pays for a non... a birth certificate."
- Brady: "So, the… the logic then behind certified versus noncertified in charging, can you… can you explain that to me? I mean, I would think if… if we're looking for a legal document, the certified is what one would… would want for the authentity of… of the certificate."
- Feigenholtz: "Actually, Representative, we... the... the Bar Association, the Department of Public Health, the parties that have been working on this for a decade wanted to address two concerns. One of which was that on a certified copy, sometimes there is private medical information pertaining to the birth mother. And the second item is, of course, the issue of identities. It's more... it's... some may be concerned about a security issue which is why we have limited it to the noncertified copy."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Bill. I've heard Representative Feigenholtz and all Members of the House talk about this particular issue and when I talked to some of the proponents of this, just trying to understand what this is all about. Now, for some, I understand that the parents who gave up those

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

children, they may not want to be identified. They may not want anyone to know who they are for a myriad of reasons. Maybe it's the circumstances under which they gave up the child. Maybe it's because they're embarrassed. You... you just never know, but what's important to me about this is fact that, here in this country, unfortunately, sometimes, a piece of paper is what identifies you. what makes you whole in some respects. And so, the way I look at this is very simple and it's not against the birth parents who don't want to be identified, but if I'm a child, at some point as an adult, I may want a copy of my birth certificate. Sometimes, when you apply for things here, when you go to purchase, major purchases, and you have to gather a bunch of documents, one of those documents that they may want to do that may be a birth certificate. So, for those of you who feel that there's a need to protect the... the individuals who gave up the children, and I can understand and respect that, but again, in this country, you need papers to get things done. And for those of you who are imm... from immigrant families, maybe your grandparents or maybe even your parents are generation in this country, having a piece of paper to identify them was important. And in my opinion, that's what this legislation is about, Ladies and Gentlemen, for those children who want a birth certificate. Again, I understand those that want to be protected. They don't want to be known. They don't want to be found out. But sometimes in order to conduct business in this country, you need documents and a birth certificate is one of those

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

identifying documents that someone may need in order to be able to make purchases or to obtain certain things here. So, again, I encourage everyone to support this particular Bill. If nothing else, if nothing else, just remember, in order to get things done here, you have to have documents, and a birth certificate is one of those documents that lets someone know who you are, not necessarily what's important about who you came from, but it lets them know who you are. So, I encourage everyone to support this particular legislation. Thank you."

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

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Riley: "Representative Feigenholtz, you have been working on this Bill a long time, and you know, you're to be commended. I think that Representative Lang in a lot of ways stole my thunder about the passion and the heartfelt concerns that almost everyone who has weighted in on this issue has had, and I think that speaks to the importance. Can you tell me... well, first of all, there was some... there was something that was said about information not being disbursed? Based on the gravity of this Bill itself, I'd like for you to address how this Bill will get information out, especially to the... well, just to the general public about the specifics."

Feigenholtz: "There's... the... maybe I just need to be clear that the original birth certificate is only released to the adult adopted person. It is not open to society. It is

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

just the adult adopted person, and if that adult adopted person is deceased, their spouse or their their children that's only upon the presentation of а certificate. So, it's limited to immediate family. not an unsealed record open for public view. There's an application that needs to be made at the Office of Vital Records after a one year robust informational campaign. I also want you to understand, Representative Riley, that this is the only Bill... this Bill is unique from the eight other states that have proposed this legislation. We are allowing for the first time the birth parent to actually take the power of what they want into their hands. I have a document from May 9, 1991, when in this very room on an Agreed Bill list adoption records were sealed retroactively for 99 years without any floor debate. My rights, and the rights of my birth mother, and anything she may have wanted, in one gavel, were removed."

Riley: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I'm going to support this piece of legislation. I... I really think that it's a piece of legislation whose time has come. But I would just like to go on record to say, because I support this Bill does not mean that I don't recognize that Representative Sommer's statements were extremely compelling, and he's got all the respect, certainly, in the world from me. Thank you."

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

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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Reis: "Representative, I know how hard you've worked on this over the years. I got a couple of questions. Is there one last firewall that's in place with your legislation, going backwards, for a mother to deny this to happen?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, there is."

Reis: "How will that work?"

Feigenholtz: "We're going to do a very robust informational campaign. I think that all of the most conservative people who have supported this Bill, have worked diligently to get that informational campaign out there. Originally, Representative Reis, this campaign was only six months long. We've extended it for a year."

Reis: "But what if they..."

Feigenholtz: "We are working..."

Reis: "...don't respond? What if..."

Feigenholtz: "We have 12..."

Reis: "...someone doesn't..."

Feigenholtz: "...million pieces... envelopes going out to owners of vehicles in the State of Illinois as a public notice about the change in this law. Every adoption agency is going to post this on their website. It is going to be tenfold of what any other state has done, and in those states, people... birth parents came forward from 40 states and three foreign countries, to fill out a birth parent preference form. So, there's your firewall."

Reis: "So, what if they don't... What if they don't respond?

What if they don't hear the public services that...

announcements? What if they don't get the letter by the deadline? Will that automatically mean that their child

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

that they gave up will be able to get their birth certificate?"

Feigenholtz: "After the yearlong campaign, birth parents still have the opportunity to come forward and fill out a contact preference form even after that yearlong campaign."

Reis: "But what if they don't?"

Feigenholtz: "If they..."

Reis: "What if the request comes in first?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, then the adoptee will get their original birth certificate.

Reis: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "But Representative, I know you're sensitive to this issue. I want to be... I want to make something perfectly clear. Today, we have a program and other... and many adoption agencies already provide for post adoption services where we can do outreach through the confidential intermediary program. This is not a Bill about search and reunion. In committee, a woman came in and said that she would never risk an outreach to her birth family. What she wanted was her original birth certificate. So, I just want you to understand that we have been serving a minority of people and forcing them to reach out to birth families when, essentially, all they've really wanted was a document of their origin, their original birth certificate."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. It's been said that those of us who have concerns about this, really don't have a compelling case because we pass Bills down here all the time that people don't really know about, and I won't argue with that but where this goes even further, and it's much

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

more than whether or not they know about something, is that it reverses a decision. It's retroactive to something that goes back to 1946. That sets a precedent and it's much more than just whether or not they know we're passing a Bill. It is reversing a decision that a woman made, a very hard decision I'm sure, not to know their child. The other thing is, is it's been said that this is about adult adoptees. I still think it's about the mother..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has expired. Will be given one minute."

"This is about the decision that a mother made and... and we've talked about this with the Sponsor of the Bill, about making this go forward. Having it varies a signed agreement whether or not that mother wants to know... have their children know who they are and pass that information So, I would argue that we should use this resources for the educational campaign, the advertising campaign, to encourage mothers back to 1946 and beyond, to sign this agreement so that they can get to know their child, that there's children out there. Maybe they can sign up on a web site saying, we are looking for our parents. Use the advertising campaign in that method and not trample on the rights that mothers have had for years, and making this legislation retroactive. I... I think that would be a much better use of resources 'cause I still think there's mothers out there who would like to, for whatever reason, keep this decision to themselves. So, I would encourage a reluctant 'no' vote."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Members of the Illinois House. It has taken me a long time to get to this place. pieces of this Bill that I really am not happy about, but I would like to speak to birth parent privacy, and I would like to talk a little bit about reality. If my birth mother had given birth to me, I would have been in foster care for six months prior to the finalization of my adoption. If no one had adopted me, my birth record would never be sealed. I know that there are a lot of people in this room who have worries about birth confidentiality, but the fact is, is that an adoption record... my birth record was sealed, not on the event of my birth, but on the event of my adoption. Today, an adoptive parent could write a letter to the court and get a copy without the need to show cause, and get a copy of the decree of adoption in the mail without any questions asked. So, I ask you, where is birth parent confidentiality? The reality is, we never asked. We never asked birth parents what they wanted, and when we finally had 18.3 statements put into statute, when we retroactively sealed adoption records, the desires of those birth parents were sealed along with them. In the eight states that have done this, come forward. birth parents have In the Illinois registry, experience here with our and with confidential intermediary program, we see an overwhelming number of birth parents that welcome contact or at least allow the adult adoptive person that they relinquished to

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

have access to their original birth certificate. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is time that justice is done. I want to walk into the front door of Vital Records and get a copy of my birth certificate just like you. Please vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moved passage of House Bill 5428.

  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. 74 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5428 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Zalewski, is seeking recognition."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I just wanted to acknowledge St. Renee's school. They were in the gallery, however, they had to go on their tour. They're here from the southwest side of the City of Chicago, and if they were here, we would all applaud for them. So... they're not though, so thank you for acknowledging me."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."
- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Riley: "I would like to welcome, along with Representative Eddie Washington, I don't think he's here... welcome a group of fifth graders from Lions Academy in Waukegan, who are here visiting their State Capitol on a history trip. So, we have Mrs. Betty Underwood and the students from Lions Academy from Waukegan. Please give them a round of applause."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield and the House of Representatives. Mr. Clerk, on page 25 of the Calendar appears House Bill 6112, Representative Flider. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6112, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Flider."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6112 is legislation that... actually, a version of this passed last year out of the House, and we're going to try it again, did not pass the Senate, and it's actually been improved. And what this legislation does is it amends the Illinois Prevailing Wage Act to ensure that a worker engaged in the transportation of aggregate or excavated materials to or from a public work site shall also be paid the applicable prevailing wages set by the Department of Labor and the IDOT equipment raise for trucks on public works projects. So, in us... in other words, those who are driving trucks would also be prevailing... be being paid prevailing wage in addition to laborers, operating engineers, cement finishers and others who are paid prevailing wage on public works projects and this does apply only to public work projects sponsored by state funds. Not... does not include federal funds, state funds only. Secondly, it ensures that the prevailing wage and the equipment rental rates paid to the contractors and subcontractors by a public body go directly to the truck owner/operators hired to transport the aggregate material as opposed to the contractor, where they previously now go.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- So, I would... this is a practice that previously was endorsed by the Department of Labor. We believe this legislation's important, will reinstate the previous practice of the Department of Labor. It's a good Bill. It's an equity issue. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6112. This Bill is on Short Debate. And the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy is seeking recognition."

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

- Eddy: "Representative, do you think that as a result of the passage of this legislation that the... the cost to public projects would increase?"
- Flider: "There's been considerable discussion on that and estimates have been, I think, wildly exaggerated. But we believe that, in effect, that what this does is it ensures that those who are working on those projects are being paid an adequate wage. Now, we know that IDOT has come with a... in its analysis, an increase cost to the state, but I would suggest to you that that number is an estimate and in fact, we believe that the cost would be minimal."
- Eddy: "Representative, I guess my question was... I... I guess you answered the question. Yes. The answer to the question is yes that this would increase cost? I mean, we... we can discuss or debate whether or not the increase to the estimate that... that we've been provided by the Department of Labor and others is accurate. But... but certainly, I think you would have to agree that the passage of the Bill

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

would... would increase costs even at IDOT by \$10 million per construction season."

Flider: "That's their estimate, yes, but again."

Eddy: "So, are you saying that IDOT is overestimating this number?"

Flider: "I believe that this estimate is in question. I don't believe there's any scientific way for them to know what kind of costs there would be associated with this, but the fact of the matter is, whether you're talking about an operating engineer, a laborer, or any other person who is working on a public works job, they are entitled to be prev... paid the prevailing wage..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman will be given an additional minute."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate that. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just very quickly, we're on a clock and I understand that, and I know we have a lot to do so I'll just make this very, very brief. Illinois cannot continue down this road. If... if there is one... one thing that should come out of this Session as a message to the people and those who provide services and... and do work in this state, it's... it's that we promote an environment for jobs. This is just exactly the type of legislation that causes those who provide those jobs to look at Illinois and say this is not a state that's job friendly. Mr. Speaker, I... I also would ask for a verification Roll Call should this get the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Mautino: "Your request will be granted. There has been a request for a verification. And the Bill is on Short

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Debate. Our next speaker is the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Reis: "Representative, I don't think we're... Mr... or Roger...

Representative Eddy asked you this, but why do we need this legislation?"

Flider: "Because we want to be fair people and when we have laws that ensure that all those who are working on public works projects should be paid according to prevailing wage, then we have an obligation to do that, and that's what this legislation's about. This is an equity issue. Secondly, the reason we need that is that the proceeds of operating and carry... for those owner/operators who bring aggregate and other materials to a job site, they are not getting the full amount authorized by the Department of Transportation. That amount is going to the contractors. That should be going to those who own that equipment so that they can maintain and afford to keep that equipment."

Reis: "Well, I find it interesting that we need to do this because it's a matter of fairness and equity when nonunion contractors can't even bid on state projects. What's fair about that? Would you be willing to amend your Bill so that nonunion contractors would have a fair and equitable chance at bidding on state projects?"

Flider: "Representative, I think you're bringing up a separate issue."

Reis: "Fair and equity is fair and equity."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Flider: "Well, this legislation takes care of a certain aspect that we believe is inequ... inequitable at this time."
- Reis: "And guess what? We can't even get a hearing on our Bill that would reverse that Executive Order by the Governor that would allow nonunion contractors to bid on state projects. I think that's one of the most discriminatory things that we do. To the Bill. You know, these people have jobs. A lot of people don't have jobs. A lot of people are taking cuts in pay. These people don't have to take a cut in pay. When we add cost to projects, it's not..."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman be given one additional minute."
- Reis: "It's not just the hourly wage. It's the unemployment insurance. It's the workmen's comp that's highest in the Midwest, and the taxpayers have to pay for this. We get less roads paved. We get less roads concreted. We get less buildings built because the costs of our projects keep going up, and keep going up. Maybe, there's a time for this. I don't think it is now, but it really... it irritates us when someone stands up on that side of the aisle, I'm on the jobs task force, I'm fighting for jobs, and then you go and vote for something like this. It sends the exact opposite message of what we're trying to do here in Illinois."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Lake,
  Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Osmond: "Representative, truckers that haul rebar, are they going to be under this Bill?"

Flider: "The definition pertains, specifically, to aggregated materials that are included in the construction of a road."

Osmond: "But why not the rebar haulers?"

Flider: "Well... the people who drafted the legislation felt that the ongoing delivery of aggregated road pack materials were the primary aspects of the project to be built and funded by the public works dollars."

Osmond: "How does this compare with the State of Wisconsin?"

Flider: "I... I don't know the answer to that."

Osmond: "Well, I can honestly tell you that I have a very large employer in my area who's fighting for every job he can get right now, and he's an aggregate hauler. And this is absolutely against him promoting his business any further. This is a great burden to him, and I don't think that this is a proper way to do right now in the economy the way that they're fighting for jobs. And I would encourage everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Iroquois, Representative Cultra."

Cultra: "Just to the Bill. You know, prevailing wage is for work done on the job. The problem with... with this Bill is, the aggregate haulers, they spend a lot of time at the rock quarry, they spend a lot of time driving to and from the job. So, this... this really is... is a new expansion of prevailing wage. Another thing, when you look at the rural county that I represent, there's only a finite amount of money that's available to work on roads and fix the roads.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

The largest expense in hauling aggregate is the trucking, so the rock doesn't cost very much. So, when you're upping the cost of the rock, that just means we're going to do less work, less roads are going to get fixed in my district. This... at this time, with finances so tight, this is a... a terrible piece of legislation. It's... it's special interest legislation. All it's going to do is help just a few truck drivers. And everybody in my district is going to have less roads repaired and everybody will pay. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Leitch: "Representative, in committee, there was testimony that none of the surrounding states have this provision. Is that not accurate?"

Flider: "That's probably accurate. I don't recall, but that could be the case. I do know that Minnesota has a law similar to this."

Leitch: "Well, I believe it was emphatically made in committee in the course of the opponents pointing out how completely uncompetitive Illinois is with its surrounding states and specifically with Indiana, and how detrimental this would be to the communities as well as to the business climate in Illinois. You know, with all this type of legislation that has been passed over the last eight years, we're not going to have in Illinois the kind of recovery that we might have had in earlier years. Our recovery will be stunted by all

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

of this antibusiness... antibusiness... antibusiness climate legislation. And I would just urge you all to recall several years ago when this Assembly had passed a Bill that put \$1100 per truck on the trucking industry, and in the first year subsequent to that, my, my, my, Illinois had nearly 20 thousand fewer trucker... trucking registrations. I checked the other day, and I'm now told that today Illinois has nearly..."

- Speaker Mautino: "Turn his light... Give you another minute.

  Yes, Sir."
- Leitch: "...nearly 60 thousand fewer truck registrations. We can pander to different interest groups all we want, but the fact remains that small business people, and larger business people are going to have and will vote with their feet. And if we want to have a vibrant economy in Illinois to restore our fiscal position, it's essential that we reject legislation like this. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I heard some discussion about jobs. As Chairman of Jobs Creation Task Force, I jealously guard jobs and I'm working to try to create jobs as the members of my task force are, but this really isn't about that. This is about... this is really not a debate about much of what I've heard. This is really a debate about prevailing wage. I haven't heard anybody speak against this Bill who's for prevailing wage, so let's put it where it is. This is a debate of people who are for prevailing wage, and

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

people who are against prevailing wage. We know who they We know what this Bill is about. We know what the opposition is about. So, rather than creating a smoke screen, those of you who are against the Bill, why don't you just say right here on the floor, hey, I'm opposed to prevailing wage because if you're not opposed to prevailing wage, you must be for the Bill. We have prevailing wage laws in the State of Illinois. The activities involved in this Bill are directly related to those same government dollar projects that the rest of the jobs relate to and so, logically, there's no reason to exclude these jobs from the Prevailing Wage Act. So, the smoke screen aside, this Bill will bring these jobs into compliance with what is already in the law, a statute we have regarding prevailing wage. Those of you who want to argue that this one thing should be exempted are really wanting to argue that we shouldn't have a Prevailing Wage Act at all. So, why don't you propose that? Why don't you come to the House Floor, go to... introduce a Bill, go to committee with a Bill to repeal the Prevailing Wage Act, and come to the floor and make that argument? To make an argument that this one item ought to be exempted from that is folly, it's ridiculous, and you're not telling the truth."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Dugan: "As... as I've sat here and listened to this discussion, and... and I think the previous Representative was correct,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

we're talking on the issue of prevailing wage. Representative, do you know, do businesses and contractors that do not pay prevailing wage, do they bid on public projects?"

Flider: "Well, they would, however, when they do, they must pay prevailing wage."

Dugan: "But they do bid on public projects, correct?"

Flider: "Yes, they do."

Dugan: "And they bid on public projects knowing that they need to pay prevailing wage, but that doesn't stop them from bidding on the project."

Flider: "That's correct."

"So, with all due respect to those who believe that Dugan: companies will not, or do not, come forward to bid on projects just because there's prevailing wage that, fact, is not true in the State of Illinois. As we look at prevailing wage, we look at the quality of life that people are able to have because of a good wage. Now, if companies in this state said we can't bid on any projects because we will not pay prevailing wage and we can't afford it, then I think if you look at contracts and bidders, not only on public projects, but on projects within your communities, you will see that many companies that do not pay prevailing wage still bid on the project. In fact, I have been in the construction area for 30 years, and I used to work for a contractor and I used to see bids that came in. And it is surprising, and maybe surprising to some to know, that contractors, even though they don't pay prevailing wage,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

their bid, in some cases, was over the contractor that did pay prevail..."

Speaker Mautino: "Grant the Lady one more minute."

Dugan: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Dugan: "...and in many cases, very, very close to the bid of those contractors that pay prevailing wage. The only difference between the costs is whether or not it goes to the workers or whether or not it goes to the business. So, I just think it's unfair to say that contractors will not be able to bid and do public projects because they already bid on projects even though they pay nonprevailing wages. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Specifically, one of the arguments that was just made is that if you support the Prevailing Wage Act, you will vote for this Bill. The language of the Prevailing Wage Act that is currently statute in this state, specifically excludes transportation of materials. So, you can support the Prevailing Wage Act. This is changing the Prevailing Wage Act. We are trying to expand, expand, expand, and this is not the original Prevailing Wage Act. I would make another point. The aggregate that will be produced in a quarry is not just for jobs that are going to be paying prevailing wage and, yet, the interpretation of this Bill is that anybody working in that quarry at all transporting, whether he's maintaining a conveyor, whether he's running a truck

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

that never leaves the quarry, whether he's running an end loader that is used to help pile, or to stack, or to load material, all of these that may be mixed nonprevailing wage jobs and prevailing wage jobs all would be mixed. The last... I would ask... like to ask the Speaker... or the Sponsor this question. How far is Decatur from the nearest state other than Illinois? How far is it to Indiana, Representative?"

Flider: "Don't know exactly."

Winters: "Seventy-five miles, something like that?"

Flider: "Probably farther."

Winters: "Probably 200 from Wisconsin, 150 from Iowa, couple hundred from Kentucky or Missouri? You are going to bankrupt hundreds of trucking jobs and trucking firms on the borders of this state when out-of-state contractors hauling out-of-state material from out-of-state quarries with bidding for Illinois projects. None of these states pay prevailing wage. It's another nail in the coffin for Illinois business. I urge the opposition of this Bill and 'no' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Champaign,
Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Jakobsson: "Representative, aside from all of the folks who are just plain opposed to prevailing wage, I've heard some opponents expressing the thought that this is unconstitutional. Can you help me with that argument, please?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Flider: "Well, we don't believe that's the case. In fact, this law is in place in Minnesota, and the Constitution of the… the constitutionality of the Prevailing Wage Act was challenged on equal protection grounds in a case Hayden v. Ogle, and it was determined by the Illinois Supreme Court that the Act is constitutional."

Jakobsson: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Watson: "Representative, do you feel that Illinois is a business friendly state?"

Flider: "I believe that there's room for improvement."

Watson: "Do you believe that this is a good climate if you were going to bring jobs to, if you were an employer, a job creator, do you believe that the State of Illinois is good compared to the states around us?"

Flider: "I believe that if you look at certain factors, we are doing well in others, but there's others where we definitely need improvement."

Watson: "What factors would those be?"

Flider: "Like, I... if you want to go, you know... I... I'm trying to present this legislation, and you're bringing up factors that are, I believe, outside the realm of this legislation."

Watson: "Okay. Well, let... let me rephrase it then. Do you... do you feel this Bill will help create jobs in this state?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Flider: "I think the thing that everybody's forgetting about is that owners and operators are business owners. small business people. They're not getting compensated adequately for a job that they are doing to haul aggregate. They are... get ...getting paid a... only a wage, but they're not getting compensated for the value of the equipment, the hauling rates that IDOT must approve. IDOT authorizes certain rates that owners and operators should be getting, but they're not. Those rates are going to the contractors. Those who are actually submitting the proposals, the costs for that, then they're hiring haulers and they're paying them prevailing wage, but not compensating them for their rigs or their equipment. That is definitely hurting businesses and we have a number of business organizations that are supporting this legislation for that very reason."

Watson: "So, was... that was a yes? You think this job... this Bill will help create jobs?"

Flider: "I believe that the capital Bill that we passed will create jobs, and I believe this is an equity issue that treats people fairly."

Watson: "Okay. Representative, do you know what the unemployment rate is in Illinois right now?"

Flider: "Believe it's above 10 percent."

Watson: "It's 12.2..."

Speaker Mautino: "Please give the Gentleman another minute."

Watson: "Thank you. It's 12.2; a year ago it was 10.6. I just want to make this clear, I am for people making as much as possible. It's not... it's not about, well, let's don't pay a fair wage or prevailing wage; it's... it's really about,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

let's put people to work. It is not meant as a slight. It's a philosophical difference, and... and with all due respect, I believe that... that if anything history's shown us, is that when you add expenses to projects, to job creators, it hurts job creation. It... it does no good to have high wages and high demands when people aren't working. I... I mean, it's really that simple. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Mulligan: "Representative, I was trying to get an idea of what prevailing wage is, and the answer that I got was that it depended on the area. So, there's a couple questions I have about that. I represent an area adjacent to Chicago, a little bit of Chicago, around O'Hare where there are trucking firms, a lot of construction, and I would presume the prevailing wage would be pretty high there. Can you tell me what the prevailing wage would be in my area?"

Flider: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative. I didn't hear the question. Could you repeat that? I apologize."

Mulligan: "Well, then, I'd like them to set the clock back.

Would you set the clock back since he wasn't listening when
I asked him the question? He was discussing what he was...

other things about the Bill with the staff. So, would you start again, please?"

Speaker Mautino: "You'll be granted an additional minute when the… as other Members have been."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Mulligan: "Thank you. Representative, I was trying to find out what prevailing wage in my area is."

Flider: "I do not know the answer."

Mulligan: "But it's your Bill. Shouldn't you know what the answer would be?"

Flider: "I don't know the answer of what the prevailing wage is in your area."

Mulligan: "My area's around O'Hare Airport, that has trucking firms, a lot of construction, and haulers. I'm presuming it would be quite high, and that it is set... what I was asked... I was told it was set probably per job, in the area, by the Department of Labor, and that it varies across the state. But you can't tell me what it would be in my area or zone, correct?"

Flider: "I can find that out for you."

Mulligan: "Well, it's a little late when... by the time I vote.

Can you also answer me, if you have a business that's on
the edge of the state if... the prevailing wage territory
takes in across the border of the state and goes..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's granted an additional minute."

Mulligan: "Can you tell me if it takes in the area, would it...
would it only be Illinois, or would it go across, in say, a
circle into the other state that is next to where that
business would be, or where that project would be located?"

Flider: "In answer to your first question, prevailing wage in Cook County is between 30 and 33 dollars an hour in your area."

Mulligan: "Thirty-three dollars an hour is prevailing wage?"

Flider: "Yes. Yes."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Mulligan: "All right."

Flider: "And, secondly, with regard to your question, this legislation provides that during the transportation of materials to and from a construction project, that prevailing wage would be paid. Now, would, you know... so, does that mean a contractor's going to say, well, I'm going to go to a quarry farther away so that it cost more? I don't think so. I think it's going to give an incentive to use quarries even closer in Illinois so that the cost will be reduced."

Mulligan: "Well, when you bid on a job, do they set the prevailing after or before you're bidding?"

Flider: "Prevailing wage..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's time has expired. The Gentleman may finish the answer to the question. Bob, you may finish the answer to the question. Have you finished... furth... next speaker is the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Sacia: "Bob, following the debate on this issue, I... I was...

didn't have my speak light on 'til I heard the gentle Lady
from Kankakee make several comments, and some of them
troubled me from the standpoint that we have to recognize
that we have the responsible bidders Act here, and the
responsible bidder's Act, among other things, requires
apprenticeships for every job that is bid upon. The gentle
Lady asked a question, if it was not so that contractors
who don't normally pay prevailing wage could bid on these

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

jobs, and you answered appropriately yes they can bid, but the reality is they won't get the job. And... and another thing that was not pointed out here today, and it surprises me significantly that this legislation is supported so strongly on your side of the aisle because it is absolutely counterproductive to minority bidders and bidders, because they absolutely are walking against an administrative nightmare to try to bid on projects, because most of them, and statistically it will show that, are nonunion bidders who cannot comply with the apprenticeship This is very, very invasive legislation to minority bidders, and to female contractors as they try to bid on... on projects that would be beneficial to their businesses. Ladies and Gentlemen, this isn't Democrats and Republicans. This is a Bill about fairness and we really need to defeat this legislation. I encourage a 'no' vote, standing in support of minority bidders and female contractors. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6112. On that, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, like the previous speaker, wasn't sure that I was going to speak until I heard some of the comments from the other side of the aisle. This truly is a philosophical issue, but it really is greater than that. It's about real people and the effect that our public policy has on real people. Is it about fairness? Yes, it is, but it's about fairness and a decision on whose side you're on, whose side you're going

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

to be on. Are you going to have the public policy in the State of Illinois, a public policy that ensures that people get a living wage, that people get paid and compensated adequately for the work that they do? You want to talk about unfairness. We currently have prevailing wage on public works projects, but it's on the project itself. the laborer gets prevailing wage. The cement finisher gets prevailing wage. The operating engineer gets a living, prevailing wage, but the person who just happens to be hauling the aggregate material to that public work site does not. So, this is about fairness. It is about making sure that a family... a person and a worker gets compensated adequately, so they can raise their family, send their It's about fairness to them. children to school. about fairness to their family. And you talk about businesses leaving Illinois, this is about public works. It's not about private enterprise. It's not about a private business coming to Illinois. It's whether we want to have the policy of the State of Illinois that mirrors the policy of Henry Ford years ago when he decided, I'm going to pay an adequate wage to the people who work for me so that they can buy the Model-T Ford. More money to workers means more that they're paid, more to state contractors, more disposable income, more revenue to the state, and more jobs created. That's why we should be voting for fairness and vote for this Bill."

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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lang keeps looking at me, so I'd like to yield my time to him because I'd like to hear what he has to say."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang for two minutes."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Mr. Franks. You know, I don't know that I can say it any better than Representative Hoffman did. He did an excellent job as he always does in... in defending what's right. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... I'm going to repeat some of what I said before. I don't hear a lot of conversation here about the Bill. Hear a lot of conversation here about allegation that this is going to cost jobs. I hear some... all kinds of allegations and all sorts of things but, ultimately, do you... do you believe in prevailing wage or don't you? If you believe in prevailing wage because you think that on government paid for contracts, we ought to be paying a decent wage to people who are taking taxpayer money, then I think you ought to consider what prevailing wage is all about, what it was meant to do, why we passed it in the first place. I recognize that many of who have spoken are just simply against it, and every time you open your mouth, you're making sure that people know you're against it. I don't know that's what you want to do. We're here to defend working men and women. We're here to make sure that working men and women have a right to a good paycheck, and at a time where there are so few projects going on and the capital Bill hasn't really begun to roll, it seemed to me this would be a time you'd want to say to

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

those working men and women, we're on your side, we've got your back, we want to help you. Ultimately, we're going to create 400 thousand new jobs when the capital Bill rolls out, and I don't think anybody will care that much about the prevailing wage part of this because there are gong to be a lot of people working, a lot of people being paid. It'd be good for working men and women, it'll be good for this chamber to put people to work, but first they need to be paid a decent wage. This Bill will ensure that."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien."

Beaubien: "I'd like to call the previous question."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has called the question. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it.

And the question is put. Representative Flider to close."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I know this is good debate and I know there are a lot of strong feelings about issues that really, I think, don't relate to this. what we are doing here is we are voting to reinstate a practice that used to be in place here in the State of Illinois. This is an equity issue, and not only does it relate to prevailing wage as it relates to public works projects where people deserve to be treated equitably and fairly, all practices, all trades, and it also ensures that it levels the playing field. And what... the reason it levels the playing field is that owners and operators will be able to be paid appropriately for their equipment. Not somebody else, but they will be able to be paid appropriately for their equipment. These are small

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

business people. These are people who, quite frankly, if they're not compensated adequately, are having a hard time making ends meet. And lastly, I would say that this legislation is sponsored by, and much has been said here today, but it's sponsored by a number of organizations including the Black Chamber of Commerce, Black Contractors United, Suburban Black Contractors Association. So, we've go a good strong Bill here, a good fair piece of legislation. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6112. The Gentleman from Crawford has requested a verification. That's been acknowledged. All Members please vote your own switches. And all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. The vote totals are 71 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Representative Eddy, do you seek your verification?"
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, based on the Roll Call, I do remove my request for verification."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for verification. Therefore, on a vote of 71 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6112 is declared passed. Representative Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Brady: "I'd like to give a nice Springfield welcome to the General Federation Clubs of Women of Illinois, who are up

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

in the gallery here for their legislative day. Please welcome the General Federation of Women's Clubs throughout Illinois. Welcome to Springfield, Ladies."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Senger, the Lady from DuPage, is seeking recognition."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to add to that large welcome that this group is the largest nondenominational, nonpartisan women's volunteer organization in the world, and they are celebrating 150 years of community service."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Jakobsson: "In celebration of women's history month, I want to commemorate the life and the contributions of Georgina Trotter. Born in Ireland to an aristocratic clan of agriculture, she came to the United States in 1850. She served as a nurse during the Civil War, working with Julia Ward Howe and serving during the Battle of Shiloh. Georgina Trotter was also in charge of escort services to northern hospitals and operated hospital boats on the Mississippi River. With her brother, Miss Trotter was involved in a successful lumber, grain and coal business in Bloomington. She was the first woman to serve as a member of the Bloomington Board of Education. She and her friend, Sarah Raymond, raised \$20 thousand to build Withers Library in 1887. The Trotter family fountain on the grounds of the

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

former Withers Library stands as a familiar landmark to local residents. It was designed by noted sculptor Lorado Taft and was bequeathed to the City of Bloomington in 1907. Georgina Trotter."

- Speaker Mautino: "For the benefit of the Members, we've had some requests about the plans for Friday. The... the House does plan to convene on Friday, tomorrow, at 9:30, and then on Monday, we will be convening at 3:00. Representative Lyons in the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hello, again, everybody. Mr. Clerk, Representative Burke has House Bill 5842. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5842, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a matter that I bring to your attention again. We put it on Postponed Consideration last week. The matter was thoroughly discussed as I suggested to the body at that time. This is a business in my district that is wishing to be exempt from the distant requirement... distance requirement from a school. It's probably 7 feet short from the required 100 feet distance. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all...
  those in favor of the passage of House Bill 5842 should
  vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.
  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 46 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Don Moffitt, on page 21 of the Calendar under... Order... Bills Order of Third Reading you have House Bill 4974. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4974, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Don Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4974 is an agreed Bill. It's an initiative of the Illinois Genetic Counselors Association. It clarifies the responsibility and authority of a licensed genetic counselor. What this would do would give licensed genetic counselors the ability to order genetic tests, if they're given that authority and a referral by a medical doctor. The Department of Professional Regulation would like us to clarify the definition of genetic test, and we did that in this Act also, so that the Genetic Privacy Act and the Genetic Gounselor's Act match on that definition. I know of no opposition. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4974 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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mary Flowers, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 5113. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5113, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mary Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5113... HA... HFS is in the beginning stage of implementing the integrated care pilot program for the aged, the blind, and the disabled population. specific areas of Illinois, DuPage County, Kane County, Kankakee, Lake, and Will are some of the counties. has been some questions regarding the expediency of implementing this pilot program. Some advocates are concerned that this pilot program is driven by budgetary pressures. In addition, the advocates that represent the developmental disabled populations are concerned whether the individuals will have the ability to continue services with their current providers because continuity of care is important to this vulnerable population. Since HSF... HFS does not need legislative approval to implement this integrated care pilot program, House Bill 5113 is an attempt to halt the process. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to this legislation."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Patti Bellock."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. Representative, I was under the impression that when we had this Bill in committee, 'cause I do support part of this Bill, that you were going to bring the Amendment back to committee 'cause there were concerns that in this Bill, that would take away the managed care that already existed in Illinois?"

Flowers: "Representative... Excuse me. May I take this Bill out of the record and I'll get back with you?"

Bellock: "Great. Thank you very much."

Flowers: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, take that Bill out of the record. Representative Jack Franks, on the Order of Third... Third Readings, you have House Bill 4694. Wish to call the Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Debbie Graham, you have, on page 24 of the Calendar, House Bill 6014. House Bill 6014. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6014, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an Amendment to the child labor law. Currently, if a child wants to work in the State of Illinois and they're from out of town, the

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

child has to come and apply in person for a work permit. This law would waive the presence of the child showing up in person. It would authorize the parent or the authorized agent to apply for the child in person. There's no opposition to this legislation. And I'll take any questions at this time."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6014 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 Ramey, Coladipietro... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rosemary Mulligan, you have House Bill 5823. Rosemary, you wish to call the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5823, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is it requires the Illinois Department of Veterans Affair to establish a grant program to make grants to entities that provide mental health and preventive maintenance services through the use of mobile units. There's many places in this state that do not have any active mental health unless you do it by phone. And the veterans, VFW, and AMVETS are supporters of this. Illinois Department of Veterans is

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- neutral. I serve on the returning workforce veterans... returning veterans committee, and this issue has come up in the discussion that there are not equal services around the state. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on House Bill 5823. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5823 pass?' All those is favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, you have House Bill 5859. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5859, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "On request of the Sponsor, take that Bill out of the record. Representative Mautino, you have House Bill 4797. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4797, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this... Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Frank Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill extends the tat... the statutory sunset on wind farm assessment practices from 2011 until 2016. This is an agreed Bill and it's... it's been a very tremendous

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

industry for the State of Illinois. Currently in my area, there's about a billion dollars worth of new construction on windmills. That law sunsets on how we assess their taxes. We brought all the groups in, they've agreed to push it out another five years, and that will allow the construction to continue. Thank you, Mr. Sacia, and Mr. Pritchard for working with me on this. And I'd answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4797 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady. Representative Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, you also have House Bill 5377. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5377, a Bill for a Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After the Amendment, which was placed on... it removed all of the objections. Many of you received emails and phone calls on the agents and the people who work with animals and pets. The Bill as introduced affected agents. It no longer does. It only deals with the issues

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

of veterinarians in the Veterinarian Care Act, and it is 100 percent agreed. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5377 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's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lou Lang, you have House Bill 5781. 5-7-8-1. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5781, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Leader Lou Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. In simplest terms, this Bill is a initiative of the Department of Revenue to help the state collect debt that it's owed by its own taxpayers. I would ask your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Representative, were you for or against the tax amnesty in order to cover the map grants?"

Lang: "I don't remember, Representative."

Mulligan: "Well, it was just a little while ago."

Lang: "Is... does that have anything to do with this Bill?"

Mulligan: "Well, you... it looks like you what you're doing is you're increasing going after people for taxes. Certainly, you're not looking for a way..."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Lang: "Well, I'm sure you would agree with me, Representative, that we want our taxpayers who are paying their taxes on time and appropriately, to not be prejudiced by the fact that we have some taxpayers who don't, or who bounce checks, or who don't pay their fees as appropriate."
- Mulligan: "Do you think that we're going to get our refunds on time this year from the state?"
- Lang: "Representative, I don't work in the Department of Revenue, so I don't have an answer for you."
- Mulligan: "Well, you're carrying their water."
- Lang: "I'm certainly handling a Bill for them, Representative."
- Mulligan: "And you got this out of the Revenue Committee?"
- Lang: "Yes, I certainly did."
- Mulligan: "I guess you have to be a Democrat to get a Bill out of Revenue Committee."
- Lang: "Actually, it's the only one I've ever gotten out of the Revenue Committee, so..."
- Mulligan: "You must be doing well this year, honestly. I was just wondering why you didn't support the tax amnesty and what do you think this is actually going to generate in revenue for the State of Illinois?"
- Lang: "Well, it'd certainly going to give the tools to the Department of Revenue to go after the people that owe the state money and certainly, your constituents would want you to vote for a Bill that did that because they pay their taxes, and everyone else should as well."
- Mulligan: "Representative, the last time you used that argument with me was when you decided that the universities in the state should pay four year... you know, when you started, you

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

would pay the same tuition for four years, which automatically meant that the universities charge more each year to cover inflation. So, I don't know if that would be what I would think would be the best thing to do, because you are urging me to vote. I think I'll make a decision on just looking at the content of the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond."

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

Osmond: "Representative, recently in my district, I had a situation where the Department of Revenue attempted to close a business, and that business had paid. In fact, they were due refunds, and the collectors came out and gave this business 10 days to pay up when they, in fact, owed a credit. And my question to you is, are you giving the tax collectors with the Department of Revenue more authority, because these gentleman, the two of them that appeared at this business, had not returned this business's phone calls for over a month. And when I tried to get a hold of them, I couldn't reach them. So, how does this, when they're out there collecting, does this give them more authority?"

Lang: "The answer is 'no'. In fact, it doesn't even relate to their own collectors. Part of this Bill is about collection agency fees when they refer a matter out. Part of this is about the statute of limitations. Part of this is about the Secretary of State, who can give information to the Department of Revenue to help them collect debt, and part of this is about the Reciprocal Tax Collection Act so

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

we can go into other states and find people that owe the State of Illinois money and go after them there."

Osmond: "Well, I'm not against that."

Lang: "So, this... this does not provide any new powers to revenue agents."

Osmond: "All right. Thank you for explaining that, 'cause I was very nervous for a very short time."

Lang: "Well, I'm glad you're no longer nervous, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

"Representative Lang, just one question. Reis: In our analysis, it says that it provides the Secretary of State will be granted the authority to furnish Social Security numbers to the department to help collect toll highway authority fees... or fines. Is there any restrictions on that? Is that right away when they provide them the information because sometimes the tollway says Secretary of State gave them the wrong information. And we have a lot of constituents that call our office and say, I've got a ticket from the Tollway Authority, but I've never been in Chicago, that's not my car. I have a B plate and that's an A plate. So, sometimes them the socm the Secretary of State's Office gives them inaccurate information. Is there any provisions that they couldn't give their Social Security number for, say, 30 or 60 days? They have to have a chronic late payment?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Lang: "Well, I... I think your analysis is too restrictive. Whoever wrote it must have been using the toll highway authority as an example. This provides that all debts that the Department of Revenue collects, if they can't find the person and they think they can find it through getting the information from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State would have the power to give it to the Department of Revenue. It has nothing to do, specifically, with the toll highway authority."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. I appreciate the answers to the previous speakers and you've cleared up a lot of the questions that I had, there's a few though that are remaining. When we're looking at the statute of limitations, in this Bill is providing that the Department of Revenue will have six years now instead of two years to exhaust all conventional collection methods? I'm wondering, won't... isn't that in vio... isn't that in violation of the statute of limitation laws we presently have? Because right now, if you were to collect on a debt whether it's written or oral, let's assume that it's a... it's not a written contract, the statute of limitations in this state is five years. So, is it the intent of this Bill to alter the statute of limitations when the State of Illinois is attempting to

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

collect a debt, as opposed to a private entity trying to collect a debt?"

Lang: "The answer to that is yes."

Franks: "Okay. So, what you're saying is that a new statute of limitation, and would the toll start… would it start to run at the time that the debt is incurred, or at the time of the first co... dunning letter?"

Lang: "This would provide six years to do all the work they have to do to get the background, to locate the person, all the way up to the time a lawsuit might be filed. So, they have six years 'til that point. Under the law today, the state has a different statute of limitations than everybody else today. Today the state only has two years. So, you and I, if we were suing a debtor, we would have five years under..."

Franks: "Right."

Lang: "...the law today. The state has only had two. So, this alters what the state can do."

Franks: "Well, my suggestion, I'm concerned if we would give the state additional time as opposed to other conventional creditors. Since our statute of limitations for everybody else is five years, don't you think it makes more sense to bring the state up to the same level instead of giving them more priority? Because of this reason, primarily, because of the starry decisis of the cases that have been involving the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. And I think with... if we have here the state turning out their debt to outside collectors, for instance, those collectors would be under the auspices of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

which is a federal statute. This flies in the face of that federal statute because it changes the statute of limitations, in my opinion."

Lang: "I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks, your time is..."

Lang: "I wouldn't say flies in the face, but I would say does alter it."

Franks: "And I'm... I'm not sure it's legal. I'm not sure that it would pass muster if anyone would challenge this law on that basis, because it would not conform with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. That's number one. And the second issue I want to talk to you about is the collection agencies..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks, your... your time has expired. I'll give you one more minute to finish that line of question."

Franks: "Okay. The next issue... and this is very important... on the collection agency fees, what we're saying here is regardless of a contract, you're requiring that these agency fees be added on to a debt. That's not the law in the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois indicates that unless there is a contract, there's no way a judge is going to give you those attorney's fees. I don't see how we can do this with a straight face, because I think we have a very established reasons for this, and it puts the debtor in a horrible position if they want it to... if they want to challenge this. For instance, if the Illinois Department of Revenue entered into a contract with someone to collect these debts at 50 percent, that would add 50

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

percent onto the debt of the person, which could really take away their ability to challenge."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang, are you going to respond to that 'cause the time has expired?"

Lang: "Well, I would just simply say this, that under the law today, if you want to sue someone for attorney's fees along with a debt, you have to have a written contract for that."

Franks: "Right, right."

Lang: "However, if we put into state statute that when the state sues somebody and there are attorney's fees, or debt collection fees that were entitled to them, then you wouldn't need a written contract. It's a simple change."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks, we extended your two minutes to an extra minute, so the next speaker's been waiting. We're following the letter of the law pretty close today. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Leitch: "Representative, I'm curious about the expansion here, apparent expansion, of the ability of the Department of Revenue to release security... Social Security numbers to... to whom? Contractors? To tax collectors who have contracted with the state to pursue owed amounts of tax?"

Lang: "The Bills says that the Secretary of State can release it to the department for interdepartment use only. So, this could not be used by others."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Leitch: "So, what... perhaps I'm overly cautious here, but what kind of protections would there be on those Social Security numbers?"

Lang: "They would have to be held in the department just like the Secretary of State holds them now. So, I think you would agree with me that if someone owes the state \$10 thousand because they haven't paid their taxes, or they wrote a check for \$10 thousand and bounced it, that we would like to collect that money. And if we can't collect the money because we can't find the person, the investigators within the department, if they had a Social Security number, might be able to find that person. The purpose is not to disseminate the Social Security number to other people. In fact, the Amendment narrows the Bill to make sure that information stays within the department."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "This is not a complicated Bill. The whole point of this Bill is to give the department additional tools to collect the many billions of dollars that are owed to the state by its own taxpayers. I would urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5781 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 Kosel. Representative Coulson. Dave Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 89 Members voting 'yes', 24 Members voting 'no'. This

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kevin McCarthy, you have House Bill 5960. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5960, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kevin McCarthy."

McCarthv: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5960 is a initiative of my hometown Orland Park, along with some other municipalities in the Central Municipal Conference and the Conference of Mayors. It's a completely permissive Bill, which back in the 1980s, different municipalities across our state were encouraged to build these civic centers. The donation of land was the only investment on the part of the municipality. The civic center was paid for by state So, this is a permissive gesture that if one of bonds. those municipalities wanted to contact the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, and if it was in their best interest to take on the responsibility for those bonds so that they could run the civic center completely on their own, the state would be relieved of any of the bond debt because the municipality would have to take that on. Some of the municipalities said they'd like to look at the numbers to see if it would be a wise investment for them to They feel they could run these civic centers do this. better with just the local... the board of trustees that now sits for the different municipalities, as opposed to having an independent civic center... civic center authority for

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

each different one of these... these buildings. So, it is completely permissive. They would look at the numbers, and decide whether they thought it was in their best interest to go forward. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Eddy: "Yeah. Quick question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "What happens to the... the state debt service for that?

Does that then transfer? So, would the state benefit from this just basically by tran..."

McCarthy: "The state would benefit because the municipality would be... if it was in their best interest after they look over all the numbers, if it was in their best interest to assume it, then they would take on that... the responsibility and pay off the bonds."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd appreciate a positive vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation, all those in favor of the adoption of House Bill 5960 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gordon. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Representative Michael Bost, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could, we'd like the record to reflect that Representative Kosa... Kosel and Sacia are excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lyons: "The record will reflect. Mr. Clerk, so noted.

  Representative Raymond Poe, you have House Bill 4578. Read
  the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4578, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Raymond Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4578 deals with a new drug on the market. It's called K2. And we'd like to put it in a classification of controlled substance, under the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. What this is is a new thing that's come out that our creative youth are starting to smoke and some of those kind of things. It's a lot like marijuana. It's ten times more powerful than marijuana, and it's about the same price. Right now, you can take a drug test and it doesn't show up. And we just want to stay ahead of the curve and get this... make it illegal before it becomes a real problem."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to certainly congratulate my colleague

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

on the other side of the aisle with introducing this measure. I actually introduced a similar measure unbeknownst to this legislation until I got to committee. But this is certainly timely to have this type of legislation that simply adds to the... the statutes of violations as a way to uncontrol... well, controlled substance in this state. And right now, a 6-year-old, a 10-year-old can actually go to the store and buy K2 product, an incense really, over the counter. So, my hat goes off to you, Representative. I'd like to be one of your cosponsors. I think that this is a tool that we're going to need in the future."

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

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

Fritchey: "Representative, I know this is... this is a product and an issue that is quickly gaining attention around the country. It's a relatively new issue and we may, in fact, be right, but we don't know. Have you seen any studies that show that there is any harmful effects of K2?"

Poe: "In the last month, there's been 30 cases in the St. Louis
University has dealt with, with young people dealing with
this drug."

Fritchey: "Right."

Poe: "And... and they're finding out it's very dangerous. And what's happening, they think that it's something similar to marijuana. But what happens to them, they don't realize that it's a lot more potent than marijuana, and what we've

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

read is it's ten times more potent than marijuana is, and it's a synthetic chemical that they're spraying on potpourri and they burn it as in incense and then as... all these people get creative, I guess, they use drugs. They've decided they'd go ahead and roll it and smoke it. So, it's becoming a problem that way. They've already outlawed this in European, some countries right now. Missouri and Kansas, also, Legislatures looking at this same issue. And I thought, in Illinois, we ought to get ahead of the curve and just get this... we're just adding it to the list. We're not creating a new law."

Fritchey: "Well, no, I... I understand that. And it's a lengthy list and most everything on that list belongs on the list. You know, I think the... the way it's drafted is interesting because we talk about... the common name for it is K2, when it's really the... it's the chemical substance and not the product name that... that should be in... that should be in the statute here. You know, I'm going to support it. I think everybody's going to support it. We're probably right, but we really need to try cover... we really don't know what... you know, we really don't know what this is here or what I've also read, too, is that in response to the bans that are popping up now on K2, that it can actually be very, very, very minorly..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey, your time is expired.

We'll give you another minute to conclude your questions."

Fritchey: "Not... not even a minute. Just... just a word of education, I guess. It... it's possible making exceedingly minor modification so that technically, it would not fall

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

under the cat... the classification that we have now. It would still have all the same effects, all the same potential danger, yet be completely legal. I think we've really got to look at how we classify this one because it is a synthetic. All you got to do is make a very minor tweak to it and it's no longer a banned substance. So, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Poe to close."

Poe: "I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 4578 pass?'
All those in favor signify by vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Currie. Danny Reitz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Connie Howard, you have, on the Order of Third Readings, House Bill 5388. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5388, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5388, as amended, would amend the MRDD Community Care Act by making a technical change allowing facilities under this Act to be governed solely under the MRDD Community Care Act. The Amendment would add a... the Amendment adds a date of closure that coincides with the implementation date of the Act. It

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

cleaned up the language that added a date of closure that would coincide with the Implementation Date Act... of the Act. It prevents the intermediate care facilities for the developmentally disabled and long tong... term care for under 22 facilities from being licensed under two separate Acts. I'll... I'll answer questions at this point."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5388 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 Wait, Ron. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative David Reis, you have House Bill 6158. Out of the record. Representative Tim Schmitz, House Bill 5749. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5749, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill seeks to correct a situation that happened out of Kendall County where a police officer had used a document to defraud the police department, that being a time sheet. And when he was charged with forgery, the Appellate Courts overturned it saying that that document was not sufficient to defraud the maker... or to defraud the police department. So, he was

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

found to be... not... there was not sufficient evidence there to establish his guilt, and the convictions were overturned. This would seek to clarify that this type of document could be used, when you sign it, that it has material... materially false information and therefore, would correct the statute. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5749 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? Dugan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Debbie Mell, you have House Bill 5419. Out of the record. Representative Harry Osterman, you have House Bill 5849. Out of the record. Representative Phelps, you have House Bill 4858. Out of the record. Representative Senger, you have House Bill 5321. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5321, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Senger (sic-Mr. Speaker) and Members of the Assembly. House Bill 5331 basically refers to child sexual exploitation. And today our definition of exploitation is you need to be physically present in front of a child and do something lewd. What this is doing is basically adding the definition of what we're talking

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

about, as known as Webcams in the wretch. So, what we're saying here is that exploitation is also defined now, not just in the presence of a child, but also through a virtual presence which is similar to what we're doing with Webcams. And I'd appreciate your support."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5321 pass?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all Representative Hoffman. voted who wish? Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Representative Ed Sullivan, you have House Bill 5923. Out of the record. Representative Ron Wait, you have House Bill 587... 5675. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, you have a Senate Bill, Senate Bill 1702. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1702, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Menard, Representative Rich Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was brought to me by the Sheriff's Association, and what it does, it takes a fee from \$30 a year to \$100 a year, which makes it uniform, and even less in some of surrounding states. It's something we need to update the

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

LEEDS program which takes about \$400 thousand to... to pay for each year for the vendor. I'll answer any questions." Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's discussion, is there any explanations or any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1702 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommer. Representative Jakobsson. Like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Going to be moving a few Bills from Second to Third on the list that had been turned in to the Chief of Staff, Tim Mapes. So, we'll be going through a few Second ... Second Readings to see if your choice is to have them moved to Third or not. The first one is Representative Cross. Leader Cross has House Bill 6065. Out of the record. Representative Shane Cultra, you have House Bill 5699. Out of the record. Representative Toni Berrios, you have House Bill 5334. Do you wish to move that Bill to Third Reading? Out of the record. Representative Berrios, you also have House Bill 5701. Out of the record. Representative Golar, you have House Bill 5836. Do you wish to move that Bill to of Third Reading? Out of the Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 1629. Bill to move that from Second Representative? Been advised by the Clerk there are notes pending on that, so hold that Bill on the Order of Second

115th Legislative Day

- Reading. Representative Kevin Joyce, you have House Bill 5057. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5057, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Lou Lang, you have House Bill 6083 on Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6083, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative David Leitch, you have House Bill 5304. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. David, you also have House Bill 5306. Do you wish to move that Bill to the Order... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 5306."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5306, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Rosemary Mulligan, you have House Bill 5517. Do you wish to move that Bill from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Jim Watson, you have House Bill 5623. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Danny Reitz, you have House Bill 5224. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Representative Al Riley, you have House Bill 5448. Out of the record. Representative André Thapedi, you have House Bill 6215. Out of the record. Continuing on Second Readings, is Representative Mike Bost... Is Representative Bost on the floor... Mike, do you wish to move... move House Bill 4821 from Second to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4821, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Dan Brady, you have House Bill 5630. Representative Brady, House Bill 5630. Do you want to move that Bill from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Cavaletto, you have House Bill 5539. Out of the record. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, you have House Bill 6052. Barbara, do you wish to move that Bill from Second to Third? Out of the record. Representative Monique Davis. Is Representative Davis on the floor? Representative Will Davis. Is Will Davis on the floor? Representative Will Davis. Representative Sara Feigenholtz, you have House Bill 6059. Sara, do you wish to move House Bill 6059 from Second to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6059, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #3."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 is an agreement with the Governor's Office. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6059 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Mary Flowers, do you wish to move House Bill 5476 from Second to Third? Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Jack Franks, on Second Reading you have House Bill 4658. Do you wish to move that Bill to Sec... from Second to Third, Representative Franks? Out of the record. Representative John Fritchey, you have House Bill 4982. Wish to move that Bill from Second to Third, Representative? The Clerk tells me there's a note pending on that, so we'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Fortner, you have House Bill 5191 on the Order of Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative David Leitch, you have House Bill 5308 on the Order of Second Reading. David, do you wish to move that? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5308, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this House

115th Legislative Day

- Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "I'm sorry. Please move that back to Second. I'm waiting for an Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, move that back... that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Michael McAuliffe, you have House Bill 5996. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5996, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McAuliffe, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative McAuliffe on Floor Amendment #1."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. We discussed this Bill in the Health Care License Committee, and after additional discussions with the Illinois Department of Public Health, the language in this Bill would remove any concern from the agency. And I ask for the adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing none, the question is, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Rosemary Mulligan, you have House Bill 4924. Rosemary. Representative Mulligan, do you wish to move House Bill 4924? Out of the record. Representative Raymond Poe, you have House Bill 4871. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Chapin Rose, you have House Bill 5966 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Chapin, you... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Rose: "Speaker, there was an Amendment filed. Was that released from Rules? No, it's..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative..."
- Rose: "We have to wait for the Amendment to come out of Rules, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "There's an Amendment pending in Rules. Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Skip Saviano, you have House Bill 4976. Do you wish to move that Bill, Skip? Representative Saviano, you got an Order... Bill on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4976, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Darlene Senger, you have House Bill 6272. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Ed Sullivan, you have House Bill 5799. Out of the record. Representative Jehan Gordon, you have House Bill 5905 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Debbie Graham, you have House Bill

115th Legislative Day

- 4805 on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Graham. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4805, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Lisa Hernandez, you have House Bill 4928 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? 4928. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4928, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative J... Naomi Jakobsson, you have House Bill 5040 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Lou Lang, you have House Bill 5752 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5752, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Lang, you also have House Bill 5677 on Second Reading. Lou Lang. Lou, you got a second Bill, 5677. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5677, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

115th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Ok, Representative Senger, you wish to move House Bill 6272 from Second to Third Reading?

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6272, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jehan Gordon, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Gordon, J.: "Today with us in the gallery is a group of young African-American males from Illinois Central College in East Peoria, Illinois. If you'd stand, please. This group of young men has come down here today to learn more about the government process, and they have been very much so engaged in the civic process back in Peoria, Illinois. And I'd like for all of you to please give them a round of applause and welcome them to the General Assembly."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to Springfield. We're glad to have you at the Capitol. Enjoy your day. Representative Mike Tryon, on the Order of Second Readings, you have House Bill 5214. Mike. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5214, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. The state's mandates notes, balance budget notes, and judicial notes have been requested on the Bill as amended and have not been filed."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Keep that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Ron Wait, you have House Bill 5601 on the Order of Second Readings. Out of the Representative Jim Watson, you have, on the Order of Second 5623. Bill Out of Reading, House the Representative Debbie Mell, you have House Bill 5420 on the Order of Second Reading. Representative, do you wish to move that Bill to Third Reading? Debbie Mell. Deb, it's on Second Reading. Leave it on Second Reading? Out of the record. Representative Elaine Nekritz, you have House Bill 6208 on Second Reading. What's your pleasure? Out of the record. Representative Bob Rita, you have House Bill 6239 on Second Reading. Representative Rita."

Rita: "Should be an Amendment for that, too, correct? Was that..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6239, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 remains in the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Lyons: "Keep that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

Representative André Thapedi, you have House Bill 5409.

Out of the record. Representative Mike Zalewski, on the Order of Second Reading, you have House Bill 4931. Out of the record. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're working on a second list today of Bills that are now on Third Reading alphabetical. We'll be going back and forth on both sides of the chamber. Representative Patti

115th Legislative Day

- Bellock, on the Order of Third Reading, you have House Bill 5696. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5696, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Patti Bellock."
- "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is House Bill Bellock: 5696, and what this does is, beginning July 1, 2010, the Department of Human Services shall reinstate the Community Hospital Inpatient Psychiatric Services Program, which is commonly called the CHIPS Program, in the same manner it has been since May 1, 2009. What happened is when a lot of the mental health beds out of the state facilities were closed in 2002, the State of Illinois committed to the Legislators in that area and the community mental health advocates that they would pay for those services in some of, especially, in the rural county hospitals. As of last year, they said they weren't going to pay for those services anymore for the extremely low-income people who have no private or no public insurance. This is for shortterm psychiatric care in severely needed hospitals."
- Speaker Lyons: "Patti, you're finished with your explanation of the Bill? Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I do appreciate that the services that would be offered under this Bill are important services. But I have a question can you tell us, Representative, what the cost will be?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Bellock: "Yes. The cost is 9,400,000 and that's what was in the Bill. I mean, that's what was a line item for these hospitals over the last eight years. Since, the DHS closed, let's see, I think it was 75 beds in Alton, it was 75 beds in Elgin, and they closed our mental health hospital. So, at that time, they committed, DHS, to all the people in those areas and throughout Illinois, that they would keep that line item in the budget to pay for those psychiatric services that are emergency, short-term hospital psychiatric services. They committed that to all the Legislators throughout the State of Illinois whose hospitals... now there's 75 counties in Illinois who will now no short-term psychiatric services in hospitals."

Currie: "Representative, I just want to make the point to the Members of this chamber, well-intentioned Bill, no question about it, but the state doesn't have the money today that mav have when they said, we'll meet responsibilities in a different fashion. I see nothing in this Bill that respects the PAYGO principal that is so important to many of the Members of this chamber. The payas-you-go principal that says we are not going to spend money on a program unless we can find a savings some place else. So, I certainly appreciate the good heart that is behind this Bill, but I am certainly also a little disturbed at the fairly cavalier approach to the state's fiscal problems."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Leitch: "Thank you ve... very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. Not only has the state reneged on a promised program, but if one were to look for money, when they closed this program, nobody got fired, nobody lost their jobs. So, we kept the overhead in the bureaucracy, but got rid of the services. So, I think that this is upside down. If we're going to lose these programs, then the people administering the programs should have gone out the door along with those programs. And I strongly agree they should be restored."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock to close."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I understand where Representative Currie was coming from, but I understand that in 2002, the State of Illinois, under the Department of Human Services, made the commitment to those people in those areas that they would take care of some of those psychiatric services. That money was in that budget for the last eight years. Now, last year, \$400 million was given in raises to state employees and yet, they took out the 10 million... \$9,400,000 that served the poorest of the poor in psychiatric units throughout the state, where those when they closed those mental health facilities throughout Illinois, especially, in the rural area, they committed to them that they would give them a line item to provide those services through CHIPS. And now, last year at the stroke of a pen, when the \$400 million in raises were given to state employees, they just dumped those people out on the street."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady asked for an 'aye' vote. The question is, all those in favor of House Bill 5696 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jefferson, Burns. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Bradley, on the Order of Third Reading you have House Bill 5232. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5232, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley."

Bradley: "This is a Bill... it's an initiative of the Illinois Press Association. It would require the... the different newspapers around the state to, as a free service, provide Internet website for public notices. So, it doesn't cost the customer anything. It's something that they've taken upon themselves and initiated and are doing themselves. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I think this also requires school districts, if they don't have a newspaper of circulation in the county where they're supposed to provide notice of... of

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

certain legal issues, to do it in a neighboring county that also has circulation in... in the county."

Bradley: "I... I think that's already the law, isn't it?"

Eddy: "I... it's included, I think, in the Amendment to this, but I... I just wanted to clarify that. I think it's fine. I think that does clarify the intent that just because you don't have a paper that's located in your county, you still need to use a neighboring county, but one or the other in that situation."

Bradley: "The main thrust of this is to get this website started for..."

Eddy: "The website started..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Eddy: "Okay. All set. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5232 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 Mendoza. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.
This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin.
Representative DeLuca, you have House Bill 6252. Out of the record. Representative Flider, on the Order of Third Readings you have House Bill 5947. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

115th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5947, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bob Flider."
- Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Spe... Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation simply enables a... the family of a... of a crime victim to actually be identified as victims themselves for purposes of being able to obtain a restraining order, so that they would not be contacted by the family... or, excuse me, by the person convicted of a crime toward their family. There's been an instance in my district where a family member had been contacted by a convict, and this legislation would enable the family to go to a state's attorney and ask for a restraining order. And so, this would put that in place. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative Careen Gordon."
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Gordon, C.: "Representative, does there have to be a basis for the state's attorney filing a preliminary or permanent injunction or a temporary restraining order, or is this just automatic? I'm sorry, I don't have..."
- Flider: "Well, it would have to be requested and..."
- Gordon, C.: "Right. I understand it would be requested, but do they have to have a basis, or is it just going to be automatic because it was the defendant who committed the

115th Legislative Day

- crime against this person, this victim, or their family member?"
- Flider: "Well, I believe it would be discretionary, of course, so I don't believe it would be automatic, no."
- Gordon, C.: "You... well, what... is the Bill silent on it? What's the actual language about? I haven't... this is the first...

  And is it a civil standard or... it could be civil or criminal?"
- Flider: "So, what the language states is that a family member would be allowed to file a complaint and apply to the circuit court for a temporary restraining order."
- Gordon, C.: "And... I'm sorry?"
- Flider: "And this would be contained in the... and so..."
- Gordon, C.: "It's on page 6, and it starts from line 17 to line 26."
- Flider: "Right. So, at the request of the victim, yes, it would be authorized."
- Gordon, C.: "So, you're asking the criminal prosecuting authority to represent them in a civil complaint, without actually spelling out the basis for what that restraining order, or temporary restraining order, or preliminary, or permanent injunction might be other than the fact that they were the perpetrator of the homicide? And this person's going to get out and they may or may not try to contact them. They may go nowhere near them. They may move..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Go ahead, Representative Gordon. We'll give you another minute to finish up."
- Gordon, C.: "They... they may not be anywhere near them, but it's just... is it going to be automatic, or do they actually have

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

to have a basis because it looks like your Bill is silent as to that."

Flider: "Right. So, if... if you are... this is... the answer to your question is, yes. So, the family whose, in this case, their sister and daughter were killed. They were getting... the person was convicted of that and he was contacting them in prison. So, yes, at their request, the state's attorney would file this and there would be an injunction or a restraining order. I should say a restraining order that would prohibit that person from contacting them, yes."

Gordon, C.: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. You're asking a criminal prosecuting authority to file a civil order and represent a family personally, and there's absolutely no basis, whatsoever, other than this person getting out of jail, and they may have no interest in contacting the family of the victim. I think we're way overstepping our bounds here, and we should really question whether or not we want to pass this legislation out of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, if you could elaborate a little bit on what happened in your district because I'm assuming the person was convicted of murder. What was the sentence? What... what facility were they sent to? Maybe you could let us know a little bit more."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Flider: "Well, the person was convicted. I... I can't tell you exactly how long, but I can tell you that they're... they come up for parole periodically, they apply for parole. And so, it's a situation where the family has had to, you know, go before the parole board, state their case, along with the community as to why this person should not be granted parole. But in the course of the time where this person was in prison, the person who was convicted of the crime had made contact with the family and this family would like never to have contact with this person again."

Reboletti: "What... what type of contact did they have? Obviously, it was via U.S. mail. What was the content in the... in the letters or whatever they sent? Was it in a criminal intent type letter or was it some type of, you know, I... I'm not sure what was in those letters, so..."

Flider: "It was not a... a situation where they were threatening in any way, no."

Reboletti: "Representative, I have some concerns about putting that on to the state's attorney since they aren't able to step forward and help people who file civil orders of protection in cases of domestic violence. I was wondering if you would consider taking it out of the record for a few minutes so we could have a conversation about maybe how to clear this up. I don't know if they're the right entity to help out in this situation. Would you consider doing that for a few moments?"

Flider: "I have no problem with that."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Flider: "Be great."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill..."

Flider: "Mr. Speaker, please pull this out of the record."

Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Representative LaShawn Ford, you have on the Order of Third Readings, House Bill 4587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4587, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LaShawn Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4587 develops a Lupus Education Awareness Program. And this Bill is agreed, and it's supported by the Lupus Foundation of America. And the Bill has no impact... physical impact. And I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentlemen's explanation of House Bill 4587. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4587 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 Currie. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rich Brauer, you have House Bill 5688. Out of the record. Representative Mike Connelly, you have House Bill 5282. Out of the record. Representative Roger Eddy, you have House Bill 4711. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4711, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4711 deals with Eddy: unfunded mandates to school districts. Very basically states that a school district, either public or private, is not obligated to comply with a statutory or regulatory mandate or requirement that's enacted... acted into law or adopted by Rule whenever the appropriation does not meet The Bill is prospective, going the cost of the mandate. forward, all existing mandates are not affected by this legislation. Also, an agreement was made very late in the Bill process to exclude Chapter 820 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes, which excludes any law related to prevailing wage or... or their labor issues. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. In this time of fiscal crisis in our state, it's imperative that we give our local school boards every tool they can... they can have to manage what little cash flow they do have. Representative Eddy has taken a... the lead on this. I salute him for doing it. It is long past time that we've done this and returned control to our local school boards. We cannot keep piling on mandate, after mandate with no funding... with no funding. We have to give them the ability to manage their own cash flow back.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Representative Eddy, thank you for the hard work you put into this. And to my fellow colleagues, I... I urge you to vote for this on behalf of your local school kids. Give the districts the ability to manage their cash flow back since we can't give them any money. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Eddy, I also want to congratulate you on the hard work on this particular Bill. This is a difficult subject, but in these times, school districts need all the flexibility we could possibly give them. I know there may be some mandates out there that... that were put on the schools by individuals who felt they were very, very important, but at this point, schools are going to have to teach the kids reading, writing, math, and... and the subjects that are mandated already. This doesn't let them out of any of those types of mandates. It's simply those extras that, at this point, really can't afford. So, I certainly urge everyone to vote 'aye', and help out the school districts across the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Thank you. I wanted to make sure I read this correctly.

This implies to future mandates only?"

115th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Yes. Originally... the original Bill would allow districts to... to choose from existing mandates, but after a lot of discussion and really trying to figure out what any existing funding would be for or not for, I think going forward is best, and then to have a separate forum to look at existing mandates and then be brought separately. So, yes, Sir."
- Lang: "All right. So, conceptually, I agree, but in practice, I'm not sure how this works. So, let's say next year we dump a new mandate on them, right, and then we don't pay... we... they... we pay them less money then they would like to have. How do they know which mandates we're paying for and which mandates we're not paying for?"
- Eddy: "The... unless there's a specific appropriation for the new mandate, then a board... but they would also have to have a public hearing regarding that mandate prove that there is not appropriate funding, and by local resolution, pass an affirmative action to eliminate that mandate."
- Lang: "And so, we could presumably then, if we put a new mandate on them, and we put a line item in the budget and paid for it, there could still be other mandates from the past that we're not paying for, that they'd still be responsible for. Is that correct?"
- Eddy: "Well, yeah, because of the way this is written. It's prospective for new."
- Lang: "All right, I'm going to think about this."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

115th Legislative Day

Eddy: "I..."

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Davis, M.: "Representative, your Bill is stating that the only mandates that the state would have to abide by would be those currently in existence. Is that correct?"
- Eddy: "Well, the Mandates Act is for the school districts, and what it says is that any future mandate would be... that would not be funded fully, school districts would have to take some action, but they could opt out of that mandate because funding wouldn't come."
- Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I really do recognize the fiscal constraints under which our state operating, but I do not believe that all the excellent ideas have been put forth. I do not believe that all of the brilliant, needed mandates are currently in place. I do believe that if an emergency occurs and new mandates have to come forth, then Illinois should honor those new mandates and perhaps, look at some of the older ones that may not be as needed. In other words, we'll have to prioritize our spending in this economic situation as a family does. You wouldn't go home to your family and say, there will be no more new needs in this house unless you have the money to pay for them. Don't bring me any new problems into this house, any new needs, without the funding for it. The adequate response would be, we'll prioritize our needs. Is the new mandate, or the new need in the family greater than something that currently exist?"

09600115.doc

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, your time has expired.

  We'll give you one more minute, please, to finish up your remarks."
- Davis, M.: "Well, I just want to say, I certainly recognize the conditions of our state, but I don't believe that all the excellent ideas have been put forth. I don't believe that we're the superior people with superior knowledge. I don't believe that a coming legislature may not have some great ideas to help better our school system and move our students forward. I know you have an excellent intent, and I have great respect for you, Representative Eddy. You're a superintendent of a school, and I know you have the best interest of your district at heart. But, as a Legislator for the State of Illinois, I cannot condemn new ideas to the back burner. I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield my five minutes to Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, two minutes. Two minutes."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would also just like to say, for a number of years, people have come to the General Assembly. They have placed ideas in the hopper. They went from a committee, to a committee, the House Floor, the Senate, committee, committee, Governor's desk, and for us to decide that that process is no longer going to happen for new Legislators, or new General Assemblies if you can't come up with the money that

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

everyone agrees should pay for your new idea. Emergencies can occur. The President... the First Lady is talking about obesity in our state, and what our kids are being fed on a daily basis, and how it's feeding into the condition of their health. So, some new mandates may come forth, and we may have to decide that something that's sitting there today doesn't have the priority of a new mandate. So, to blanketly say... to blanketly say new ideas without money, we just can't do them. I don't think a doctor would say that about any of his medical practice. I don't think a dentist would say that about medical practice. I think you have to prioritize the needs for the time and condition. needs may change. Our needs may change. Our conditions have changed, and our needs may change. There may be some things that don't have a priority, that in the next coming fiscal year will have a priority. And I think if you support a tax increase, you may not have to try to remove new ideas from this Body. There was a time people wanted to continue to believe the world was flat. Don't bring us any ideas that says..."

Speaker Lyons: "Your time has expired, Rep... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Paul Froehlich."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Froehlich: "Representative Eddy, I support your Bill, but I... I have one question. We... we know there will be future Bills imposing unfunded mandates. Is there anything to prevent

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

the future Bill from simply exempting itself from this Act if it becomes law, and we're back right where we started again?"

Eddy: "Representative, I wish there was some way to guarantee that, but as you know, that that is... is not necessarily possible. Future General Assemblies can't be bound by this, and... and very quickly, an ancillary point. I don't want to stop the flow of good ideas. I... I think anybody can bring a good idea. They're... they're welcome to and our committees will look at those and decide whether or not we should support those good ideas. But when we do that, we should also decide whether or not we're going to send the money along with the good idea to make sure it's implemented correctly. I... I welcome all the good ideas but... but I think we need to get to the point where we fund those. But no, I... to answer your question, I don't know that we could ever quarantee that kind of responsibility in the future. I would like to think it's going to happen, but I... I can't guarantee that."

Froehlich: "Well, I do hope anybody who votes for your Bill today will at least keep it in mind when they're tempted to propose the next unfunded mandate. Thanks."

Eddy: "Appreciate that."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mark Walker."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Walker: "I like your... the concept of this Bill. I have a couple of questions. One is, who determines when the funding is sufficient?"

Eddy: "The line item to... that appropriates it determines whether it's funded or not. So, if there's a separate appropriation that funds the line item."

Walker: "Whether or not school districts tell us this isn't even remotely covering the cost?"

Eddy: "Well, the district has to prove that in the public hearing. They have to have a public hearing that demonstrates the cost shortage. We do that now with the… a breakfast program opt out. There… there's a similar process that if you're required to… to have a school breakfast program during the summer, that if you can't afford to have that and the funding isn't there for it, you have to have a public hearing and prove that. They'd have to do the same thing."

Walker: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Will this... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Eddy, you know I'm a co-sponsor on this and we've been dealing with this for the last couple months, since last year, as far as Representative Bassi's list of all unfunded mandates... or underfunded mandates. Do you have a projection of how much, roughly, guesstimate, how money could be saved by the institute of all the school districts in the state? Any idea?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Eddy: "Well, I don't know how I could guess what future
 mandates might cost."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, let's take your school district. How much do you think you could save?"

Eddy: "Well, remember, this is prospective. These are future, so it's really hard to guess. I... I think what we... what we should do though in addition to this is... is support the Resolution that passed here yesterday that establishes a specific list of... of current mandates, and that's where some of the funding savings could come for this year. But I think we need to do both. I think we need to... to pass this for future mandates to make sure that we're responsible as we go, but also encourage the State Board of Education through the Resolution, to bring us, for at least a period of time..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Eddy: "...some of those mandates. But it could be tens of thousands of dollars."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. And earlier, we heard from a Representative saying that we're kind of putting a ban all... a ban on all future mandates, but that's not true. That is voted on as resolution by the school board on what they'd like to teach the kids and what they don't think they should teach the kids right now. And... and the sunset on that would be when we do get money into the system to pay for those mandates. Correct?"

Eddy: "Absolutely. If they're paid for and they pass this General Assembly, I have no problem. I... I mean, I may not

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

vote for them or agree with them, but implementing them with funding..."

Chapa LaVia: "What'd you say?"

Eddy: "Not a problem."

Chapa LaVia: "You might not what?"

Eddy: "Implementing... implementing those mandates aren't a problem as long as the funding comes along."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I... I think this is a fine piece of legislation. I want to thank you for all the work that you have done with the unions, all the concerned parties that had issues in the initial onset of this piece of legislation. People, the Governor has requested a 1.2 billion dollar cut out of education. We have to..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapa LaVia, your two minutes are up. We'll give you one minute to conclude your remarks."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. We have to find the creative ways, if you will, how to save dollars into these school districts. Just in my district alone, the school district that touch Aurora, we owe \$45 million to. So, I commend the Sponsor on this. I am a supporter, and we really need to work on more solutions. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Al Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Eddy, I know what it is you're trying to do. You know, earlier today, we spoke about information not necessarily being diffused out to people so they

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

understand some of the pronouncements that come out of the General Assembly. And I'm not real big on subscribing to the slippery slope argument that's made here from time to time. But, could you explain how maybe school boards might sort of get an idea that they can sort of thumb our... thumb their nose at pro... pronouncements made by this Body, then we get into the arguments on what was funded, what was underfunded, and so forth?"

Eddy: "Well, first, I don't think I'd describe it as school boards thumbing their nose. I think there'll be deliberation and they'll..."

Riley: "No, I'm saying some people might, you know, view it that way."

Eddy: "Well, look, they have to go through a process. And the process is the mandate is the mandate until they act to remove it. So, they... they don't automatically get a pass on any mandate that the General Assembly might impose. That has to come through their affirmative action to study it, to post a hearing, to have a public hearing about the merits, and then prove that it isn't funded, and then make a motion. And they have to do this, by the way, annually. They have to do it annually, so that they have to review these things and all of that information is open to the public, and provided to the State Board of Education upon request, as well. So, I think there's some safeguards in place here."

Riley: "Thank you."

Eddy: "Representative Eddy to close."

115th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... I appreciate the fact that there are some concerns. I... I really don't believe though that this will stop the flow of good ideas and proposals from Representatives. What it might do, though, is make us think twice in... in the future as we look at these good ideas. We'll put our money where our mouth is if we think they're good ideas, and we'll make sure there's an appropriation before we pass it down to local governing bodies. Because what happens now is we pass those on and it becomes a defacto tax increase. The property tax increase locally because we didn't fund it here. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 4711 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 Hamos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 103 Members voting 'yes', 7 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tom Holbrook, you have House Bill 5998. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5998, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Tom Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 5998 is cleanup language. We're getting rid of the assisted living shared housing authority committee that was established years ago

115th Legislative Day

- to do the licensure when we set up assisted living. The Bill hasn't... the group has not met since 2008. They finished their work. I know of no opposition to the Bill. Be glad to take any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5998 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 May. Representative Dugan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Connie Howard, you have House Bill 5402. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5402, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5402, it amends the Criminal Code. It provides that it is a Class X felony to use force or to threaten the use of force against another person in order to affect, or attempt to affect a transaction of an electronic fund transfer terminal. And of course, that would be located in our state. I'll take questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation.

  Representative John Fritchey. John, before you start,

  Representative Mautino in the Chair."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Fritchey: "Thank... thank... Thank you, new Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Fritchey: "Representative, I... I want to understand this because at... at a time that we are looking at ways to not further congest our prison system, and ways to not put people away for life, potentially, this says that if you threaten the use of force to make them... I mean, basically, what you're talking about, if you threaten the use of force to get somebody to withdraw money from an ATM, it's a Class X felony."
- Howard: "That is correct. Are you asking me to read this again, or do you..."
- Fritchey: "No, no. I want to... I want to make sure that I understand this, and... and I'm not being facetious."
- Howard: "Yes, that is what..."
- Fritchey: "It... so, if... if I threaten you to hand over your purse and your wallet to me, it's assault, it's potentially a battery. It's sure as heck not a Class X felony, but if I threaten..."
- Howard: "Well, it would be a Class X felony if we pass this legislation."
- Fritchey: "No, no, no, no, no. It... it would be a Class X felony if I threatened you to make you take money out of an ATM. But, if I simply threaten you to give me your wallet, it would not be."
- Howard: "This particular legislation says it would become a Class X felony if what I described occurs."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Fritchey: "Corre... Well, and... and maybe I'm not being clear. If I... if I'm not, let me apologize to the Body, but I hope that the Body pays attention to this, because this is how we make potentially... I don't want to say bad, 'cause I don't mean it in a disparaging... in a disparaging way, but I do mean unconstitutional laws. If... if I threaten you today and demand that you give me your wallet, I'm guilty, likely, of a Class 4 felony. If I threaten you to make you withdraw money from an ATM under this Bill, I would be guilty of a Class X felony. Is that correct?"

Howard: "You're asking me if that's what this legislation is saying?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Ma'am."

Howard: "Yes. That is what this legislation is... is saying."

Fritchey: "All right. This... this is... this is why I have to keep a sentencing card here. I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons back in the Chair. John, your time ran out. We'll give you an extra minute to finish your remarks."

Fritchey: "To... to the Bill. Ladies... Ladies and Gentlemen, we... we would be... we would be creating an inherently unconstitutional and illogical difference in our sentencing structure here. Under this legislation, if it were to become law, I can threaten you to make you give me your wallet, and I would get one to three years. I could threaten you and make you give me your car keys, I would get one to three years. I could threaten you and do bodily... to do bodily harm to you and get one to three years. But if I threaten you to make your withdraw money

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

from the ATM machine, I would get, potentially, 30 to 60 years for making you take \$10 from an ATM machine. But, if I have you... give you... have you give me your wallet that has \$1000 in it, I'm doing one year as opposed to 60 years. The... the costs incurred with this, the policy incurred with this doesn't make sense. I understand the very troubling nature of this type of crime, but this is a crime like any other robbery or any other burglary, and if there's an enhancement here, it's definitely not one from a Class 4 felony to a Class X felony. It's bad policy. It will not stand up in a court of law. This is unconstitutional. is disproportionate. I... I understand what you're trying to do. Representative Howard, obviously, my comments are not directed at you, but this statute the way it's written... this Bill the way it's written, simply just does not work, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please, pay attention to this. know we all want to say that we're tough on crime, but we got to understand the laws that we're trying to pass out of this place, too."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Howard to respond."

Howard: "Representative Fritchey, persons who are standing at an ATM machine are particularly vulnerable. They generally have their back turned, and someone walks up to them and... and makes the threat, or does the deed with some armed... with some kind of firearm. That is why we believe that it is necessary to have this kind of penalty for that kind of crime."

Fritchey: "But in... in response to that, Rep... Representative.

A... a woman walking by herself down a dark street is equally

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

vulnerable. If I... if I were to... if I were to forcibly rob her and take her wallet, I would get one to three years. If I was to forcibly make her withdraw money from an ATM and give it to me, I would get 30 to 60 years. The same woman, the same vulnerability, the same crime."

Howard: "I... I think that there's a different situation going on here. As a woman, if I'm walking down the street, I generally turn around and I'm able to watch my back. I can turn around all the way. If I'm focusing on an ATM machine, and on the process of getting the numbers in correctly, that means I am distracted from anybody else who might approach me. So, I do think that the circumstances are different."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy,

Representative Careen Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Repre... Rep..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey, we've long gone over your two minutes, plus your one minute. Okay? So, one last minute and then Representative Gordon."

Fritchey: "That... that's fine, then I'll... I'll simply point this out. Ladies and Gentlemen, under... under the Sponsor's proposed legislation here, if... if I force the individual at the ATM machine to withdraw money and give it to me, I get 30 to 60 years. If I wait for them to take the money out of the ATM machine and then rob them, I get one to three years. That's not good policy and that's not good law. Thank you, Speaker, with the accommodation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Gordon."

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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Gordon, C.: "Representative, isn't this crime already covered under potentially robbery, armed robbery, aggravated robbery statutes with... in... with taking into consideration or not, under the aggravation and mitigation... mitigating factors statute in the sentencing code, you could have extended term sentencing on any of this? So, I mean, why specifically are you doing this when it's already the law?"
- Howard: "This legislation is speaking to a specific crime.

  There is not... this legislation... or this penalty for such a crime currently does not exist."
- Gordon, C.: "Well, for armed... armed robbery. Armed robbery... I mean... it's... the only thing it changes... it's the location of where it occurs, but... so, you're add... you're actually adding in another factor that they have to prove, but all the other elements are... are the same."
- Howard: "Mr. Speaker, please remove this from the record for a few minutes. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor take this Bill out of the record. Representative Rich Brauer, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 5688.

  Do you wish to move that Bill? Representative Brauer. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, you also have House Bill 6178. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6178, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brauer, one moment for a minute, please. Representative Currie."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would you please show the… let the record show that Representative Dugan is excused for the remainder of the afternoon."
- Speaker Lyons: "Clerk will so note. Thank you, Representative Brauer. Please, proceed."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a few years ago the General Assembly passed legislation stating that an arresting agency would not be liable for medical expenses due to self inflicted injury. I had a case where a young man murdered his father, tried to commit suicide, and then the county was responsible for that injury. There's a... that passed, became law, and this provision was inadvertently repealed by a later Bill. I'll... this Bill fixes that problem. I'll answer all questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on this Bill. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6178 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 Howard. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Annazette Collins, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 5916. Do you wish to call that Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Frank Mautino, on the Order of

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Third Readings, you have House Bill 6022. Representative Mautino, 6002, Frank? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6022, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Amendment #1 made changes to the introduced Bill, and this is an initiative of the Department of Revenue and it... it structures the tax payments, as paid to the distributor, supplier and reseller for their rates, and they would pay them on a quarterly or annual basis. the department establishes on January 1, April 1, and July 1 of each year the average selling price per gallon on motor fuel. This has to do with the single trip permits. And there are a number of changes. These are all agreed We have the single trip permits will be \$40. to. Currently, they're \$20, and it allows the permit to be valid for 96 hours instead of 72 hours. This is an initiative of the Department of Revenue working in conjunction with the Midwest Truckers. I know of no opposition. And be happy to answer any question."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the… the question is, 'Should House Bill 6022 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Pat Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's a 100… 76 Members voting

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- 'yes', 34 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 6368?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6368, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook on Amendment #1, Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6368 is... becomes the Bill. And as they said in the Sun-Times editorial today, it's the first step in cutting pensions and our long-term liability debt that the state has incurred over... over many years in our five pension systems that we fund. This Bill will only affect future entrance into the systems. Anyone who joins either the General Assembly Retirement System or the Judges Retirement System on or after July 1 of this year. The 20-year timeframe that has always been a part of those two systems will be maintained in this Bill: however, the percent per year will be a flat 3 percent. So, new members into those systems can attain a maximum benefit of 60 percent, which is 20 years times 3 percent. We also raised the age for the people to receive a pension under these systems to 67 years old, and they can receive a reduced pension if they're willing to take... or if they want to take it starting at 62. The... there is a COLA in here that is the Consumer Price

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Index for urban, either that will be figured every year, or 3 percent, whichever one is less. And the... the final average salary for both of the systems will be based on the last 8 years. And one of the good things about this is because we're implementing this for immediate... for new members after July 1 is there's not only a great reduction in long-term liability through the plan of 2045, but even in this year through our current pension formula, the way we determine every year what the proper payment is to the systems, the reforms we have in this Bill will reduce the commitment under JRS by \$21 million and under GARS, because we're so small, by \$900 thousand. So, when the Governor talked about looking for \$300 million in relief this year through reforms, he was talking about the way we have the formula, the way we... some people don't like the formula... I'm not really excited about the formula myself. it should be changed long-term. But, we're having such a hard time meeting the formula payments as they are today, that trying to say we're going to change that at this point, I think is a little bit foolhardy. But under that formula, the payments that we're going to send to the system this year will be reduced by \$22 million, so I think it's a good start in that direction. I think it also, you know, many of us who have defended our own pension over the years when we met with the groups, the fact that we've always had the highest percent pension of 85 percent, I think it is more in keeping what the average citizen of Illinois will have. Actually, much... much more, but it does reduce it down to 60 percent. So, I'm very, very grateful

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

that for the first time, we did pass a pension reform Bill out of committee last year with just 6 Democratic votes. This year, everybody on the committee, some energetically than others, I will admit, but all 9 Members the Pensions Committee who were with us yesterday morning did vote in support of this Bill. There was one opponent which was the judges system itself, but some of the other groups such as the education groups did not file any position on the Bill. So, I really feel that we have to say to the general public that this is something that we understand how important it is. Any of you who have studied our budget problems, this long-term debt to the pension systems is the number one problem we have. We can change education funding every year. We say we owe it this much, but that is a fluctuating thing. This is a hard debt. And since we started this reform process, we've had a mantra that says promises made will be promises kept. And if we really want to do that, we have to do these reforms to the system, because there's no way we're going to be able to honor the promises we made in the past. Because this only affects new members, I think we can say, promises made will be promises kept under this system. And I think that the new people coming into it, and I know there's some disagreement with this, but if you go check with your local citizens back home, you read the editorials that were in the paper today about this, the average citizen of Illinois has nothing that's even as good as this new reform's going to be for the judges, and the General Assembly Members. And I can promise you that we will still be able to attract

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

high quality candidates to both of those occupations. And I think whatever we do in the future to the other systems controlled by the state, we will continue to attract high quality candidates to those positions, as well. So, I welcome any questions, and I really encourage you to be as supportive as you can. I think this is a great first step for us. We're doing it to our... our own future Members first to let the public, as I said before, know we're very, very serious about this. And I think it's time we start moving on it and show them that we're going to make reforms that are actually going to make a difference, not only long-term into the future, but actually on this budget year. So, thank you. And I'd answer any questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Well, you certainly have everybody's attention, Representative McCarthy. So, we'll start with Representative Will Davis on Amendment #1."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "I'll wait 'til you finish giving your autograph there, Representative."

McCarthy: "I'm sorry, Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "I just... I just have one simple question. I... how does this House Bill differ from what's happening in the Senate? Are these identical measures? I had a conversation with Senator Trotter last night and he told me about some of what they're doing with regard to pension. So, I'm just trying to find out if what you're doing

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

mirrors what they're doing, or is it different than what they're doing? Are we going to get a... a different Bill coming over from the Senate?"

McCarthy: "This is... this Bill is just onto itself. So..."

Davis, W.: "It's just what?"

McCarthy: " ... it's nothing mirrored in it just yet. Members of the Senate, and Senator Cullerton's staff are very much aware of this. As soon as the Amendment was drafted, it was given to them. Senator Raoul, when he was visiting you today, I actually spoke to him about, you know, giving me an answer as to whether he was going to pick this up or not. From what I've heard, they are making some significant steps. To my way of thinking, this is a much more significant step forward. They're working with some of the other systems. I don't see this as that every other system's going to get the same kind of changes as I think these two systems are unique and that this. they're more like a 20-year career path as opposed to the 35 to 40 year that our regular state employees or teachers would have. So, I know they're working on that. I'm proud to say they're going to move some things forward, from what I understand, but I have every intention to work closely with the Senate so they will pick up this measure and pass it as is."

Davis, W.: "Okay. And so, my... then finally... so, the teachers groups are neutral on this or they're..."

McCarthy: "They... they filed no slip whatsoever. They were both... they were at the meetings, and..."

Davis, W.: "They were at the meetings."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "...they told me they were not going to... not going to file a slip at the committee yesterday, and they did not."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley." Representative Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: " Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, can you... this is a piece of sweeping legislation, but can you give me any idea on the cost savings over time with this? For example, you know, we're talking about 90 percent coverage, you know, here to... at 2045. Do we get to that, you know, in a shorter period of time, or... just give me an idea of the cost savings."

McCarthy: "Well, as you know, everything we do, any kind of pension legislation, they always talk as far as the rule of the 2045 clock that we're on to get us to a 90 percent thing."

Riley: "Right."

McCarthy: "So, over the years, from now until 2045, it will save the state over \$1.65 billion. And remember, these are the two smallest systems by far..."

Riley: "Right."

McCarthy: "...of the systems that we regulate..."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

McCarthy: "...and \$22 million this year off the formula payment.

So, that frees up \$22 million to spend on other necessary programs."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters."

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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

"Kevin, one question that I have, it concerns the Winters: report from the Civic Committee of The Commercial Club of Chicago. Which within the last month suggested that we could also look in reforming our pension systems at the current employees of the state, that the guarantee that we thought that was sacrosanct under the constitutional provision that you could not reduce pensions, actually, if you look at Appellate Court decisions in Illinois courts, only applies to those pension benefits that have already been earned. In other words, a Member of the General Assembly or a judge who has served for 10 years would have guaranteed what he already has earned, but the schedule that he's under in future years could be diminished. Have you reviewed that at all, and have you considered including that? While this is a good, I think, first step in setting up new employees for lessened benefits, all of us currently here, and judges that are currently serving could also reduce our future benefits that we will be earning in the future. Have you looked at that at all?"

McCarthy: "Well, we certainly studied it in the task force, and I've had many conversations with Mr. Eden Martin, who you're referring to in the… and he has shared with me the legal opinion that has been used with private companies where they've done that. They've… they have guaranteed the benefits up to the date, a date certain, and then they change them into the future. This Bill does not do that. This Bill does affect all new future entrants. I have taken the position that the Governor also spoke about last

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

year, in that I think the promises we made, we should keep to the current employees and the current retirees. But I also said in committee yesterday, and now that we got some movement on this, and I, hopefully, this will inspire even more movement, I... I said to my fellow committee Members there, but it's open to all the Members of the House, if you have a Bill that's coming forward, we..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters, your two minutes are up. If you could finish the question, and then we'll move on."

McCarthy: "I... I would ask that you give a little extra time because I took most of it just with the explanation there. We have looked at that closely. It's not included in this, Dave. I think that's much more sweeping and we could study that into the future. But, I think it's so important, before we start taking on constitutional challenges like that that would automatically pop up if they were in a Bill like this. I'd rather move forward with a clean Bill that'll give us some relief this year and of course, long-term, and we certainly could address that later. And all I was saying was that, I... I told the Members of the committee, and like I say, it's open to the other House Members, you come forward with an idea, we'll give it a full debate in that Pension Committee and... and move forward if it... if it has the necessary support."

Winters: "Well, I... I agree that it probably is. This is clean.

There won't be a constitutional challenge to this, and I have legislation being drafted at... at LRB, so I'd love to add you as a co-sponsor when that is ready to be filed."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "I'll look it over. I already got enough targets on my back, but an extra one will fit there, too, Dave."

Winters: "Very good. Thank you, Kevin."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative McCarthy, I salute what you're doing here. I intend to vote for your Bill, but is there a severability clause in this?"

McCarthy: "No, Sir."

Rose: "Well, as you know, several years ago, we stopped funding pay raises and the judges sued and went all the way to guess what, the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court agreed with the judges, and they've had a pay raise every year since."

McCarthy: "I've always been shocked that when judges go before judges, they win a lot, but..."

Rose: "Yeah. It's stunning, isn't it?"

McCarthy: "...but I... I've had challenges before on some of my Bills from my original Bill in this chamber that went all the way to the Supreme Court. And I won on that one, and I think that the Attorney General will, if it becomes necessary, we will ask the Attorney General to defend us to the highest court in the land."

Rose: "Well..."

McCarthy: "And I think we... I don't think it will go that far though. I think we will win at the lower levels."

Rose: "Well, being that it's... and I guess my fear, as you just correctly noted, the deck is stacked when the judges are

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

suing themselves, in their own courtrooms. Beings we're on second here, could we insert a severability clause to make sure that this would stay in place should they knock out their own... the changes to their own?"

McCarthy: "I certainly will entertain that in... in the Senate.

I don't think I want to stop it at this point, but I will
talk to you more about it if it's... I mean, I... I think
that's probably a good idea."

Rose: "Representative, you're a man of your word..."

McCarthy: "I'll ask my Senate..."

Rose: "...and I'll take it at that because..."

McCarthy: "...Sponsor. So..."

Rose: "...I think that would further enhance this legislation.

So, thank you."

McCarthy: "I think that's a good idea."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative André Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Representative McCarthy, just as a matter of clarification, would you please clarify the judges objection... (audio malfunction) to this piece of legislation considering that it does not affect sitting judges?"

McCarthy: "The... all that's... there was no slip filed, but Tim Blair, who represents the State Employee Retirement System, which includes the state employees, our system, and the judges, said that he did contact his board, and they said they wanted to file opposition. He never clarified what that was, and... and there was... and there was no questions of

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

the committee of Mr. Blair about that matter. So, I would only be guessing, you know, but..."

Thapedi: "Will you be able to ascertain what the judges objection is by the time we get to Third Reading?"

McCarthy: "I... you know... they had a... they had a chance if they would of allowed us to spell it out more clearly than that. I would just be assuming what it is. I think all of us can assume on our own what they think that is. But, you know, some of them talk about attracting better candidates and everything else. I think this will still be a very, very attractive position to be a judge. I mean, the current... the lowest paid judges today are close to \$170 thousand. This pension if they stay 20 years, you know, cost of living going up from the Social Security maximum today, it's going to be somewhere above 65 to 70 thousand dollars for the first people leaving the... the system under this new So, I think, you know, holding a position where order. you're making that sizable amount of money, which will certainly allow you to invest in, you know, other forms for your... for your retirement, and having a \$70 thousand pension to look forward to, I think is a very, very attractive offer. And I... I don't think we'll have a hard time. I think there'll be a lot of... a lot of lawyers out there that'll be more than willing to look at, you know, going on the bench with those kinds of benefits."

Thapedi: "So, if I understand correctly, this applies to associate judges, full circuit judges, Appellate Court Judges and Supreme Court Justices, as well, correct?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "It applies to all members of the judges retirement system, and I... everyone you mentioned is included."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the ... "

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

"Thank you. Representative, I thought I heard you say Eddy: earlier, it got a little loud, but the actuarial calculation regarding the savings in the amount of next year's projected payment to the five systems of ILPERS would... would be \$22 million less based implementation of these reforms, or modernizations, for future judges and General Assembly Members?"

McCarthy: "Correct. And the... and the gentleman from SERS passed that out to all the members of the committee yesterday, and I can certainly make a copy available to you to show what that reduction is for all the years from now until 2045."

Eddy: "'Cause this is a little different approach than we've seen in... in past years, and that was an attempt to get to a certain number and substantiate, okay, we want to make this much of a payment. What this is, is a true calculation of the savings and the proposal would be to apply that, not some number that would underfund the... the system with a calculated payment. That... that's the approach you're taking."

McCarthy: "The approach is to make sure that we stay at least, at least, at the bare minimum to make the payments under the formula. The formula, as applied, with these long-term

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

benefits down the road being reduced, comes up at this year, the 2011 payment, will be that much less."

Eddy: "For that closed group. That's what you're talking about. But you're talking about only... only changing the payment based on the amount of the actuarial savings for that particular year. You're not talking about trying to get to a number where we want to try and eliminate... I think, last year we wanted to get to a certain dollar amount. We're... we're really looking at the actuarial calculation as the basis for the payment?"

McCarthy: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Other question I have, this has a cap in it, and the cap is a Social Security cap..."

Speaker Lyons: "Go ahead, Representative. We'll give you another minute to finish your question."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

McCarthy: "Yes, it does. It starts in 2011 with the current maximal pensionable sal… maximal Social Security wage base, which is \$106,800. It will move up, you know, for the people in that class, the new entrants, it'll move up at the CPI urban. So, probably by the time the first person would be… would be applied here, say it's 15 years down the road, that cap could be as high as like 120 thousand."

Eddy: "Now, that doesn't preclude the individual from... through a defined contribution program of some type, adding some type of other retirement system. This is just the public portion of any individual's retirement would be capped at that amount. Is that correct?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "Correct. I mean, they could... under current law, they can contribute to like a 457(b)plan like we do, and like we can today, and that would not change under this for the new members. And they certainly will have some... they should have some ample income there that is above the hundred... you know, move their salary down to \$106 thousand, they would be able... they won't be taxed at the 11 percent for the contribution to the system. So, they could use that money at their discretion to put into a..."

Eddy: "So... so would there still be an employer contribution to any amount over that, or would the employer..."

McCarthy: "Ab... absolutely none."

Eddy: "...contribution end at the cap?"

McCarthy: "At... No, no. There will... the only employer contribution will be for their defined-benefit Plan. Which we worked hard to maintain a defined-benefit plan because, you know, there are people talking... Well, I had the original Bill over a year ago about going to a defined-contribution plan. It wasn't very warmly received, I'd have to say, by any of the systems."

Eddy: "Representative, I know this is on Second and there's an Amendment, and I... and I have a lot more questions, but I'm sure I can an... answer those on Third... or get those answered on Third Reading. Let me just ask, when do you anticipate calling this for a final vote?"

McCarthy: "It's 4:00 right now, so..."

Eddy: "Today?"

McCarthy: "I... I would... I don't know. I'm going to have to work with the Chair and... I'm not trying to rush anything

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

through. We put everything out on paper, and so… I mean, I would love to call it right now 'cause I'm very excited about getting this thing going forward, but the…"

Eddy: "Well, I'm going to just... I want to quickly commend you on all the work you've done, and also just state, you know, some of these modernizations are things that everybody agrees to. We think they're common sense moving forward. We just want to make sure for clarification, once we get to that point, that some of those things are on the record, and I'd appreciate knowing when that vote might take place so that we can be prepared."

McCarthy: "I would say that I have faith that our Leadership will work with yours, and if your Leadership wants us to delay it a day or something... I mean, I do have some Members here who have told me they really wanted to vote for this and for one family reason or another, they might not be here tomorrow. So, I would love to do it today just so I can honor their requests that they want to be here to vote. Plus... plus, I want their vote. But, if... I'm sure if Leader Cross makes a serious..."

Eddy: "Yeah, I... I think with proper time to study this..."

McCarthy: "Yeah. I mean, Roger..."

Eddy: "...unless it can't be done today."

McCarthy: "...I... I would state that I'd be more than willing to wait until tomorrow or..."

Eddy: "Well, let's make it clear, this isn't an objection. We just want to have time to study it."

McCarthy: "I understand that. I..."

Eddy: "Certainly, some things in here..."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "I... I understand that."

Eddy: "...we support. There's some..."

McCarthy: "I appreciate the support I've gotten from your side."

Eddy: "...very good modernizations in here I think that are models, and... and we just need a little time to... to make sure, and I appreciate that."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy, final comments...

Amendment."

McCarthy: "No, thank you. You must be talking to me."

Speaker Lyons: "Yeah, I'm talking to you."

McCarthy: "No, I mean, I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Final comments. You're... you're the final speaker."

McCarthy: "...if... if they... if you have concerns, if you in the Chair have concerns, and delaying it until tomorrow is, you know, wasn't my number one wish but if the... today... can't..."

Speaker Lyons: "Now, why don't you hold on a minute.

Representative Eddy, what..."

Eddy: "Inquiry of the Chair. The status of the Bill, has it been read a second time? I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "This is the Second Reading of this Bill. Second only. Has not been read a second time, previously."

Eddy: "So, I... I think based on... I don't think we can. I think... is that right? We need to wait?"

Speaker Lyons: "Well, let me get back to you on that, Representative Eddy. Representative McCarthy."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

McCarthy: "Thank you, Speaker. My intention is to adopt the Amendment today, and we will not call it on Third today."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Representative Eddy, Roger, you okay with that? Okay. So, I've heard the Gentleman's Motion to... for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. We'll do a Roll Call vote on this. All in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 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. 109 Members voted 'yes', 1 Member has voted 'no'. Amendment #1 is adopted to House Bill 6368. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Back to the Order of Third Readings. Representative Karen May, you have House Bill 6103. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6103, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

May: "Yes. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 6103 just says that our mental health facilities around the state, that anyone who is a veteran would get free mental health services. And this is under DHS, they are neutral on the Bill. They said it would have a very nominal impact. And I think it's important as more and more of our service people are reservists going over. Right now, we have three thousand that are serving in Afghanistan last year, that when they come back with post-traumatic stress disorder... I have a picture, a story here from the paper,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

someone in Oak Lawn, a veteran killed his wife. I think it's important that we make sure that all of our veterans can use our state mental health facilities to get free counseling."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation, is there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6103 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? voted who wish? Representative Eddie Jackson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Jackson. this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 6047. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6047, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sid Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 60... House Bill 6047 just clarifies that a hybrid vehicle is eligible for a conversion cost rebate under the current Alternate Fuels Rebate Program. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you heard the explanation. Is there any questions on House Bill 6047? Seeing none, the quest... Representative Franks, question of Representative Mathias."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Franks: "Thank you. Representative, what's the genesis of this Bill?"
- Mathias: "I believe there was some issue about whether or not it was covered under the program, the existing program, and this is to... just to clarify that."
- Franks: "Are we actually paying out on these, 'cause I know we have a lot of programs in the State of Illinois, such as for solar. If you put some solar panels on your house, or if you want to put a windmill up, and we talk about... we talk a good game, but then when you go check to see if there's any money's there, there's never anything there funded. Has this line item been funded in the last year's budget?"
- Mathias: "Well, it's supposed to be, but whether they paid it out, I don't know."
- Franks: "And... and the only reason I bring it up because we had that Bill just a few... a few minutes ago about the unfunded mandates, and it's... with the schools, and it seems like, we're perpetuating a cruel hoax on folks, that if they think they're going to get some state... state assistance here, but oftentimes, there's none available even though we passed a law. So, I'm a little concerned about continuing to vote for these programs if they're not going to be appropriated. Because I think what we're doing is a disservice to our citizens by paying lip service to these types of green technologies, but then never funding them. I think we have to put our money where our mouth is."
- Mathias: "I will be glad to talk to IEPA and get back to you on that."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Franks: "Thank you."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Franks: "And I appreciate you bringing this forward but enough's enough. If we... I we really do have a commitment to these type of technologies and to green issues, then we'd have to... we have to fund them. But otherwise, we should take these Bills off the books..."

Mathias: "I'll... I'll..."

Franks: "...and tell people the truth."

Mathias: "I'll get you an answer."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias to close."

Mathias: "I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 6047 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 Ford. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.
This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Susana Mendoza, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 5247.
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5247, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Susana Mendoza.

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5247 amends the Day and Temporary Laborer

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Services Act by requiring third party clients that use temporary or day labor services, to pay wages and payroll taxes to the day and temporary labor service agency that provided said labor. Basically, what we're trying to do here is to ensure that if a third party client does not pay the day laborer for the fees that they had to pay up front to the people employed, that the labor agency would be able to either file a complaint with the Department of Labor that the Department of Labor would then investigate for cause of negative finding or not, or be able to take the third party client to court. There is no opposition that I know of to this legislation. I think it's an important message to send that if these day labor agencies are doing their part, which is paying for the services rendered, the third party contractor should also do their part, which is pay the labor agency. Again, no opposition to this Bill. The agreed... the language is agreed upon between the Department of Labor and the staffing agencies. And I would certainly be happy to answer any questions, and would ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Representative Rita, do you have questions of Representative Mendoza? The Gentleman does not seek recognition. Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5247 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Harry Osterman, you have House Bill 5480. Out of the record. Representative Cynthia Soto, you have House Bill 5060. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5060, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Cynthia Soto."
- Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5060 amends the Unified Code of Corrections by expanding the type of evidence that can be subpoenaed for investigations and hearings regarding alleged violations of parole, or a mandatory supervised release. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 50... 5060 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Rita."
- Rita: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to let the record reflect that on... on House Bill 6368, Amendment #1, it was supposed to be a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Are you sure, Representative? Are you positive?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Rita: "I'm... I'm positive."

Speaker Lyons: "You're positive. The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative."

Rita: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente, you have House Bill 4726.

Representative Sente, you have House Bill 4726. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4726, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Carol Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill assists in the control and maintenance of diabetes. It changes the classification of glucose monitor test strips from pharmaceuticals to durable medical equipment and therefore, makes the purchase of the test strips more affordable for the consumer. Currently, the glucose monitor and the lancet, are already covered and both classified under durable equipment. So, therefore, the only missing element for an individual to test their blood is the test strip. This Bill would place all three components under the same category, and the test strips and lancets are required to make the machine work. It is not uncommon for accessories to be part of durable medical equipment and to be all included under this classification. For example, for sleep apnea, the CPAP machine is classified durable, and so is the mask and the hose. With diabetes being such a large issue and cost to the United States and the State of Illinois, I... this change would be very helpful in making it

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

more affordable for the diabetes patient. And I'm happy to take questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation of the Bill. Is there any question? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I..."

Speaker Lyons: "Well, to the Bill."

Osmond: "I believe that the Sponsor's intentions are good and honorable, but each one of us are faced with the cost of rising insurance premiums. And the problem here is that this is another unfunded mandate where, actually, the cost is going back on the individual on all of us. And in this wonderful book that we... we just received, Leg... Legislators' Guide to the Issues of 2010, it states in here that Illinois has... the average for mandates in the states are 42 and Illinois, right now, has 47 different types of mandates. And I believe that the intentions are good for this Sponsor, but I really ask to consider the fact that this is another mandate that we do not need in the insurance industry. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, is this for the state insurance program or is this for all public and private insurance?"

Sente: "The state already covers it, so this is for self and employer based plans."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Reis: "So, another mandate on businesses, another sure cost increased as far as premiums, and we have a health care crisis. This is exactly what our problem is. We keep adding more and more mandates. The insurance companies have to underwrite this future expenditures into their premiums. I guess it all plays along with what we're trying to do out there. So, I think it's been said already that so many things we do here just adds to the problems. I understand that certain things are covered and certain things aren't covered, but we cannot as a government, both state and federal, be everything for everybody. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "That... you know, Representative Sente, you and I had a discussion about this yesterday and I was trying to... was trying to figure out whether this was better or worse than what we have now because you know, most insurance companies do have some kind of reimbursement rate for diabetes testing equipment. And I just wondered if you knew what the average of that... that was, somehow, what most insurance companies do."

Sente: "I've been looking into this and it is a difficult question to answer just because of the variety of plans, the deductibles, and if a company provides a pharmaceutical benefit, or I went and talked to my pharmacist to various diabetes patients, looked online, checked the policy that my office provides to our 20 employees. Generally, I have

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

found that if you have durable medical equipment... in fact, for this constituent who brought this to me, this was 100 percent covered. Test strips were 100 percent covered. you're... if you have a P... and he had an HMO plan through Blue Cross Blue Shield. If it's a pharmaceutical, there is no generic test strip. And so, you have your brand, your formulary, and your generic. So, it's going to be at the... at the brand... its going be... going to be at the formulary rate. So, that might be, again, depending on your plan, maybe \$60 to \$100 copay. And so, you also have to look at how often you're going to test your blood. have diabetes 1 or 2, you may be testing your blood anywhere from a couple times a day, to 14 times a day. Again, depending on the diabetes you have. The retail cost for a strip ranges from 30 cents to about a... \$1.50, with an average of about a dollar. So if you had an HSA plan, you would be paying retail 'til you reached your deductible. So, that's why it's a little bit of a hard question to answer..."

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

I'll give you another minute to finish your..."

Tryon: "My time..."

Speaker Lyons: "...line of questions."

Tryon: "Wait, I thought I got to ask a question. I think my...
my response took up my question time there. But you know,
that happens. Maybe I asked an open-ended question and I
need to learn from that. You know, diabetes, I suffer from
diabetes. I've been very open about that, and I have to
say that... that testing should be encouraged because the

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

complications that occur from diabetes are... are more costly to an insurance company than the testing strips or the testing equipment could ever be. It leads to amputations, it leads to kidney disease, it leads to eye diseases, it leads to blindness, and it... and if somebody is there that has diabetes continues to test, continues to keep their blood sugar under control, the cost to an insurance company and the cost to society is extremely less than... than if they didn't. So, I think in... in order to promote good health and good testing, and lower insurance costs, I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beth Coulson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Coulson: "Representative, I... as I understand it, you're trying to move test strips from being covered by insurance already under one part of the plan, to a different part of the plan. Is that correct? Is that what this Bill does?"

Sente: "Correct. If you have a pharmaceutical component on to your current plan."

Coulson: "And do all insurance companies cover durable medical equipment?"

Sente: "Virtually, all of them do, yes."

Coulson: "So, what you're... I guess... let me ask you in anther way. Who or where did this idea come from for moving it from one place to the other?"

Sente: "The idea originally came from a constituent in my district. I also have a 25-page document of... of diabetes

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

patients complaining about the test... the cost of test strips. It's... it's really an insurmountable issue and we want to make sure that we're focusing on prevention and maintenance of the disease."

Coulson: "And... and absolutely, that's the, you know, the... the testing is so important as Representative Tryon mentioned.

But, I'm... what I'm concerned about is that I'm not sure this is going to make it any..."

Speaker Lyons: "Beth, hold on a second."

Coulson: "...better for people."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could bring the noise level down just a little bit. A pretty important discussion going on here, please. Shhh. Thank you. Go ahead, Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "I'm not sure it's going to make it any better for people to put it under durable medical equipment. And originally, when we talked about this, I had asked you to look into the Medicare regulations and where they have it, and how that is covered. Were you able to find that information, and if so, what was it?"

Sente: "I did look. You had two questions; under Medicare, it is currently under pharmaceutical. The lancet was not listed under there. And you asked about it being durable... I mean, the... the term of durable has a very specific definition, and it doesn't mean ex... that it can expire..."

Coulson: "Correct. Correct."

Sente: "...but a test strip is used only once."

Coulson: "Yeah. And I... that's why I'm bringing this up.

Because I'm... I'm... we cannot change Medicare coverage and I

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

don't want to... people to believe that if you do this, you're going to be changing it for every single person that has coverage. You're not going to be changing any of the federal programs. And on top of that, you are also going to be making a piece of equipment that is not a durable piece of equipment, but can only be used once, to be covered under a part of a plan that is supposed to be for, just as it says, durable medical equipment. And my concern is that people were... are going to try to purchase a test strip that might expire, or might on... is only being able to be used once, but might try to use them more than once and I'm... I'm a little concerned about having the definition under test strip being under a durable medical equipment. So, I appreciate your having gotten those answers for me. Obviously, Medicare does not consider this a durable medical piece of equipment. They tend to pay for the majority of diabetes supplies. So, I'm... I'm very concerned about this change making it very confusing for patients. So, thank you."

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: "I was listening to the debate, and I want to make sure I understand this. What you're trying to do, I understand, is to move the test strips to be classified like other items that are used for diabetes treatment, correct?"

Sente: "Yes."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Franks: "Okay. So, right now, is this... this is one thing, like, hanging out on its own and it's not with the rest of the group. Correct?"
- Sente: "Absolutely, and the… and the lancet, which is also only used once, is already under durable medical equipment.

  This groups all items that are used with the monitor."
- Franks: "So, it's a commonsense approach to put it all under one area, and it's not as the previous speaker said, would be confusing to patients because patients don't really care. They're going to be getting the same product, regardless, but this is a way to keep it all under one area of the code. Correct?"

Sente: "Absolutely, and at a lower cost."

- Franks: "Okay. Well, then, to the Bill. That makes perfect sense and I appreciate what Representative Tryon had said, as well. Now, Representative Tryon got up and he talked about this from a personal nature. And this is a commonsense piece... piece of legislation that not only will help keep people healthy and save lives, but it will also save our state money. This is a Bill that we all should be voting for because it cleans up the code, makes sense not only for issues of public safety, but will also save us money. Please vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan. On fire, Rosemary."
- Mulligan: "It's either me or you trying to do some... Thank you,
  Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

115th Legislative Day

- Mulligan: "Representative, did you inquire what would happen to a Medicare supplemental policy that already treats them differently? Did you get any responses back on what would happen if that actually changes the definition?"
- Sente: "No, I didn't because this Bill applies to only private plans and employer plans, not to Medicare."
- Mulligan: "When you change anything by law, it changes what can be then used for a test of the law. So, I mean, that could be a problem. And private plans, depending where they are, are the only ones that would be covered. Employer plans, mostly, unless you're Bill changes it, would be covered by URISA and it wouldn't cover them anyway if they're out of the state. So, it's not going to cover as much as you think it would, but the issue would be more what does it do legally to the definition? And I don't think you have all the answers on that."
- Sente: "Some of the items that you brought up are not my understanding, and under the definition of durable medical equipment, again, the lancet is currently durable medical equipment. It is used much in the same way the test strip is. One time to test your blood, and then it is discarded. This combines the two items and moves them over for use with the monitor in a very effective and cost-effective way."
- Mulligan: "Well, I guess it'll be awhile before we actually find out the actual consequences of this."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mary Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative, is this medically necessary?"

Sente: "Is testing your blood for diabetes medically necessary?"

Flowers: "Yeah, is it medically necessary?"

Sente: "Absolutely."

Flowers: "And so, what would happen if a person that's diabetic doesn't test their blood?"

Sente: "A variety of things, at the worst, amputation and death. I mean, diabetes, as you know, is a very, very serious disease."

Flowers: "And so, if it's medically necessary and the insurance company, by law, should they cover what is medically necessary? If the doctor says that this is medically necessary and they have insurance, I mean, would it not make sense for them to cover… 'cause you did say this cost about 30 cents… from 30 cents to a dollar and some odd per strip? How much would it cost if they had to go to the emergency room of a hospital, approximately?"

Sente: "Much more."

Flowers: "And even a doctor visit it would cost more? It's...

this is a... this is a very good piece of legislation. And I
would really urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Sente: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente to close."

Sente: "Diabetes is the seventh leading cause of death. This is no small issue. I also am a small business owner. I choose the insurance policy that protects 20 families based

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

on prevention. We want diabetes maintained and this encourages it. It places the classification, all three, in the same category where they belong. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 4726 pass?'
  All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mathias. Howard. Cole. Connie. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 77 Members voting 'yes', 30 Members voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Don Moffitt, you have House Bill 4779. Out of the record. Representative Sandy Pihos, you have House Bill 5890. Representative Pihos, ready to move the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5890, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of the House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Sandy Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5890 provides that a prescription order may contain, at the discretion of the individual issuing the order, information on the indicated use of a drug. It's not required to list the illness or disease, but it may contain the drug and the purpose for which it is being prescribed. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5890 pass?' All those in

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapin Rose. Representative Rose, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddie Washington, you have House Bill 4910. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4910, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Ed Washington."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the back side of House Bill 4909, which we passed the other day. And what it does, it amends the Older Adult Services Act, changes the composition of the Older Adult Service Advisory Committee by allowing the Director of the Department on Aging to appoint one member representing municipal, township, or county officials. Thirty members will be appointed by the Director of the Department on Aging in collaboration with the Director of Public Health and Healthcare and Family Services. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan. Wait a minute, Rosemary. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, it's getting awfully loud on the floor. Can we please shhh."

Mulligan: "Are we having a fight down there?"

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you very much. Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think what they're doing is they're telling Representative DeLuca to never leave his chair again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, we just passed, probably, three Bills that cut out every advisory group for the Department of Aging. Can you tell me why you're adding a new one with all these members?"

Washington: "Yes, Ma'am. House Bill 4910 is an initiative that is put forth by the Department on Aging. Under the current law, 32 members are appointed by the Director of the Department on Aging, one member representing township officials, one member representing municipalities and one member representing county officials. The department was having problems with participation as far as having three separate individuals representing municipal, township or county official. So, the department feels that it is better to instead, having only one person to represent those inter... interested."

Mulligan: "So, we just cut out... and I can't go back and remember them all, but we've just gone through them in the last couple days, maybe three to four boards so they could add a new and different one? And appoint all these new people or... who's appointing them, the Department of Aging or the Legislative Leaders in the Department of Aging or the Governor's Office?"

115th Legislative Day

- Washington: "Rep... Representative, to my understanding, it is a collaboration done with some of the entities you mentioned in collaboration, also, with the Public Health and Healthcare and Family Services. Things were going smoothly, but as it stated and I just read..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan, your time has expired.

  We'll give you another minute to finish your discussion."
- Washington: "As I just read to you, it was done due to the lack of participation. And so, I... I think they would rather shorten it than lengthen it and try to achieve the common goals involved."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4910 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 Riley. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bob Pritchard, you have House Bill 4947. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4947, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This piece of legislation amends the Property Tax Code and the Special Assessment Supplemental Bond and Procedures Act by allowing the owner or owners of a record of a parcel to be divided for special

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

assessment purposes. It requires all owners of record to be in an agreement. It allows the board of review to of these apportionments to request and approve if it is just and equitable. It requires a petition to subsequently be filed with the court, and an order entered to... unless the court finds that it is unjust and inequitable, and it applies prospectively only. I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Representative Riley, do you seek recognition on this Bill? Representative Al Riley."
- Riley: "Not on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to inform the Chair that on House Bill... the vote on House Bill 4810, my switch was stuck. I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request. Seeing no further questions for Representative Pritchard's Bill, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4947 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommer and Cultra. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapin Rose, you have House Bill 6141. Representative Rose, wish to call the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6141, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill would return to the Rose: taxpayers a minimum of \$36 million by requiring those who blow off court appearances to reimburse the taxpayers for We surveyed my district, as well as the Illinois State Police, to come up with that estimate, but it would be at least \$36 million in funds returned locally to taxpayers, reimburse them the cost. The committee had a very good suggestion that we make sure that people who made a good faith attempt to appear or, perhaps, were unable to appear because they were sick, should not be stuck with such a penalty. So, the Amendment was attached that includes a good faith exception where for good cause, they are unable to appear or if they voluntarily surrender themselves within 48 hours. But this could, again, could raise a substantial amount of money for the State of Illinois, as well as for our local counties and local police departments by simply making those who blow off criminal court appearance pay the cost of going to... going to get them and bring them back. And this only applies to criminal failure to appear warrants."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6141 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Poe and Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia, on the Order of Third Reading you have House Bill 5341. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5341, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Let me pull up my Bill. What House Bill 5341 does is it changes the validity of instruction permits for minor in certain situations and makes it unlawful to supervise a minor driver while under the influence of alcoholic drugs or combat it thereafter, makes it a misdemeanor. This is whether the child is under a permit and the parent, or guardian, or adult that is actually in the car while the child's on a permi... permit, is actually intoxicated. So, I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5341 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 Osmond. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to start doing some Second Readings, some Bills that you have as your

115th Legislative Day

- priorities that are on Second Readings to see if you wish to move them to Third Reading. Before I start, I'll let... Mr. Clerk, do you have an announcement?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on March 18, 2010: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6359."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the Order of Second Readings, Representative Patti Bellock, you have House Bill 3693. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Brady, you have House Bill 5197 that's on hold. Out of the record? What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk? House Bill 5197."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5197 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. A Floor Amendment was referred to the Rules Committee and has not been reported out."
- Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Out of the record. Representative Brauer, you have House Bill 3323. Out of the record. Representative Monique Davis, on the Order of Second Reading you have House Bill 6450. Do you wish to move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading? Out of the record. Will Davis, you have House Bill 4826. Standing next to me. You want to move that Bill? What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4826, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits has been read a second time, previously. No Amendments. All notes have been filed."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Ken Dunkin. Is Representative Dunkin on the floor? Representative Bob Flider, you have House Bill 5879. Do you care to move that Bill, Representative? Representative Flider, you want to move that Bill to Third? What the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5879, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Representative Mary Flowers, you have House Bill 4825. Do you wish to move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4825, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "House Bill 4825, it's on Third Reading? Leave that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Fritchey, you have House Bill 6072. Representative John Fritchey, do you want to move that Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Esther Golar, you have House Bill 6177. Out of the record. Representative Julie Hamos, you have House Bill 6115. On the Order of Second Reading, Representative. Out of the record. Representative Roger Eddy, you have House Bill 6041. Out of the record. Representative Mike Fortner, you have House Bill 5555. Do you want to move that Bill up to Third Reading? Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Is there... is there Amendment?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"

115th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "On House Bill 5555, a Floor Amendment has been referred to Rules Committee, but not yet reported out."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

  Representative Bob Pritchard, on the Order of Second Reading, you have House Bill 5942. Representative Pritchard. Out of the record. Representative Greg Harris, you have House Bill 5691 on Second Reading, 5691. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5691, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris on Floor Amendment #2."
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is at the request of the department asking that we put... have the continuing education requirements in rule, as opposed to statute so that we don't have to come back to the Legislature every time the course work changes."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Hernandez. Lisa, you have House Bill 4927 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

115th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4927, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jay Hoffman, you have House Bill 6152 on Second Reading. You want to move the Bill, Jay? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6152, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Debbie Mell, you have House Bill 5226. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5226, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Connie Howard, you have House Bill 5401 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, you have House Bill 4936. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? 4936. Out of the record. Representative Chuck Jefferson, you have House Bill 6315. Out of the record. Representative Saviano, you have House Bill 5026. Out of the record. Representative Dave Winters, you have House Bill 5655 on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5655, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. However, a Floor Amendment was

115th Legislative Day

- referred to the Rules Committee and not yet approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

  Representative McCarthy, you have House Bill 4851 on the

  Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4851, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. All Mot... notes have been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Jack McGuire, you have House Bill 6125. Jack, you want to move that Bill from Second to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6125, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Debbie Mell, you have House Bill 5226. Out of the record. Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 5772. Out of the record. What's the status, Mr. Clerk, of House Bill 6123?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6123, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. A Floor Amendment has been referred to the Rules Committee and not yet approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

  Representative Bob Rita, House Bill 6434. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6434, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No

115th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Representative Bradley. Is John Bradley on the House Floor? You have House Bill 5230 on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5230, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Sente, you have House Bill 6359. Representative Carol Sente. House Bill 6359 is on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6359, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sente, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, do you wish to call your Amendment, or do you want to hold it on Second Reading? You have an Amendment approved."
- Sente: "Thank you, Speaker. Sorry."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook on Amendment... Floor Amendment #1. Representative Sente, you have Floor Amendment #1."
- Sente: "So, this is a retailer's certificate of registration fund. The current access that applicants... Oh. That applicants for certificate of registration need to furnish a bond to protect the state in case that the applicant fails to pay the ROTC... the ROT tax. But since '86, the

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

department has set applica... application bonds at zero. The Auditor General recently questioned the practice. And so, because of the climate... because of the current economic climate, provision of a bond would be prohibitive for businesses, but we do also need to protect the state from the retail establishments that may default. So, the Amendment allows the department the discretion, and that's the key word, to request bonds only if they feel that the retail business may warrant it. So, one, if they're in default of a payment for other ROT moneys or, two, if they have their certificate revoked within the last five years."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Thapedi, you have House Bill 1545 on Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Washington, you have House Bill 5499 on the Order of Second Reading. Do you wish to move that Bill to Third Reading? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5499, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what the status of House Bill 5044?"

115th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5044, a Bill for an Act concerning financial regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Jakobsson, you have, on the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 6001. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6001, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative John Bradley, on the Order of Third Reading, you have House Bill 6035. Out of the record. Representative Annazette Collins, on the Order of Third Reading, you have House Bill 5914. Do you wish to move that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Sara Feigenholtz. Is Sara on the floor? Out of the record. Representative LaSh... LaShawn Ford, you have House Bill 2236. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2236, a Bill for an Act concerning child support. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LaShawn Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2236 simply codifies what the child support agency is doing now. The attempt is to make sure that we're able to modify any child support orders that... that's owed to any parents or while a person is in jail. It also aims at modifying child support orders when an individual is released out of prison, which is a recommendation made

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

while the Bill was in committee. And that's what the Bill attempts to do. And I ask for a favorable vote."

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

Eddy: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Eddy: "Could... could we get the status of the Amendments, what we're dealing with here, specifically?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. There are... there's Floor Amendment #2 that was referred to Rules Committee, and Floor Amendment #3 that was referred to committee, neither of which have been approved for consideration."

Eddy: "Okay. So, we're dealing only with Committee Amendment #1. Is that... that correct?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment... Committee Amendment #1 is the only Amendment adopted to the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. So, Committee Amendment #1 is the Bill. I... I think it keeps the underlying intent of the Bill, which, Representative Ford, I think you said it's... to provide assistance to incarcerated individuals who are obligated to provide child support. Is that right?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford. Speak up or bring the microphone..."

Ford: "I need Amendment 2 to be adopted. This Bill's not ready. It's still pending."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "So, we should take that Bill out of the record?"

Ford: "Yes. Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Do you wish to put it back on the Order of Second Reading?"

Ford: "Please."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, we'll take that Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, put it on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Feigenholtz. Representative, you have House Bill 6080. Do you wish to call the Bill? Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 6080?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6080 is on the Order of Third Reading. There are two Floor Amendments. One has been referred to committee, and one's been referred to the Rules Committee. Neither have been reported out... approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Eddy, on the Order of Third Reading, you have House Bill 5132. Do you wish to call that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5132, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, what this Bill does is it sets up a mechanism whereby students with IEPs that are in high schools, between the ages of 18 and 21 up to the age of 22 birthdate right now, DCFS doesn't... doesn't

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

take hotline calls. This would set up a mechanism where DCFS would take the hotline calls, transfer those to DHS where the age appropriate 18-year-old investigation would take place by the Inspector General. Just closes a loophole that exists. And I would appreciate your support, and answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanations. Is there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5132 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's 110 Members voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddie Jackson, you have House Bill 5846. Representative Jackson on the floor? Out of the record. Representative Cynthia Soto, you have on the Order of Third Reading, House Bill 4972. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4972, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Cynthia Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4972 amends the Public Community College Act to prohibit nonvoting student members of the Illinois Community College Board and advisory committee members from receiving reimbursement for duties related through expenses. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

115th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4972 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAsey, you have House Bill 6094. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6094, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Emily McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 6094 does two things. First off, there is a technical change related to the definition of neighborhood vehicles, a specific class of vehicles. It changes the Vehicle Code, changes the language stating that it conforms to a... it does not conform to certain federal safety standards. In addition to that, House Amendment 1 was adopted in committee last week. This is an Amendment supported by the Farm Bureau that would allow for these neighborhood nonhighway vehicles to be driven on county or township roadways, when those vehicles are being used for farming operations. Additionally, there are insurance requirements and safety requirements related to headlight use if these nonconforming vehicles are being used in this purpose. I

115th Legislative Day

- would urge an 'aye' vote. And would be willing to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6094 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Saviano, Poe, Cultra, Brauer, Bellock. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, you have House Bill 5720. Out of the record. Representative Sandy Pihos, you have House Bill 6194. Representative Pihos. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6194, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Sandy Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This provides that lists held by IDFPR, of licensed professionals in Illinois, may not be used by third parties for purposes not related to the licensee's profession. We had a question yesterday, whether the associations were on board or neutral with this and the department as well, and I believe we have answered those questions to Representative Washington's satisfaction. I..."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanations. Are there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Ed Washington."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, I don't know why this analysis still includes that the Department of Financial and Professional Regul... Regulations, Illinois Association of Realtors, Pharmacists, and the Illinois Society for Advanced Practice Nursing are against it. I spoke to each one. All of them are in favor or support of the Legislator's Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos to close."

- Pihos: "I think this is a Bill that will keep our professionals by... from getting solicited by third parties. And I hope you will vote in support of this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 6194 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 Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.
  This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jefferson, what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."
- Jefferson: "Just want to recognize in the balcony over to my right, the Pastor from Rockford, Illinois, Pastor Kenneth

115th Legislative Day

- Board, who's going to be doing the invocation tomorrow. Welcome him to Springfield, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to Springfield, Pastor. Enjoy your day, and we're looking forward to seeing you tomorrow. Representative Pihos, you also have House Bill 6034. Do you wish to call that Bill on the Order of Third Reading? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6034, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sandy Pihos."
- Pihos: "Yes. I think I'd like to move this Bill back to Second Reading for now. I'd like to hold it."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Dave Winters, you have House Bill 5972. Out of the record. Representative Dan Burke, you have House Bill 4802. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4802, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Danny Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This initiative is brought to us from the Water Reclamation District of greater Chicago. And very simply, the district is requesting an extension of the sunset date for two reasons. Firstly, the district's long-term capital plan includes over 2 million in projects for replacement of aged infrastructure, and the construction of two major flood control reservoirs. These capital projects and their

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

funding requirements extend beyond the current sunset date of 2016, and extending the sunset date on the district's bonding authority would help the district maintain its triple A bonding rating, which saved district taxpayers millions annually in debt service costs. This legislation imposes no fiscal burden on the state, requires no tax increase or exemption from the tax cap. It merely allows that the district continue to do what it has been doing for the last 35 years. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation of House Bill 4802. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 84 Members voting 'yes', 25 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Speaker, (sic-Clerk) what's the status of House Bill 5914?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5914, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal laws is on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that Bill back to Second, please."

Speaker Lyons: "On request of the Sponsor, Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Biggins, on the Order of Third Readings, you have House Bill 6151. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 6151, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Bob Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And House Bill 6151... amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, provides that a person found guilty of or pleading guilty to, including any person receiving a disposition of court supervision of violation of the Code of similar provision of a local ordinance, shall pay at a minimum a fine, or penalty inclusive of cost equal to the amount of bill... bail required by the Illinois Supreme Court. This Bill was suggested by the mayors of the West Central Municipal Conference in my district, part of Cook County in my district. Be glad to answer any questions anyone has."

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

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support... To the Bill. I rise in support of this Bill. It's an important issue for the west suburban... the western suburbs, specifically, the town of Riverside. We need to be able to equip the towns like Riverside to collect on these fines, and ensure that the court system's doing the proper thing. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Reis: "Representative, you tease us sometimes that we talk too slow, but I'm going to tease you that you talk too fast. What exactly does your Bill do, again?"

Biggins: "Well, thank you for the question. This may take me a long time to answer your question. It has to deal with law enforcement issues. It's very serious for the policemen and the mayors, as suggested, in the west sub... west suburban district... the west... West... All the suburbs of Illinois would be affected by it. All the towns, I should say."

Reis: "So, is this a new fee?"

Biggins: "Does it what?"

Reis: "Will this impose a new fee?"

Biggins: "I... I don't know if it imposes a... a fee, but let's see..."

Reis: "Does it impose a new fine?"

Biggins: "I think, yes."

Reis: "I just want to make sure..."

Biggins: "By this... there's a fine involved in the legislation.

That's the purpose of this to get some... some revenue.

Yeah."

Reis: "And what's the... how is the fine based, again? I just want to make sure everyone knows what they're voting on."

Biggins: "It's a flat amount. So, it's limited. It's not unlimited. It's got a set fee amount in there."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Biggins: "Okay. Thank you."

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

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, so this sets a minimum fine at an amount equal to what the bail would be for that offense, correct?"

Biggins: "That's correct."

Fritchey: "What's the rationale behind that?"

Biggins: "Well, it... it was an amount that some of the people put their collective thoughts together and this is the amount that they determined... they thought this would be a proper amount. It does remove some of the court's discretion."

Fritchey: "Well, and that..."

Biggins: "By giving it more specific amounts."

Fritchey: "That... that's actually what I... what I was getting at.

I mean, what... what you're doing is taking the authority
away from the judge to set or waive a fine, depending on
what the offense was and the circumstances surrounding the
event, and say that that fine would have to be pegged to
whatever the prescribed bail is for that offense. Right?"

Biggins: "Yes."

Fritchey: "But I... and again, I'm not trying to be difficult, but what's the purpose of doing... what's the rationale in linking the fine amount to the bail amount? The... the bail... the bail... amount is prescribed by the Supreme Court based on the nature of the offense and other mitigating factors of whether bail is warranted and what value should be set at. The purpose of the fine for a certain offense is based on very different standards."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Biggins: "Yeah. The… the judges aren't collecting the fines and so, this sets a specific amount that can't be waived arbitrarily. Actually, the municipalities are losing revenue because they're being waived too often. So, this is kind of… doesn't give them that freedom to waive them."

Fritchey: "So, the municipalities are losing revenue, and in order to make up for revenue that they're losing, they want to take authority away from the judges on how to set a fine for a traffic offense."

Biggins: "I... I think... the way... I know... I think the purpose is to ensure that the judges..."

Speaker Lyons: "Gentlemen, your time has expired. John, we'll give you another minute. Bob, to answer that question."

Fritchey: "Well, to the Bill, brief..."

Biggins: "It's to make sure..."

Fritchey: "I'm sorry, Bob."

Biggins: "...that they pay something."

Fritchey: "Well, just to... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... you know, I understand that, you know, just like the State of Illinois, no municipality wants to see a decrease in revenues in tough economic times, but I think you need to tread very carefully if you think that the answer for capturing those potentially lost revenues is to take the authority away from a judge in a case like this and tie it arbitrarily to a bail amount, which is really scheduled for very different purposes than the fine for an underlying offense. I think it's a very dangerous policy where we start treading into judicial authority as a way to make up for revenue deficits. Thank you."

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biggins to close."

Biggins: "Yeah. Thank you, and we'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Some of the proponents on the Bill include the Village of Riverside, West Central Municipal Conference, DuPage Mayors and Managers, Illinois State Police, Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Metro counties. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 6151 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 Cole. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 95 Members voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. There's some Bills on Second Reading. I'll ask the Sponsors if they care to move these Bills to Third Reading. Representative Will Davis, you have House Bill 4827. Out of the record. Representative Dunkin. Is Representative Dunkin on the floor? Out of the record. Representative LaShawn Ford, you have House Bill 5323 on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5323, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Golar, you have House Bill 5918. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

115th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5918, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law has been read a second time, previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative McAsey, you have House Bill 4037, 4037. Out of the record. Representative McAsey, you also have House Bill 5932, Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Bob Rita, House Bill 5513. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5513, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Sente, you have House Bill 4817. Out of the record. Representative Cynthia Soto, you have House Bill 4755. It's on its Second Reading. Do you wish to move that to Third Reading? Yes or no. No. Leave it on Second Reading. We'll leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Bellock. Representative Patti Bellock. Okav. Representative Bill Mitchell. Representative Mitchell, you have House Bill 4663 on Second Reading. Want to read... leave that Bill of the Order of Second Reading? Representative Mitchell, you also have House Bill 5663, Wish to move that Bill? Leave that Order on the Second Reading. Representative Don Moffitt, you have House Bill 5183. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Leave that on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Rosemary Mulligan, you have House Bill 5516. Rosemary.

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

House Bill 5516 on Second Reading, you want to leave it there? Leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's been brought to my attention to announce that Members should review pages 28 and 29 in the Calendar. There are Senate Bills looking for House Sponsors. So, they're starting to appear in our Calendars, so a message from the Senate for us to take a look at Senate Bills that are available for us to... to take and run on the House Floor, put through with our process on the House. Representative Bob Pritchard, for an announcement."

- Pritchard: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Legislative Education Caucus will meet a little bit tardy, over in Room 413 of Stratton. So, I would ask all Members to join us for some discussion about education."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1019, offered by Representative Stephens. House Resolution 1021, offered by Representative May, and House Resolution 1023, offered by Representative Washington."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative McGuire moves for the passage of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, with no further business to come before the Illinois House of Representatives, the House... Representative McGuire moves that the House will stand adjourned on Friday, March 19 at the hour of 9:30. The House will stand adjourned to the hour of 9:30. So,

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative McGuire moves for the adjournment of the House. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 tomorrow morning. Have a safe evening, everyone."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 88, offered by Representative Crespo. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 352, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 374, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 377, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 387, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 448, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 663, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 730, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 735, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 851, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 1020, offered by Representative health. Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1055, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1118, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

concerning business. Senate Bill 2462, offered Representative Mendoza, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2497, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2508, offered by Representative Coladipietro, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 2513, offered by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2542, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning athlete agents. Senate Bill 2551, offered by Representative Walker, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 2559, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 2570, offered by Representative Gordon, Careen, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2571, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2580, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Senate Bill 2612, offered Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2637, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2660, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Senate Bill 2795, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 2810, offered by Representative revenue. Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2879, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2927, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2931, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning public Senate Bill 2976, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2980, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3012, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 3023, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Bill 3029, offered by Representative Gordon, Careen, a Bill Senate Bill 3044, for an Act concerning criminal law. offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act Senate Bill 3047, concerning liquor. offered Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning health care. Senate Bill 3060, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3084, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Senate Bill 3091, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3096, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 3129, offered by Representative Eddy, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3134, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3147, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3180, offered by Representative revenue. Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3199, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3206, offered by Representative Dugan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3211, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3222, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning educations... education. Senate Bill offered by Representative Burns, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3268, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning cemeteries. Senate Bill 3269, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning sexual evidence. Senate Bill 3273, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3309, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3313, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3322, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3323, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3332, offered by Representative Mendoza, a Bill... a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3334, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3336, offered by Representative revenue. Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3342, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3377, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Senate Bill 3383, offered by

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3401, offered State government. Senate Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3411, offered by Representative Flider, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3420, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3422, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act... a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3429, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3430, offered Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3460, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3506, offered by Representative Colvin, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3509, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Senate Bill 3514, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3529, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3531, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3539, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3540, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3545, (sic-3544) offered by Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3546, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3565, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 3566, offered by Representative Washington, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3568, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3570, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3576, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3592, offered by Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3622, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3637, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3659, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 3662, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3681, offered by Representative Eddy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3683, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3722, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3749, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3762, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3776, offered by Representative Miller, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3778, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act

115th Legislative Day

3/18/2010

concerning local government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."