60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Speaker Turner: "The hour of 11:00 having come and went, the General Assembly will be called to order. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Most gracious and sovereign King, Father, we humbly come before You this morning giving You the praise for all things. For our minded of Your word that simply says that we are to bless You at all times and that it is Your praises that should continually to be in our mouths. Father, we praise You with a confidence that all things work together for the good of them who love God and are called according to Your purpose. Father, we realize that there are some things that we simply cannot control but, Father, also realize that You are in control of all things. So, because of that, because of Your all powerful, wonderful, and gracious grace, we put all of our trust and confidence in You. This we ask in Your son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the prayer (sic-Pledge of Allegiance) today by the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jenisch."
- Jenisch 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."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Jerry Mitchell and Ruth Munson are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Giles and McKeon are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "We have 113 Members, a quorum is present. We will proceed with business. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bills... First Reading of Senate Bill.

 Senate Bill 789, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill
 for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate
 Bill 1185, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an
 Act concerning civil law. First Reading of these Senate
 Bills."
- Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to start on page 15 of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences and we will go down that order, so you should be aware of where your Bill... where your Bill is on the Calendar and be prepared to move that legislation. Page 15 of the Calendar, the first Bill we will hear this morning is House Bill 1870. Representative Monique Davis on the Order of Concurrence."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #2. It provides that the pleading on the cases of parents seeking to get their children returned, that a notice be sent 3 weeks prior to the court date for

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

closure of discovery and that the allegations in the pleading will be treated as incorporated into the petition or motion. It provides that the failure of a respondent to file a written denial of the allegations shall not be treated as an admission that the allegations are true. And I do concur with this, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1870?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1870. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1968. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1968. This is an omnibus election Bill, many of the items we have seen before. Some have passed in the last General Assembly, or at least passed this chamber in the last General Assembly, and some have been incorporated in Bills current in this General Assembly, House Bill 2564, for example, and Senate Bill 1683 as well as 1697. I'm not gonna describe each of the provisions in the Bill because it is much of... many of them are technical. But I will try to hit for you the highlights and I'd be happy to answer any questions,

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

technical or otherwise, that you have when I'm done. First, the measure would increase the number of signatures required for General Assembly candidates. For the Senate, to a thousand, for the House, to 500. The signature requirements haven't changed in more than 40 years and the populations in our districts have, in fact, gone significantly. These ... these numbers will reflect less than one-half of 1 percent of the population in the district, and that seems to me to be reasonable. We also will reduce the signature requirements for Mayor of the City of Chicago from 25,000 to 12,500. Again, a reasonable connection to the population. We will permit deputy registrars to do statewide registration and we'll make sure that colleges, universities, and many state agencies put registration forms on the Internet. We will specify that in our district offices we and our employees can act as deputy registrars and we will make sure that people who are willing to be election judges, if they give the employer 20 days notice, may take time off for that activity with, of We will specify that a continuing course, no pay. political committee that doesn't spend more than \$500 for a candidate or a question on the ballot will not need to file a pre-election report. We'll have an online voter guide for statewide officeholders, candidates for the judiciary, and candidates for the United States Congress. We're going to specify... close some loopholes so that we will have good disclosure from all who participate in elections, PACs, for example, that get all their money from a foundation.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

wanna make sure we know who contributed to the foundation in the first place. Wanna make sure that people whose names have changed, often women who've changed their names to a husband's last name, are permitted to vote in their precinct by affidavit. We provide for early voting 23 days before election day. Election jurisdictions will have to make it possible for people to come in and vote in person. We also have a number of changes and specifications regarding a digitcal... digital recording equipment in the Election Code, for example. We want to clarify that there has to be a paper trail that would be available for review by the public and that there be random audits in precincts where votes are cast using digital record... recording equipment. Again, there are many, many technical changes in this Bill as well, but I think these are the highlights. And again, I'd be happy to answer your questions on the substantive or technical changes that we proposed in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1968."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Winters: "Well, we have, I guess, the first one of the shafting Bills of the Session. I... I've got so many things that we started on in committee yesterday, let's start with the universities. You're requiring higher institutions... higher education institutions to notify incoming students that they can register in their... their new home."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Currie: "How to register at their new address, yes."

Winters: "Even though the Illinois Supreme Court, years and years ago, said that the... in normal circumstances, a university student's home is not where they attend the university but where they actually have grown up and where they a have a history."

Currie: "My understanding is that they..."

Winters: "You require..."

Currie: "...they have the option of registering at their parents' home or at their university address."

Winters: "I understand that. Does this apply to private institutions as well as public institutions? Hopefully, just public institutions, you're not going to infringe on pri... private colleges?"

Currie: "Let me... let me double check that."

Winters: "Okay."

Currie: "I think it's the only publics, but we're double checking."

Winters: "Yes. And I... I asked many of these questions yesterday and you were going to try to get me answers before the debate. We'll be using up the 5 minutes fairly quickly, I imagine."

Currie: "Just... I was right, just public universities."

Winters: "Public universities only. But the... the potential for fraud... and that is the key on this Bill, the potential for fraud is being opened. The door is opening wider. The Democratic Party has control of the State Government and doesn't want to give it up. Anything they can possibly do

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

to enhance their ability to elect more Democrats next time around, that's what this Bill is... is for. First-time voters voting by mail. Any indication of exactly how many more voters you're gonna be able to get in under fraudulent conditions on this Bill? Did you run the numbers? How many thousands of additional fraudulent votes do you expect from this?"

Currie: "If... if people register by mail they will have to vote for the first time in person."

Winters: "If they register, however, 14 days... 15 days before, they can register and then cast an absentee ballot."

Currie: "And we're assured by the election authorities across the state that that does not open the opportunity for fraud or for misidentification."

Winters: "Oh, come on. Give..."

Currie: "But the kind of identification..."

Winters: "Give me a break."

Currie: "...they will require..."

Winters: "Give me a break."

Currie: "...for registration and for voting will secure the notion that the election is fair and free."

Winters: "There... there's also provisions in here that the election authorities can designate other places to... to vote, maybe not at the election authority. Do you intend to have booths set up Taste of Chicago, at the Bears' games? Ya know, where... where are we gonna vote? Any place that you can attract large numbers of people?"

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Currie: "We... we would anticipate that the election authorities will set up the early voting at their... at their place of business."

Winters: "But it... it's not restricted to that place of business. It says they can designate."

Currie: "Well, we... we would assume that, for reasons of cost and convenience, that's likely where they'll do it."

Winters: "Well, assumptions are one thing but reality is another. And the reality is it's a Bill for election fraud. Time off for voting, 2 hours required. If a... if an employer has people that say, 'Ya know, I really can't get to the election place, there are long lines, I need 2 hours off.'"

Currie: "That's only in the case where the individual has to be at work 2 hours before the polls open and has to be at work 2 hours after the polls close."

Winters: "I don't believe it's..."

Currie: "The idea is..."

Winters: "...it's both cases."

Currie: "...that that individual should be able to take time off while the polls are open so they can cast their vote, so they can exercise the franchise. This Bill is about expanding opportunities for people to participate in the election process. That, to me, is a good thing, it's what democracy is supposed to be about."

Winters: "Well, let's look at another situation. Let's make it... one... one of the provisions people here ought to understand, and this affects everybody in this chamber, the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

number of signatures that you're gonna be asked to... to gather for getting on the ballot for Members of the General Assembly will go up about 60 percent, from 300 to 500 for House Members. At the same time that we're increasing the requirements for House Members, we're decreasing it by half. We're cutting in half the number of signatures required to run for Mayor of Chicago. It seems like in a city of 3 million people that 25 thousand is not a huge burden, particularly with an organization that I understand is quite efficient at gathering signatures, fraudulent or not. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. This is a 220 page Bill that was delivered to us yesterday. has every wish list and grab bag of the Democratic Party to try to expand the number of votes that they can get in the next election, fraudulent or legitimate. It is an unbelievable expansion of voter potential fraud in this state. If we pass this Bill it will probably end competitive natures of elections in this state for the rest of our lifetime. I can't believe all the garbage that is in this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill stinks and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Froehlich: "Representative, would this Bill create, in effect, same-day registration? In other words, when you combine early voting with the 14-day registration period we passed

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

earlier, would this in effect create same-day voter registration?"

Currie: "Yeah, during those 9 days it would. And we are told by the election authorities, the people who run elections, that they do not believe that that would open any potential for fraud or misuse of the electoral system."

Froehlich: "Okay. And on... on this early voting, the 23-day early voting, I noticed it... this does not apply to mail-in absentee voting. Is that correct?"

Currie: "This would be..."

Froehlich: "This only is in person?"

Currie: "This is in person. I mean, people often ask for their absentee ballots before that 23 days before the election."

Froehlich: "Um hmm. But for absentee voting by mail you must specify a reason, a good reason, like I'm... I'm in the hospital or I'm out of town, out of state."

Currie: "Yes, that's true."

Froehlich: "Why... why do..."

Currie: "Under... under... if you... if you're voting... yes, I believe it would say that you can vote early. Yeah. I mean, the idea here is to try to encourage people to participate."

Froehlich: "But would this... would this mean... my point is, currently to vote early by mail or to vote early..."

Currie: "Or in person."

Froehlich: "...in person I need a good reason."

Currie: "Or in person. That's right."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Froehlich: "I need to swear I'm gonna be out of town or some other good reason. Are we removing that requirement from mail-in absentee voting? That's my question."

Currie: "Yes. Yes. We... yes. Even if you did not expect to be out... even if you don't expect to be in the hospital, you could vote early."

Froehlich: "By mail? By mail? That... that's my question. I understand we're changing it..."

Currie: "This... well, the early..."

Froehlich: "...for in person."

Currie: "The early voting is in-person, let me check to see if we made a comparable change in the mail... mail-in voting.

We did not change those standards."

Froehlich: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, I note with interest that candidates for the General Assembly have increased signature requirements, which doesn't particularly bother me. But the signature requirements on petitions to run for the Chicago Mayor, mayoral race and other municipal offices in Chicago, have been cut in half. Why is that?"

Currie: "And... and the reason for that, Representative, is that what we'll have then with these two changes... what we will have is signature requirements of a good deal less than

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

one-half of one percent for someone running for Mayor of the City of Chicago or other city offices, and the same will be true for people who seek office in the Illinois General Assembly. The earlier requirement to run for Mayor of the City of Chicago, 25 thousand signatures, was almost a full percent of the... of the populous and we thought that was too high. We thought that created a situation which many people who might legitimately stand for that office would not be able to meet the signature requirement. And we think 12,500 gives people a much better opportunity to stand for one of those municipal offices in Chicago."

- Black: "Well, I... I agree. I... whatever's good for Chicago is certainly good for the state. Let me... let me ask you some questions about how all these... some of these components work together. For example, can a company in Rockford, Illinois with a hundred and twenty-five employees invite a registrar to come in and register voters to work... or register workers so that they can vote?"
- Currie: "I don't think there's... maybe you could point me to a place in the Bill but I don't... I don't believe that we put that provision in this Bill."
- Black: "Ah, okay. I... I think it's in there. Let me ask you this, could the owner of that same company invite candidates for public office to come in and speak to workers during lunch breaks or to make campaign materials available for workers to pick up at their leisure?"
- Currie: "Whatever the current law is, we haven't changed it.

 My recollection is that many of us have gone to factories

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

or other places and handed out literature and, ya know, do the old meet and greet with the voters, trying to encourage their support."

Black: "No, I'm not talking about at the gate, I'm talking about going in the plant."

Currie: "I'm sorry, say again."

Black: "I'm talking about being invited into the plant by the owner."

Currie: "I don't believe there's any change in whatever current law would have..."

Black: "Ah, I... I see."

Currie: "...would say on that point."

Black: "I see. Well, let's say that during this period of early voting, can the employer call a meeting of all the workers during working hours to talk about the importance of voting on company time so... but the owner could share with workers information on who he or she is personally supporting? Would that be legal under this Bill?"

Currie: "Representative, there's no change in current law. So, if that employer could do it today, that employer could do it tomorrow. If the employer can't do it today..."

Black: "Ah."

Currie: "...then he couldn't do it tomorrow."

Black: "Could the employer tell workers why voting for or against specific candidates, in his or her opinion, would help or hurt their company?"

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Currie: "Well, I would imagine that that would count as an electioneering communication and I don't know that it is barred in the workplace."
- Black: "Well, I noticed that in the Bill..."
- Currie: "But if it is or if it isn't, it doesn't change under this Bill."
- Black: "Oh, well, we're not so sure. I notice in the Bill, electioneering nearing communication between unions and 5013C organizations is exempt. That's an interesting process. Could the employer provide bus transportation to the county courthouse to facilitate workers' participation in early voting as long as the workers were paid?"
- Currie: "This measure would provide that business groups could also do these internal communications without... without coming into the provisions of the Election Code."
- Black: "If the company is located in a metropolitan area, could that employer provide transportation to every courthouse in all six counties?"
- Currie: "Perhaps you could point me to what you're reading in the Bill, Representative, because I don't believe we've made changes in those sections of current law."
- Black: "I think if you read the Bill... thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think if you read the Bill very carefully it's heavily weighted towards groups that the party on the other side of the aisle want to vote and has certain restrictions on those people who would like to encourage people in the voting process on what they can or cannot do. Another interesting part of

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

this Bill, in my district office I can register voters. I... I'll finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker. On... you're allowing 179 political people elected to political office to now register people to vote in their offices. And I'm sure that all 179 of us will be as pure as the driven snow on how we handle that opportunity. The only opportunity I see in that is for one or two more indictments. And in closing... and in closing, the most... ya know, we've got the Internet... we've already killed that Bill once, here comes the Internet voting guide back on the State Board of Elections. But if you don't have the money, you don't get on it. And... and in closing, Mr. Speaker, for heaven's sakes, this Bill is such a mishmash. But the one I like is I can regi..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Black."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Parke yields his time to Representative Black. Representative Black, you can continue."

Black: "Ya know, in a state where we have such a checkered history of voter fraud, stolen elections, I... there aren't... many of you aren't old enough to remember the Kennedy/Nixon election. And I think... I'll paraphrase, but the late Mayor Daley said, and I can almost quote... remember it verbatim. When asked... that election in Illinois was so close and somebody said, 'Are you going to be able to carry Chicago for John F. Kenney?', who, by the way, I thought was an

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

excellent president. But I'll never forget, and I'm paraphrasing what the Mayor of Chicago said, 'The river precincts have not been heard from yet.' Now, we all know what he meant by that. Why in the world could you stand here with a straight face and say this Bill is about election reform? There's more loopholes and blind corners and dark alleys in this Bill than I have time to enumerate. But the one I like the most... and especially... especially remembering what my grandfather said years ago. On his deathbed he looked me in the eye and he said, 'William, when I die, please, please bury me in the City of Chicago.' And I said, 'Grandad, you've never lived in the City of Chicago. Why would you want to be buried there?' And he said, and I quote, 'Because I want to stay active in elections, William, that's why.' And there's one provision in this Bill that, if you agree with all the others, is an absolute invitation for voter fraud of the higher... I register to vote, I vote absentee, and I can continue to vote absentee until you can figure out my death certificate had been filed 20 years ago. I never ever have to show in person my face to any voting official. This Bill isn't a mishmash, it's a deliberately concocted Bill of attempts to influence elections and figure how to get certain people to the polls and deny other people the same ability to get to the polls. We all know what this is. It's a sham, it's a scam in a year where you've put more scams and shams on the floor than I can remember in my 20 years."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates... she indicates she will."

Watson: "Representative, could you explain to me the philosophy behind requiring an employee to pay someone to vote, to pay two hours of time off to vote?"

Currie: "Yeah. That provision only applies when the worker is required to be at the worksite two hours before the polls open and two hours after they close. So that individual, by virtue of the workday, would without this provision be unable to exercise the franchise. Now, I don't assume that there are very many people who fit that description, but to the extent that somebody wouldn't be able to get to work because of the work schedule, we think it's important to make sure that they have the opportunity to participate as have all the rest of us. So, it's a very narrow provision. It just says that if you can't get to work because you start two hours before the... the polls open and you're at work two hours after the polls close, let the employer give..."

Watson: "How long are the polls usually open?"

Currie: "...you a couple of hours in the middle of the day to go cast your ballot."

Watson: "How long are the polls usually open?"

Currie: "I believe they're from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m., 13 hours."

Watson: "Thirteen hours."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Currie: "So this would be somebody, presumably, maybe for overtime reasons or what have you, would be working 17... a 17-hour day. Yeah, a resident... a doctor who's a resident, for example, somebody who is required to do a double shift because of somebody else's not having shown up for work."
- Watson: "So... so then businesses would be... it would be... it would behoove businesses not to put anybody on a 17-hour shift for that day."
- Currie: "Right. Sorry, can you... can you ask that question again?"
- Watson: "I said then I'm assuming it would behoove businesses not to put someone on a 17-hour shift for that day."
- Currie: "That... and so it's a very narrow provision. There aren't very many people who will fit that description.

 All..."
- Watson: "Okay, there's also a provision in the law that says 23 days prior to election, election authorities can designate areas for early voting. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Early voting, 23 days before the election, that's right."
- Watson: "They can designate any areas, no restrictions."
- Currie: "That's right. We believe that our local election jurisdictions can figure this one out. We believe..."
- Watson: "So... so..."
- Currie: "...that most of them want to give people the opportunity to participate and we will... we will... this will allow them to do so. And I would point out that the Association of Illinois County Clerks and Recorders support this Bill."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Watson: "Do you... do you think it's... it's wise public policy to allow election authorities to... with no... with no restrictions whatsoever, to open up voting registration and actual allow votes at any designation of their choice? Do you think that's good public policy?"
- Currie: "I trust our local governments to do the right thing, Representative."
- Watson: "So, I guess I could go back into the records and find thi... areas where we have not put restrictions on local governments because we trust them so much. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "In this... in this arena I do... I do trust the election authorities."
- Watson: "Do you think it's wise public policy that the authority overseeing the early voting is not allowed to check the validity of voters based off their signatures?"
- Currie: "Could you point that to me in the Bill, because I don't believe that that's an accurate statement."
- Watson: "On page 136. Basically, it does not say that they have to verify the signature. So I would assume, since it's not in there, then they can... we're lowering the standards."
- Currie: "Check... check page 144 of the Bill. You will see that there is a... a comparison check with the signature."
- Watson: "Okay, Representative. Thank you very much. I do think that we are opening up a can of worms here for

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

potential fraud and I hope that we watch this clearly should this Bill unfortunately pass."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Lang: "Representative, is there anything inherent in this Bill that only benefits the City of Chicago?"

Currie: "No."

Lang: "Is there anything inherent in this Bill that only benefits the Democratic Party?"

Currie: "Absolutely not."

Lang: "Does this Bill... does this Bill have the same provisions for both political parties?"

Currie: "Absolutely."

Lang: "Does this Bill have any negative impact on independent voters?"

Currie: "No."

Lang: "Does this Bill allow college students to register to vote?"

Currie: "Yes, but that's already true."

Lang: "To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, once again we hear hysteria from the other side of the aisle for no reason. They like to set up strawmen and knock them down. So they set up the City of Chicago as a strawman to knock it down. They set up the Democratic Party as a strawman to knock it down. What is

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

in this Bill that is unfair to the Republican Party? What is in this Bill that makes it more difficult for that side of the aisle to do the work it needs to do to register voters and get them to the polls? We could tell as many stories about other counties in the state as they would like to allege about Cook, so we can get into that debate if they wish. But Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a long list of reforms designed to help voters get to the polls, to help them get registered to vote, and to help us have fairer and freer and more open elections. understand the hysteria that we hear from time to time, the concern about vote fraud. We all have that concern. the allegations that somehow the Democratic Party is a party of vote fraud is kinda silly. The idea that the other side of the aisle is gonna come to the floor and make up stories and make up issues that don't exist is kind of ridiculous. If you're fearful that our side of the aisle will do a better job implementing these new rules than your side of the aisle, I suggest you get better people to implement the new rules. But let's not... let's not set up strawmen in the House of Representatives, let's freely and openly debate the issues as they are. This is an excellent It's well-written, well crafted, helps twelve and a half million citizens in Illinois to have free and open elections. There's no reason for a 'no' vote. You should be voting 'aye'."

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

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. If I could, I'd like to yield my time to Representative Winters."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman yields his time to Representative Winters, the Gentleman from Winnebago."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Winters: "The previous Speaker just mentioned that this is such a well crafted Bill. I want to go back to an issue that I asked you a question about a few minutes ago and it's the two-hour time off... paid time off. You said that if you worked from 4:00 in the morning until 9:00 at night, that that would... those were the only people that would qualify for the paid time off. I would..."

Currie: "No, no, no. No, no. The question was who gets two hours off to vote, and those are the people. There is a different..."

Winters: "That is..."

Currie: "...provision in the Bill, Representative, that says that if you decide you wanna help in the electoral process by serving as a judge, you may give your employer..."

Winters: "No, I'm not talking about the election judges at all, Ma'am."

Currie: "...you may give..."

Winters: "I am talking about the paid time off to vote, the two two-hour block. And what you don't know is you completely misread this Bill. You misread the Bill. It says specifically in here, if you... that you have to have a two-hour absence permitted if you work... your work starts

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

less than two hours after the poll opens, they open at 6:00 and you go into work at 7:55 and work until two minutes past 5, which is just less than two hours before the polls close. So, anybody that works nine hours... one hour of overtime will qualify you for two hours paid time off by your employer. You don't even know your own Bill. How can we vote on this hundred-page Bill when you don't even know one of the simple... there's only four lines in here and you got it completely at..."

Currie: "We're looking for..."

Winters: "...you got it completely backwards."

Currie: "We're looking for the provision, Representative. I think if somebody..."

Winters: "It's on page 103."

Currie: "If somebody's work time overlaps..."

Winters: "Lines 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16."

Currie: "...the poll time..."

Winters: "You don't even know your own Bill."

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

Rose: "I yield my time to Representative Winters if he still needs it."

Speaker Turner: "He may need it at St. John's. Representative Winters, are you finished? Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a good Bill. It opens opportunities for participation in

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

the electoral process. Maybe it's a good Bill for Democrats because we think expanding the franchise is a good thing. I would've hoped my counterparts on the other side of the aisle agree that encouraging people to vote is good for democracy. If you think expanding the franchise, offering opportunity is a bad thing, you are welcome to vote 'no' on this concurrence Motion. But anybody who cares about seeing to it that our democracy operates as a democracy ought to be voting 'yes'. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1968?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1968. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concur... Concurrences, we have House Bill 337. Representative Currie. The Lady from Cook."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337.

These are some technical changes to the Judicial Subcircuit Bill the Legislature passed last year and what these do is to make for greater population equity in some places, respond to concerns that were brought up in committee

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

hearings by my counterparts on the other side of the aisle, make sure that communities of interest are kept together as much as is possible. I would be happy to answer your questions. I think this makes the kind of technical changes that make these subcircuits work more effectively for the principles of the people of these areas. I would be happy to answer your questions."

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

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Hultgren: "Leader Currie, a couple questions. Obviously, this was something that went through very last minute during Veto Session, many of you remember. A very frustrating process where there was no hearings held in districts. These maps, again, have now been redrawn. Have any hearings been held since Veto Session in the districts where these changes have been made?"

Currie: "We had held hearings before the Veto Session before legislative action and, of course, we had many committee hearings on those measures. Staff, after those hearings, did go back, listen to the transcript, and try to accommodate some of the issues that you yourself and other Members of... of the Minority Party raised at that time."

Hultgren: "Let me ask you specifically about that."

Currie: "And, for example, one of the questions..."

Hultgren: "Let me ask you specifically about that. 'Cause I do know there's changes with each of the maps and, again, how

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

it was rushed through so quickly it doesn't surprise me that mistakes were made because, again, it was not given a thorough hearing, no debate within districts, giving... residents of these districts or these counties were never given a... again, an ability either during Veto Session or now to be able to look at these maps. Let me ask you real quickly about the justification, especially for the Will County one to start with. What was the reason... my understanding is there's a change of one precinct there. What was the reason for the change in Will County?"

Currie: "Yeah, that... that... actually, I don't have real strong information about that. I believe that the Senate Members, responding to some concerns that were raised in their hearings, in their chamber, felt that the shift was a useful thing to do."

Hultgren: "Was that at..."

Currie: "I can tell you that one of the..."

Hultgren: "Was that at the request then of the Will County executive to make that shift?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Hultgren: "Was it at the request of the Will County executive to make that shift of... of line of one precinct?"

Currie: "I cannot answer that question. I can answer the question about why there was cre... the... the change in the Lake County circuits."

Hultgren: "Let's get... let's get to that one next then. My understanding is there... is there anyone in particular that they're identified to run in... in a precinct or in one of

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

the those subcircuits and maybe that's why that line was shifted?"

Currie: "I would have no idea, no way of knowing, and I would be surprised if there were."

Hultgren: "Let's talk about the Lake County one then. Again, we had given map suggestions before this was done back in the Veto Session. But, again, no hearings were held in Lake County in between that time, hearings during Veto Session versus the map that's now being presented, is that right?"

Currie: "This was responsive to concerns raised about whether we'd kept communities of interest as intact as possible. So we tried to..."

Hultgren: "But again, there weren't any hearings..."

Currie: "...make some changes..."

Hultgren: "...to address, specifically in those districts, communities of interest. Let me ask you real quick on the... the Kane County one, that's the one that affects my district most directly. And again, our judiciary... our legal system out there has been very disappointed with, again, how this has been forced through and with really no opportunity for their input. My understanding is there's a new subcircuit, so now there's no... not just four but there's five, so that this would take away one more sitting circuit judge, is that right, and make it a subcircuit?"

Currie: "The rationale, Representative, for adding a subcircuit in Kane, Kendall, DeKalb..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Hultgren: "Wait, let me... it doesn't... let me just... I just wanna clarify that. It doesn't add it, it takes away... it switches from one circuit judge now being... so, there's not an additional judge, it's just taking away one circuit resident judge who's now is now going to have be a subcircuit judge, is that correct?"

Currie: "For the reason that the population numbers in that particular circuit..."

Hultgren: "Is that right, though? I'm running out of time so I just wanna..."

Currie: "...were much bigger than they were in the other subcircuits."

Hultgren: "So 'yes' or 'no'? That's 'yes', it would take away a resident judge and make it a subcircuit judge."

Currie: "For a very good reason."

Hultgren: "So, 'yes'. To the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Hultgren: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. Again, this is something that is... we talk about fairness in voting, allegedly in the previous legislation. This is an absolute slap in the face to our voters in our district to not allow us to have any hearings in the district to make these shifts. Again, my understanding is there might only be several people in the new district who are even lawyers in the new district in Kane County that would be eligible to run for judge. To do this without even knowing numbers of judges that could... or lawyers that live in these districts, we are really hurting our judiciary. We are

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

taking away a fundamental right that our citizens have of knowing that they're going to have qualified judges serving them. We don't know that. Hearings have not been held there. We have no idea. The Sponsor has said this back in Veto Session and nothing has been said to change that today. We have no idea if there's even qualified residents in these areas to serve as these judge spots. I ask a 'no' vote, please, Ladies and Gentlemen."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "At this point in the week, Mr. Speaker, I can't remember, is my speak light on? Oh, yes, I'm sorry. Will the Sponsor yield? Hello, is anybody home?"
- Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative Currie, I have great respect for you and your abilities. In fact, let me just say on the record, Representative, I like you. I always have."
- Currie: "Oh, and... and that feeling is mutual, Representative.

 I appreciate your saying that."
- Black: "I always have liked you. And I really do like you, with apologies to Sally Field. But I really, really like you. But let me ask you one question about... about this particular Bill. I... if... if Representative Hultgren asked and I... it was a little noisy, I couldn't hear. We've read a lot of... in the papers lately, the northern papers, that some judges are being elected in subcircuits and then they immediately move out. Now, this Bill doesn't address that, does it?"

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Currie: "It does not. I believe that there was a House Bill earlier this season that sought to require judges that were elected by a subcircuit to stay in the subcircuit. I believe that measure did not have enough votes to pass this chamber."

Black: "I'll check the record, I certainly hope I voted for that Bill."

Currie: "I... I'll check it too and let you know."

Black: "I know you will. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Black: "I think Randy... excuse me, Representative Hultgren said it very well. Here's another Bill that impacts people in counties who have had literally no input into this process. Oh, yes, hearings were held, but they weren't held in the affected or the impacted areas. And I can remember when this Bill was debated earlier on the House Floor and people chastised me and said this is all about giving minorities and women and people of color and ethnicity the ability to run and be elected for judges. And I... I hope that's true. But I've been around this business a long time. I've read the Chicago Tribune for years. You know and I know how judges are selected in Cook County. It's not a very pleasant process. It's like going to a slaughter house and watching how sausage is made. Such an ugly process you don't ever want to eat sausage again. And how candidates for judges are selected in Cook County isn't a very pleasant process either. I don't ... we all know what this is about. Within reasonable limits... and I hope that what some

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

people think will come out of this is true. But what this is really all about is the ability of Democrats in the fast-growing suburban or collar counties to elect Democrat judges. That's all it is, sweet and simple. And that's politics and I understand that. I don't have a problem with that. But I think the people in the affected counties might have a problem with it. So, when all is said and done, I think Representative Hultgren framed this in exactly the right arguments. And Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I would seek a verification."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We have already created judicial subcircuits in Will, in Lake, and in Kane, Kendall, and DeKalb Counties. This measure makes technical changes to respond to legitimate concerns about communities of interests, about population sizes, and many of those concerns came from my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee who heard the measure when it was originally proposed. These changes are fair, they are responsive, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has requested a verification.

So, all Members should punch their own button and be in their own seats as we proceed with this Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Punch

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

your own button and proceed to your seat. The Clerk shall take the roll. On this question, there are 62 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337. The Gentleman has requested a verification and we will ask the Clerk to proceed with the affirmative."

Clerk Mahoney: "Voting in the affirmative: Representatives Acevedo, Bailey, Beiser, Berrios, Boland, John Bradley, Richard Bradley, Brosnahan, Burke, Chapa LaVia, Chavez, Colvin, Currie, D'Amico, Monique Davis, Will Davis, Delgado, Dugan, Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Flider, Flowers, Franks, Fritchey, Gordon, Graham, Granberg, Hamos, Hannig, Hoffman, Holbrook, Howard, Jakobsson, Jefferson, Lou Jones, Joyce, Kelly, Lang, Joe Lyons, Mautino, May, McCarthy, McGuire, Mendoza, Miller, Molaro, Nekritz, Osterman, Patterson, Phelps, Reitz, Rita, Ryg, Scully, Smith, Soto, Turner, Verschoore, Washington, Yarborough, Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under a very obscure... obscure rule of the House that only I know, I call Representative Hoffman. He isn't in his seat, that doesn't count. That's the... that's the obscure rule."

Speaker Turner: "That's the obscure rule?"

Black: "Mm hmm."

Speaker Turner: "We've had a parliamentarian that ruled that your obscurity is..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Black: "Yes, I see..."

Speaker Turner: "He's here."

Black: "I see Mr. Uhe's over talking to him right now.

Representative Acevedo."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo's down front."

Black: "He isn't in his seat either. There's two gone.

Representative Lou Jones."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lou Jones... Lou Jones is in the middle of the aisle."

Black: "She isn't in her seat either. That's three gone.

Representative Hamos."

Speaker Turner: "She's back by the ladies' room. That doesn't count?"

Black: "If she's sick she should go to the nurse's room and seek, ya know, permission. Well, they aren't in their seat, that's down to 58. Are you aware of the rule? Has he ruled yet?"

Speaker Turner: "We've got a new parliamentarian here."

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Let me just check with her."

Black: "Repre... Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Turner: "She's in her seat."

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "So does that give us one up?"

Black: "Representative Washington."

Speaker Turner: "He's talking to the doorman."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Black: "That's strictly against the rules, he is not in his seat. All right, it's time for hard ball, Mr. Speaker.

Representative Lee Preston. Representative Levin."

Speaker Turner: "You're... you're stretchin' it."

Black: "Representative Bradford."

Speaker Turner: "You're stretchin' it. Any further questions?"

Black: "Representative Monroe Flynn, he was always good for this."

Speaker Turner: "He's in his seat."

Black: "One of the few times we ever went through this. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your discipline. But on a more serious note, it would really help when we did... when we do a verification if they really would be in their seats. It's hard to find some of 'em. Thank you very much. We have no further questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing further... no further questions on this Bill, having received 62 affirmative, 51 negatives, it has received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 337. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chavez, for what reason do you rise?"

Chavez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On point of personal privilege. I would like the General Assembly to welcome people that came from the State of Jalisco, the Director of International Affairs and some people that come from the duration of Chicago. They are over there. The name of them are like Antonio Zubieta, Nicanor Torres, José Luis Treviño, Director of International Affairs from Jalisco,

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Eliseo Carrillo from Protecta, and Deigo Jiraldo from Exidos Newspaper. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. We're returning back to page 15 under the Order of Concurrences. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2004. Representative Acevedo. Take it out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're on page 15 of the Calendar. We are under the Order of Concurrences and we will move down the Calendar in that order. The next Bill is House Bill 2343. Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that we've seen twice before this year. We had duplicate Bills crisscrossing and this is the Bill that deals with the consumer's right to healthcare... the consumer's guide to healthcare. It will be a new consumer-friendly website in Illinois comparing hospital data. And with this Bill we are adding the ambulatory surgical treatment center data. Now, the purpose of this particular Amendment is to work out the only remaining problems we had with the Illinois State Medical Society and the Ambulat... Surgical Treatment Center Association. And with this... with this Amendment they now agree and it's in a... it's a completely concurred to Bill and I seek your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2343?'

All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Leitch. Bost. Leitch and Bost, could someone... There are 113... the Clerk shall take the record. There are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 2343. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2004. 2004. Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask to concur with House Amendment 1 to 2004. Basically, what it does it... it restricts it... the program to deal just with eyeglasses instead of the other as part of dental care and hearing care, it strictly deals with vision care. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, is there an estimated cost to implementation of the vision care components of this Bill?"

Acevedo: "The estimated cost would be \$3 million."

Eddy: "Three... did you say 3 million?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

Eddy: "Is that..."

Acevedo: "Representative, I'm sorry, it's not estimated. What we're trying to do, it's a pilot program. Three million would be put in the funding and once the funding runs out

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

the program would have to wait 'til next year to be funded again."

Eddy: "This is subject to appropriation."

Acevedo: "Yes. Yes."

Eddy: "Subject to appropriation, we're setting... we have \$3 million set aside for the vision needs of students. What happens with that 3 million if the actual claims or the request for reimbursement are greater than 3 million? Are they prorated or would there be no money at all for some at a certain point?"

Acevedo: "There will be no money at all at some point. Yes, Representative."

Eddy: "So, as soon as the 3 million, if it is indeed appropriated, dried up..."

Acevedo: "Speaker, I... I can't... I can't hear."

Eddy: "Ba... basically my question is once that \$3 million, if appropriated, is no longer available, there would be no proration? It would zero dollars for anyone who qualifies after that point?"

Acevedo: "Yes, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. And it is subject to appropriation, there's nothing in the... the budget that's forthcoming that specifically appropriates money to the... to this line item?"

Acevedo: "You're correct, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2004?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2004. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 2345. Representative Hamos, the Lady from Cook."

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Electronical Medi... Electronic Medical Records Task Force that we are creating in part to deal with the issues of medical malpractice by reducing medical errors. And I think that this task force will really move us forward in... in devising a statewide system. What this Amendment does is something that was recommended actually Representative Coulson the first time this came through and that is that we ask them to submit a report to us by December 31, 2006. And that's what this Amendment is. I seek an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall Senate Amendment 1... will the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2345?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur is Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2345.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 2351. Representative Leitch. The Gentleman from Peoria."

- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2351. What this Amendment does is add albinos... people suffering, who are albinos, from very sensitive reactions to sunlight to also be qualified to get tinted window license plate or stickers. I know of no opposition and would ask your approval."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur is Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2351?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2351. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 2380. Representative Coulson. The Lady from Cook."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the House to concur in Senate Amendment 1. The Amendment basically just adds the word 'subject to appropriation' to the underlying Bill on arthritis that passed the House unanimously. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2380?'

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hamos. Reitz. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this... and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2380. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 2417. Representative Kelly. Out of the record. Clerk, read the Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 28, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' Amendment #4 to House Bill 1752, Amendment #1 to House Bill... House Resolution 90, and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 27; 'approved for the Order of Concurrence' is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 130, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #7 to House Bill 325, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 991, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1562, and a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2417, and a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2578."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Speaker Turner: "And now on the Order of Concurrences, on page 16 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2417.

 Representative Kelly. The Lady from Cook."
- Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 2. It's a technical change. It deals with the conflict regarding countywide offices with Municipal Board of Elections. In other words, it assures that once the local canvassing boards are abolished, Cook County will do its own instead of Chicago."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to 24... 2417?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed... The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."
- Black: "Representative, you're moving to concur with Senate Anumber... Senate Amendment #2. My understanding that that broadens the elimination of canvassing boards considerably. Could you... could you explain that to me, please?"
- Kelly: "It doesn't broaden it, Representative."
- Black: "It doesn't broaden it? I wonder why it's..."
- Kelly: "Senate Amendment 2 deals... it was just a technical change."
- Black: "No, I don't think so, Representative. You better look again. That is not a technical Amendment. In the underlying Bill, the offices that were taken out of canvassing boards were specifically listed in Section 22-1.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

In Senate Amendment #2, you... you eliminate all kinds of questions, election questions, from the purview of the canvassing board."

Kelly: "Representative, Senate Amendment 2 deals with the conflict of... what I read before with regarding countywide offices and their being a municipal board and then the county board. It's a technical change."

Black: "Representative, in all due respect, either your staff...
you're looking at the wrong Bill or my staff is looking at
the wrong Bill, and I... and I don't think they are. Senate
Amendment #2, in effect, eliminates all canvassing boards."

Kelly: "Representative..."

Black: "Now, if you eliminate all canvassing boards who do you go to when you have a contested election?"

Kelly: "Representative, I'm gonna pull it out of the record
and..."

Black: "Thank you."

Kelly: "...bring it back."

Speaker Turner: "Take the Bill out of the record. We have House Bill 22... 2449. Representative Washington. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington, on 2449."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2449, it passed out of the Senate unanimously with a Senate Floor Amendment #1. #1 Amendment was requested by the railroad industry and the enforcement procedure has been changed from criminal proceedings brought by the states attorney to an administrative proceeding enforced by the Illinois Commerce Commission. A civil fine could be

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

issued after a hearing and finding by a commission administrative law judge. With Senate Floor Amendment #1, all original opponents are now neutral and the Illinois Commerce Commission has agreed to administer this Act. The proponents have agreed to accept this Amendment with the understanding that the provision of this Act will be strictly enforced by the commission and I ask of my colleagues favorable concurrence to Senate Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2449."

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

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I commend Representative Washington for his work on this Bill. When it left the House it carried some criminal penalties for railroad workers. And you could literally get into a situation where a... a worker was perhaps injured slightly and... and could say that the foreman, who may be a member of the same union, had neglected to provide timely first aid and then that individual would have to defend him or herself on criminal charges. I commend Representative Washington. He's worked this out, the criminal charges have been eliminated and I think the Bill... the Bill, as amended, now is an agreed Bill between labor and the railroads and they have the ability to work out these disputes without going to criminal court. And I think that's a great improvement and I intend to vote 'aye'."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2449?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this... and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2449. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, Representative Flowers, we have House Bill 2451. The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers. No... out of the record. You're right. Out of the record. We're gonna go to the Order of Sec... Senate Bills-Second Reading, page 6 of the Calendar. We have Senate Bill 27. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 27 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Molaro, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro, on Amendment #1."
- Molaro: "At this point, Mr. Speaker, I move to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

And Amendment #1 is withdrawn. The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel, for what reason do you rise?"

Kosel: "I rise for a computer problem. It seems like the Republicans' screens are all blank."

Speaker Turner: "The Republicans' screens are all blank?"

Kosel: "Yes. The computer system is down over on this side."

Speaker Turner: "Are the Democratic screens blank too?"

Kosel: "No."

Speaker Turner: "We will ask the technician to check your computer screen."

Kosel: "We would ap... it probably had something to do with that election Bill we just voted on."

Speaker Turner: "The Governor hasn't signed that Bill yet.

That's fast. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Molaro, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro, on Amendment #2."

Molaro: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Wait just a minute. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, none... none of us here have this... have anything on our computer screens and we're not being... we're not trying to be funny but I don't have it, my seatmate, our whole row, the row ahead of me, nobody's got it on our side of the aisle."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Molaro: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll just explain to them what's in the Bill. They don't really need... I don't really think they need their computers for it. I'll... I'll tell it... I'll tell it like it is. They're... this is just a merely Bill, it doesn't really do much. So... My... Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared but I don't know what you're gonna do about this. Yeah, this..."

Speaker Turner: "It's my under..."

Molaro: "...is just, as the Doctor Reverend Black would say, it's merely a technical Amendment. It technically talks about...

Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker, we did this without computers for, ya know, a hundred and twenty years in this General Assembly. And we had... so what's the big deal? Yeah, it was read about. And our screens... our screens don't say much except just 'vote 'yes'' on it. So, I don't know why we have to wait. I'm sure yours is gonna come up 'vote 'no'' so..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Molaro, let's just give it a minute and see what LIS is doing here to correct these systems."

Molaro: "So, are we gonna re... relax for a minute or two?"

Speaker Turner: "No, I'm certain... just give us a minute here."

Molaro: "I will."

Speaker Turner: "They should... they should..."

Molaro: "I don't have time to get something to eat or anything?

Just..."

Speaker Turner: "No."

Molaro: "I'll just stand at ease, Mr. Speaker."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Speaker Turner: "Yeah, when you see all their heads focused on the screens you know that they're back in business. Just give them a few minutes here. Mr. Clerk, take Senate Bill 27 out of the record. On the Order of Concurrences, page 16 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2462. Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on 2462. Simply clarifies the language that we sent out of the House over to the Senate a little while back. Would provide for the seller of the home to refer to his or her most recent property tax bill to determine the amount of the homestead exemption for which the seller was eligible. All we're doing here is clarifying the language even further and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2462?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2462. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 2500. Representative Jakobsson, the Lady from Champaign. Representative Jakobsson."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate... on House Bill 2500 I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson moves that we noncur on Senate Amendments 1 and 3. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"
- Molaro: "I have a question of the Chair. On these last Bills that we read, are they showing up on the Republican screen?"
- Speaker Turner: "Yes, they are."
- Molaro: "You mean just 27 wasn't showing up? How do we know that it was... well, I won't say."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative, the virus was caught. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the cost would be seeing it is a Saturday of a holiday weekend, but I was wondering if maybe we could get a Chicago electrician to come over here and help reboot the computers up."
- Speaker Turner: "It probably would work. On the Order of Concurrences, Representative Howard, we have House Bill 2578. The Lady from Cook."
- Howard: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As you know, my colleagues, House Bill 2578 addresses the high rate of HIV/AIDS in the African-American community. This Bill would provide for free HIV testing in busy state offices

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

serving high risk communities. It enhances reentry services for HIV-positive inmates leaving state prisons and expands the voluntary HIV counseling and testing in Illinois prisons and jails. Senate Amendment #1 changes the way that HIV testing is offered in Illinois jails. Senate Amendment #2 was submitted at the request of the Illinois Department of Corrections. It makes technical changes to the IDOC provisions and corrects some drafting errors. I Motion for Concurrence of Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2578."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 2578?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. This is final action. All those... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the... and House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 2578. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 16 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2853. Representative Tryon. The Gentleman from McHenry."

Tryon: "Yes, House Bill 2853 is... make a Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment. That Motion will simply clarify the language on cell phone billing that will require cell phone companies to disclose any third-party providers that provide services that are built for by the cell phone

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- company. It's really a truth-in-billing Amendment and I would urge an 'aye' vote for that."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2853?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2853. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 in the Calendar, Representative Kosel, we have House Bill 3048. The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we concur with Amendment #... Senate Amendment #1 on 3048. Senate Amendment #1 adds the department... adds to the Bill, which was a cleanliness standard for porta potties and an inspection process and a licensing process for porta potty pumping, it adds that the department may accept the Portable Sanitation Association International Certificate as educa... for their education and testing program. I would move for your acceptance, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Does the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3048?'

 All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Sacia. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3048. And all... and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kosel, we have House Bill 3480. The Lady from Will."

- Kosel: "Thank you very much. I would move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #3 and send it back to the Senate for..."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady asks leave to nonconcur on Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 3480. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries. On the Order of Concurrence, Representative Moffitt, we have House Bill 3532. Read the Bill. Or not read the Bill, but the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt, on the Bill."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3532."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with... with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 359... 32?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3532. And this Bill, having received the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3268. Representative Feigenholtz. 3628. Representative Feigenholtz, the Lady from Cook."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3628. These Bills are essentially... these Amendments essentially cleaned up some opposition that people had and... and retooled the Bill so that attorneys who are providing legal services and people who are facilitators could associate with agencies if they chose not to become licensed child welfare agencies."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3628?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3628. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3648. Representative Dunn. Out of the record. We have House Bill 3678. Repre... Representative Schock, the Gentleman from Peoria."

Schock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3678 was originally a bilingual reimbursement Bill that we passed

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

out of the House that no longer has anything to do with bilingual reimbursement. It was amended in the Senate and makes a number of changes for... under No Child Left Behind regards to our public schools in the Specifically, it allows for students with disabilities to take the tests or the state requirement at the grade level that they're being taught as opposed to the IEP at a higher grade level that they may be in. So, it also allows schools to come off of watch lists as soon as they meet state standards rather than several years as it currently written. These changes have been recommended and are supported by all the... the teachers' unions as well as the Management Alliance and the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee that it went before, unanimously joined me in cosponsoring this legislation. It's a very good Bill and I think all of the Members in this House will be suited to support me in cosponsoring and voting for this piece of legislation. It's a good way we can help our schools without costing our state a lot of money. Be happy to answer any questions. I'd urge an... a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3678?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3678.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 3800. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 3800. It just makes a technical change to the Bill regarding the legal description of the land that MWRD wants to annex. There is no opposition to the Bill... or the Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, just one quick question. Is the Village of Madison in agreement with the annexation?"

Kelly: "Yes, this is..."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3800?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Parke, Poe, and May. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3800. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Dunkin: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Dunkin: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just for us to take... I'd like for us to take a moment to recognize the Mayor of Maywood, Illinois, from our very own State Representative Yarborough's husband, Henderson Yarborough. Right here. The Mayor of Maywood."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield, Mayor. On the Order of Concurrences, on page 17, we have House Bill 3874.

Representative Brosnahan, the Gentleman from Cook."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 of House Bill 3874. The underlying Bill initially raised the penalty for official misconduct by a public officer or employee from a Class III felony to a Class II felony. The underlying Bill also created a new offense of public contractor misconduct, making it a Class felony. Senate Amendment #1 simply expands the definition of 'official misconduct' to include 'special government agent' as defined as the Illinois Governmental Senate Amendment #2 removed the increased Ethics Act. penalty for official misconduct, retained it as a Class It also reduced the penalty for a public contractor misconduct to a Class III felony to track with official misconduct. There's also some clarifying language that the Senate included to address the concerns of the Road Builders Association and to address the concerns of the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Illinois Mechanical and Specialty Contractors Association.

I know of no opposition to either Amendment."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3874?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hassert. Representative Dugan. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3874. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 4014. Representative Biggins, the Gentleman from DuPage."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we concur for the House Amendment... for concurrence on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill... sorry, to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4014. This language agreed to now containing agreed language from the Department of Public Health and the American Red Cross."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4014?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Lyons. Bassi. Eileen Lyons. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4014. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 18 of Calendar, we have House Bill 4023. Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you very much, Speaker, Members of the House. This... this Bill started off pretty contentious, it's the video game Act. And I move that the House concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3. The changes to the Bill... as it traveled over to the Senate I kept my word as a Member of this Body and continued to work with the other side of the aisle to make sure this Bill became something that we could be proud of. The changes that we placed into Bill from there to here, and I wanna thank the Representative Hultgren and Representative Mulligan for helping with the... the changes ... there's a couple changes. One, the new affirmative defense to protect clerks from liability. Retail salesclerks should not be found in violation of this Section unless he or she has complete knowledge that a party to whom he sold or rented a violent video game was a minor and the clerk sold or rented the video game to a minor with a specific intent to do so. The only way a clerk would be liable if ... is if she or he inintentionally (sic-unintentionally) sells it to a minor, knowingly breaking the law. Similar, if the clerk knowingly sells to a minor in the fashion the retailer may not be held liable. The second new... portion that is different, new affirmative defense for retailers. If the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

game was prepackaged and rated E, E10+, EC, or T by the entertainment software rating board then the retailer shall not be liable. This allows the retailer to rely on the industry's rating system as an affirmative defense. Games that contain extreme violence or are sexually explicit under this statute will not be sold to minors under 18. And then also, the next change, and probably one of the largest, is the reducing penalties. The fines have been reduced from the original 5 thousand and a Class A misdemeanor to a petty offense punishable by a thousand dollar fine. This removes the possibility that a young clerk would obtain a criminal record by selling violent or sexually explicit games to minors. Further, the penalties for la... for labeling and signage violations have been reduced to a petty offense punishable by a \$5 hundred fine for the first three offenses and a 5 hundred fine for each subquential... subsquential (sic-subsequent) offense. like to say that initially IRMA and the entertainment industry was extre... they are for these changes but they still are regretfully against the original Bill. When we first started with this Bill I'd like to say that... that those two industries felt that their glass was empty. I think we're at a point where it's at least half full and I'd like to also acknowledge that this might be one of the strongest pro-parenting Bills that we put into law for this year. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Speaker Turner: "Representative... Representative LaVia (sic-Representative Chapa LaVia), you are concurring in both 1, 2, and 3. Is that correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Corre... correct. Thank you for ... "

Speaker Turner: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...for validating that."

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

"Thank you. To the Motion, Mr. Speaker. repeat the comments I made in committee because I think it's important for the Body to hear them and I think it's also important that the Supreme Court read the transcript of this debate. But Ladies and Gentlemen, I intend to vote for this Bill but I intend to vote for it knowing it's unconstitutional. It's unconstitutional as written. Now, why would I vote for a Bill that's unconstitutional on its face? Because as I said in committee, I'm hopeful that we can put a Bill out there that the Supreme Court will read, look at, and send us a message as to how to fix it. Apparently, no one in this Body is able to draft this in a constitutional way, no offense to the Sponsor. It's a very difficult area of law. And apparently, the Governor's Office, all due respect to Mr. Ryan, has not been able to draft a Bill that's constitutional. The first version of this Bill wasn't constitutional, the second version of this Bill wasn't constitutional, and this version of the Bill isn't constitutional. Why? Well, some will talk about the First Amendment but I'm not sure that's the issue. The

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

issue is that the Bill is vaque. It talks about complete knowledge but it doesn't de... doesn't define what the term 'complete knowledge' means. The Bill doesn't say what 'complete knowledge' means so that the clerk or the store owner or whoever's selling this game has some knowledge as to whether they're breaking the law or not breaking the So that's the first issue. The second issue is not necessarily... the second issue also deals with what's constitutional. The Supreme Court of the United States has said more than one time that government cannot delegate to a private entity its rulemaking authority. And yet, this Bill takes ratings that have been created by a private institution and adopts them as our own. Now, these ratings can be made up and changed by this private institution at any time and yet this Bill demands that we create a law that uses these same rating systems and makes it part of our law to determine whether some 18-year-old clerk at some retail outlet should or should not sell this game. Now, we all know there are violent and... and sexually explicit video games. We all think they're harmful, we all want to get rid of them, and we all have a goal of doing that. this Bill was written not in a constitutional way. more issue. The Bill sets up affirmative defenses, which as far as it goes are fine. The problem is an affirmative defense only kicks in once somebody's arrested. So now we're gonna have somebody arrested or cited or being declared a criminal and then they have to go into court and convince a judge, by using these affirmative defenses, that

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

somehow they have not violated the law because affirmative defense kicks in. So first we arrest the person and make them a criminal... or an alleged criminal and then we allow them to throw their affirmative defense in. There's something wrong with that, Ladies and Gentlemen. Now, having said all this, again I say... I'm only saying this so maybe the Supreme Court will read the transcript of this debate. I'm hopeful they will read my comments because what I really would like the Supreme Court to do is say, 'Representative Lang, you're right. Representative Chapa LaVia, you have a great idea, here's the way to fix the Bill to make it constitutional to get our kids away from these games.' So, I would recommend 'aye' votes but I'd like some of you to talk about how you think that some of these ideas I have talked about are also correct so we can convince the Supreme Court to help us draft a Bill that the Governor has been unable to handle properly. you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will Representative Lang yield for a question? Representative Lang, I just wanted to thank you for living in the past. You referred to Governor Ryan. Sir, he is no longer Governor. Yes, you did, you said 'Governor Ryan'. I don't think Governor Ryan had anything to do with this Bill. All right. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Black: "Representative, one thing that you have done to make the Bill a little more sensible is the... the rating codes that come from the industry will be the rating codes that the stores will use, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. In the… in the case that they do get cited, that would allow them… kind of, if you will… and I don't know… we don't like using these words…"

Black: "Sure."

Chapa LaVia: "...'loopholes'. It's not part of the Bill, it allows them to use it..."

Black: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "...if they are cited."

Black: "Well, in other words, you're not mandating that each video store open the game, look at it, and put their own rating on it, right?"

Chapa LaVia: "Cor... correct. Correct."

Black: "Okay. Now, there... there are still some problems with the Bill and I think Representative Lang did an excellent job of outlining some of those problems. So, you buy one that's rated 'T' for teenagers. You buy it, you take it home, and your little bro... your little brother or sisters who's eight years old who knows how to use these games puts it in there and plays the game. Mom and Dad's gonna be able to go back in the store, aren't they?"

Chapa LaVia: "Mom and Dad can buy the game. That's why I call this..."

Black: "Well, I mean, that..."

Chapa LaVia: "...a very pro-parenting..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Black: "...that, to me, is the... the crux..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Black: "...of this whole issue."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Black: "Mom and Dad go into the store, buy any game they want and give it to a seven-year-old and stick him in front of the game just so he shuts up and doesn't bother them."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Black: "It's... it's the deterioration of parental responsibility that's the real problem with these games. And I don't think anything we do here is gonna fix that. But I do commend you on making what... a Bill that I voted against when it left here at least somewhat more palatable. Speaker, to the Bill. What the Governor has done... and he's a fan of Elvis Presley and so am I, but I was in high school when Elvis Presley started his career. And I think what the Governor has forgotten, for many years when the... when Elvis Presley would appear on television the selfstyled censors of the day said that the television camera could not go... focus below his waist because he could shake it, he could swivel, he could get with it, he could walk it, he could talk it, he knew the game. And he went on to stardom. And what the Governor has also forgotten is that many of his records, in churches throughout the country, were burned. I could remember radio stations having promotions, 'Rock and Roll has got to go'. And they would burn these records and they would run over them with steamrollers. They would flush them down the toilet, until

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

they figured out that didn't work. From time immemorial, government has tried to regulate personal behavior. I can remember Prohibition, it didn't work. I'd go up to Chicago and John D'Amico could show me almost any speakeasy that I could get into. He was very young at the time. We just don't do a very good job of regulating personal behavior. And what we have done in government is we have given parents a false sense of security that if it's rated, somehow those of us in government have convinced them it's okay. Government says it's okay. When I grew up, what established in my life, what I could watch, what I could read, and what I could buy was my mother and my father. And we've given that up. We've decided that parents just don't have the means to do that anymore so we will make those decisions. And some poor 17-year-old clerk who works part-time in the video store may be charged with an offense because he sold a video game to somebody who looked 21 or 22 but turned out to be as young as Aaron Schock. know, in all seriousness, and I think Representative Lang has said it very, very well, this Bill will not pass a constitutional challenge. Most everybody in this floor knows that. But what we have, Mr. Speaker, is what we get from the second floor, all fluff and no stuff. It's hard for me to vote... Governor. But it's awful hard to support a press release. And I don't know if I'm gonna vote much longer for fluff. Send me some stuff."

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

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a comment to the Sponsor, when this Bill left the House previously I'd not supported it primarily because of the way that you had the rating system set up requiring each retailer to... to do the individual rating. And I just didn't think it was a workable solution to... to the rating system. I would thank you for hopefully at least listening to somewhat of what I said and having changed that in the Senate through an Amendment. I appreciate your cooperation on this and would stand in support of it now."

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

Rose: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she'll yield."

Rose: "Senate Amendment 3 does what?"

Chapa LaVia: "Senate Amend... Se... yeah, it allows a new affirmative defense for retailers if the game was prepackaged and rated 'E', 'E10+', 'EC', or 'T' by the entertainment softmo... Software Rating Board. And in... in the Supreme Courts in California they upheld the use of a private rating system as affirmative defense and..."

Rose: "Representative..."

Chapa LaVia: "...I feel that the usage under this Act will allow it to be constitutional."

Rose: "Let me ask you this, is it for prepackaged software?

For prepackaged software..."

Chapa LaVia: "For prepackaged."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Rose: "...or video games or whatever? Okay. Thank you. the Bill. I still don't believe this is constitutional. One, we're in the 7th Circuit Federal Court of Appeals, not whatever California court you were citing. The 7th Circuit Federal Court of Appeals' Judge Posner at case out of Indianapolis distinguishes the differences something that's violent and something that's extremely violent and pornographic in nature. We have an op... we have every right to regulate what is extremely violent and pornographic and it is my belief we should regulate those What we don't have a right to do is regulate violent items. I understand what you're trying to get at with the prepackaged items, but what about a resale shop that puts on the store a video game that was bought and essentially is sort of a pawnshop and it's not prepackaged and puts it back out? They're not subject to your affirmative defense and, therefore, under the Posner Decision, would not be un... would not be constitutional. Again, I would... thinking of things like John Madden football where, by definition, it's not extreme acts of violence that rise. And that's the key, that rise to the level of offensiveness. By all of us... well, not all of us, but the vast majority of the American public on each Saturday and Sunday in fall watches football. That's a violent act, but it's a publicly acceptable act that does not offend. And that's the key distinction in the Posner opinion that we have the ability the regulate and should, frankly, in my under... in my own opinion, regulate things of

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

extreme acts of violence, pornography, et cetera. What we don't have the right to regulate is what is... is there socially acceptable violent content, football, baseball, things of that nature. This will, in my view, ultimately be found unconstitutional and I would like to yield the balance of my time to Representative Black."

Speaker Turner: "He's lookin'... he's lookin' for stuff. He's lookin' for stuff. Turn on the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Oh, thank you. At my age, Representative... or Mr. Speaker, I appreciate anything you can do to do that. All right? Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates... she indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, this has... this has caused me some distress because I don't know the answer. I'm assuming that a lot of these violent video games will have to be destroyed 'cause it can't be sold or they're afraid to sell them. Will... will it be illegal to take these violent games to a landfill for disposal if my brother-in-law owns the landfill?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, we're not... we won't destroy them. Or your sister-in-law, right?"

Black: "What?"

Chapa LaVia: "Your sister-in-law."

Black: "Well, could you get me a list... yeah, but I could take them to a landfill as long as my family didn't own it, could I... couldn't I?"

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Chapa LaVia: "We're... we're not destroying them, Representative.

All we're doing is restricting it so under a... age 18 cannot purchase them."

Black: "Well, you're... you're bending my confence... confidence just a tad in truth, justice, and the American way. Where are the heroes when you need them? Where's Superman? Where's Batman? Oh, I'm sorry, those are illegal videos."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Parke: "Representative, I'm looking at a sheet having game ratings and decipher... decipher (sic-descriptor) guide. How does these ratings get put on these films?"

Chapa LaVia: "You mean how do the ratings get placed on the films?"

Parke: "That..."

Chapa LaVia: "By the manufacturing."

Parke: "We'll start there."

Chapa LaVia: "By the manufacturing."

Parke: "The manufacturer. Now, they make a determination for every state in the Union? They're... they'll have a ruling?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. And what..."

Parke: "It is a uniform or is it... will it vary from state to state?"

Chapa LaVia: "It... it's a... the industry association that's uniformed."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Parke: "What happens if they mislabel a film and one of our clerks in Illinois sells it and it comes home? What happens to that clerk?"

Chapa LaVia: "That's exactly why the affirmative defense is in there for the protection of the clerks from the liability of."

Parke: "Will there be anybody with liability?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, yeah. The retailer."

Parke: "Who?"

Chapa LaVia: "The retailer, the actual business that sells."

Parke: "If they... if the industry mislabels a film, why should the retailer be penalized?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, we're only within our guidelines of what happens in the state. So, if something is mislabeled and comes into the state and say your son purchases it and he's 17 and they're relying them on the misleading information..."

Parke: "So, what you're saying, that retailer must hiler... hire an attorney, must go to court with that attorney, must take time off from their jobs to go to court to protect themselves from the penalties that you have built into this Bill. Am I right?"

Chapa LaVia: "It... the practicality of this Bill is no one's going to enforce the law if these..."

Parke: "Well, then why do we have it at all?"

Chapa LaVia: "...affirmative ac... defenses can be used."

Parke: "Why... if we're not gonna enforce the law, why even have it?"

Chapa LaVia: "If the affirmative defensive..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Parke: "No."

Chapa LaVia: "...applies."

Parke: "What's gonna happen is you're gonna require people to have to defend themselves in a court by hiring an attorney, taking time off. And you just got through telling us that nobody's really gonna get prosecuted under this."

Chapa LaVia: "That's... that's not true."

"Well, let me just say... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a difficult Bill to vote against. But I think we all understand, by virtue of the people that have spoken, that this is very difficult Bill to enforce, it has constitutional problems. And I wanna point out that one of the previous speakers... one of the previous speakers had the audacity to tell us that even though this is a bad Bill, even though everybody knows it's unconstitutional, that we should let it go to the courts so the courts can determine how to make it constitutional. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a thing called separation of powers. And I'm sick and tired of the state courts getting their noses into public policy. That is our responsibility, not the courts. I don't want the courts to make decisions on this. This is something that is our responsibility, we're elected to do that. And for them to even have the audacity to say... is that we're not smart enough to craft something, only the courts have enough smarts to come up with something that can work is ridiculous. And I'm telling you, let the courts make rulings on the constitutionality legislation we present and keep their nose out of making

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

sure that we are the only ones that develop public policy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Davis, M.: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor and I have discussed what Representative Rose talked about in reference to a trailer Bill to take care of the prepackaging. In other words, we could draft something quickly that stated whether it's prepackaged or secondly or whatever. But I think what most of us in here are not aware of is what some of these games contain. attended a press conference with Governor Blagojevich in which samples of some of these games were shown. And you would be absolutely shocked at what your children have access to. We would be more than shocked of what this does than what not having a filter on a library computer does. We want filters on library computers, then surely we want to filter this kind of material out of young children's In the press conference there was a group of hands. students in Representative Nekritz's district and I asked those students, 'Do any of you play sports with your video games?' The response was 'not many' because one little lady said, 'We don't learn anything from them. They're boring and we're not learning anything.' And I asked, 'What do you learn from the violent ones?' And she said, 'We learn how to hide guns, we learn different ways to kill people.' And this little girl was like fourth of fifth grade. We have a responsibility to see that children are

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

not growing up on getting pleasure from seeing the murder and the death of women, the murder and death of police Not just a murder, but the kind of vicious stomping, beheading. You would be shocked if you saw some of this material. You haven't seen it, you don't know what's out there. We were given an opportunity to look at some of them, have children respond to what they saw, and we recognized a need, not just in this state. But this is our obligation, this is our responsibility. I commend the I commend all of those who join the Governor in this attempt to protect children from growing up developing the kind of heart that gets pleasure from seeing people killed, from seeing blood drip from babies, from seeing a women being stomped to death, from seeing a police officer become drug addicted and then become the murderer. I think we need to take a good look at this legislation and accept our responsibility so if it goes to court, it goes to court. We've done what we should do. Protect those babies. Don't let them become the monsters that we see in these violent games. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Will the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 4023?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those ovote... all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 4023. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in the gallery today behind the Democrat section we have a gentleman and his wife from the Freeport, Illinois Park District, Tom Jungen and his wife, Beth. Would you make them feel welcome?"

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. On the Order of Concurrences, on page 18 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 4030. Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 4030. The underlying Bill strengthens the reporting requirements for registered sex offenders. Senate Amendment #2 simply adds clarifying language that when a juvenile sex offender is required to register as an adult sex offender it does not extend the original 10-year registration period. It also limits the ability of local enforcement agencies to require law additional registrations to no more than 4 per year. Senate Amendment #3 deals with the provision that prohibits registered sex offenders from residing within 5 hundred feet of a park. This Amendment simply clarifies that that restriction applies to all parks, not just those providing services

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

directed exclusively toward minors. I know of no opposition to either of these Amendments."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4030. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're gonna go to the Order of Senate Bills-Third Readings on... that's top of page 5. We'll start with Representative Colvin on Senate Bill 49. Out of the record. You know, the deadline is very close. We have Senate Bill 254. Representative Yarbrough. Out of the record. We have Senate Bill 1738. Representative Osmond. Out of the record. We'll keep trying. We have Senate Bill 1943. Representative Pihos. Out of the record. And Representative Phelps? Out of the record. Do we want to work today? We're going to go to the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. On page 6 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 92. Representative Joyce. Out of the record. We have Representative Graham on Senate Bill 193. Out of the record. We have Senate Bill 251. Representative Black. Representative Black on Senate Bill 251. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

60th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 251, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. I should say, it's on Second, move the Bill to Third."
- Black: "I'm... I'm ready to hear it right now if it's okay with you."
- Speaker Turner: "Read the Bill again, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 251, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Black, I'm not surprised that you're ready to work today. Let's go on 251."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was amended this week after the entire Session of being negotiated by the Illinois Trial Lawyers, the Farm Bureau, and various sporting groups. I appreciate everybody's help on it. All we were able to do on the Illinois Outdoor Land and Use Recreation Act (sic-Recreational Use of Land and Water Areas Act) at this particular point in time is to reinstate a landowner's ability to allow people to hunt on his or her land and... and still retain some degree of limited liability of they trip or fall or whatever on the land. For those of you who went through this last year with thousands of pheasant, quail, dove, deer hunters who did not have a

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

place to hunt because the Supreme Court struck the law down, I think this is as much as we can get for this year and it will take care of the hunting season. I would ask an 'aye' vote on the issue and be glad to answer any questions that you have."

- Speaker Turner: "This is final action. Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 251?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Readings, we have Senate Bill 385. Representative Lyons. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. On page 9 of the Calendar, Representative Leitch, we have House Bill... Senate Bill 945. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 945. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill again, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 945, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

60th Legislative Day

- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate Bill 975 (sic-945) is identical to a Bill that we passed earlier in the Session which would permit beer distributors and some others to serve on city councils if they were... and require that they not participate in any matters that would become before those bodies that would relate to the sale and other... other issues pertaining to liquor. The only difference in this Bill is it has an immediate effective date in order... while it's not special legislation, the impact of this would be that it would enable the mayor of the City of Peoria to consider candidates that he couldn't otherwise consider for appointment to his seat when he was elected in the most recent campaign. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 945?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kosel. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Readings, we have Senate Bill 926. Representative Saviano. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 926. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

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

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 926, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 926 is identical to the House Bill that we passed last week, I think it was House Bill 3176. This is a measure to license distributors' pyrotechnic products. This is... these are products not for retail sale. This is distributors who set up fireworks displays at places like Navy Pier, different Fourth of July events. This is all professional and I would ask that we get a favorable vote on Senate Bill 926. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no que... the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt, for what reason..."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, if you stated this, I... I missed it. This... this is an agreed Bill now, isn't it?"

Saviano: "Yeah, it's an agreed Bill with the hard work of the State Fire Marshal, Illinois Fire Safety Alliance, and the Illinois Firefighters Association."

Moffitt: "It's my understanding, if you would confirm it, that there was a similar Bill that... that you did make reference to and, of course, the fire service was extremely concerned about. In fact, I think it was the last Bill we passed in

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

the... in the prior Session before new Members were sworn in and the fire service had some serious concerns. You have worked with them and... and they have all now removed their opposition and considered a... an acceptable Bill. Is that correct?"

Saviano: "That was... that is correct. We... we put a lot of hours of work into this and, just to correct, it wasn't 3176, it was... 3167 was the House Bill that we passed last week."

Moffitt: "Well, I just... I commend you and all those involved for continuing to work to where we still have proper regulation, the fire service is comfortable in terms of the safety, and we're still able to advance the issue. So, Representative, I really commend you. I know it took a lot of time at the table to get to this point. Thank you."

Saviano: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bla...
or, I should say, the Gentleman from Vermilion... he's been
talking about Cook all day. Representative Black."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, there was an article in the local newspaper a week or two ago that said that the Bill, as... as we're voting on now, still would require someone who bought Class C fireworks at a local tent, like in Spring... there are only two counties in the State of Illinois that allows Class C, what I call backyard fireworks, to be sold, and that is Sangamon and Macon. The article indicated that if

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

you went to buy these, and they could be fountains, small backyard pyrotechnic devices, that if you're going to light them off for your children you would still have to be licensed. Do you... do you interpret the Bill that way?"

Saviano: "No, not at all. This... this is just professional fireworks. This is not... this is not the small articles you would buy in a tent on... in... on a retail basis."

Black: "And the insurance requirement on those who sell backyard fireworks in Sangamon County, for example, if you're just selling those, you don't have to have a million dollar liability policy. That's out of the Bill, is that correct?"

Saviano: "That is not in this Bill."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 926?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano, we have Senate Bill 1267. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1267. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

60th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 20... 1267 was brought to me by the Illinois Department of Labor. It's... it's pretty much a simple Bill. What we're doing is cleaning up our Safety Inspection and Education Act to put it in synch with the federal safety guidelines so we would be eligible for federal funding for the OSHA standards as they apply to public employers, which would be a cost savings to the state. It... it... the Municipal League is neutral and it passed out of committee 18-0 and I would ask for your favorable vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1267?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black. Daniels. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1333. It's on Second Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1333, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

60th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Hold the Bill. Move it to Third. Mr. Clerk,
 Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for House Resolution 510 and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 157."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Order of Second Readings,
 Representative Currie, we have Senate Bill 157. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 157. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment has technical changes to the Amendment that was adopted yesterday in the Human Services Committee. Clarifies some reporting under the employer reporting part of the Act in response to some suggestions from the Department of Public Health with respect to the adverse reaction reports from hospitals. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Mulligan: "Representative, what does this Amendment do to the Bill?"

Currie: "As I say, the Amendment makes some changes in the reports about employers. This was at the recommendation of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. It then goes on to make some changes in the section having to do with reporting adverse outcomes in hospitals. So, for example, it clarifies that if somebody is in the hospital and terminally ill but the medication regime actually hastened the death, that that would become subject to the adverse report. And the Amendment further underscores the collaborative nature of the evaluation, the reviews of reports on adverse outcomes in hospitals."

Mulligan: "Representative, why would you put the Amendments on the Bill that you did when this is a very important Bill for revenue? And you put two Bills on this Bill that have previously been defeated repeatedly in committee and on the House Floor."

Currie: "Well, first of all, Representative, I think all three parts of these... of this Bill are very important. And second, of course, the two that you refer to are now identically worded to those items that you objected to earlier. I would remind you, Representative, that the Illinois Hospital Association stands in strong support of this measure as does the Illinois Department of Public Aid and the Department of Public Health. I would further remind you that without adoption of this Bill we will find

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

yet one more gaping whole in the budget for Fiscal Year 2006."

Mulligan: "I think this is a perfect example of what's happening this Session, the example is you can pass whatever you want. On this particular issue... this is a revenue issue and it's also an issue that you need us to help you with federal CMS level. You need House Republicans on this. These are two Bills that have repeatedly been judged bad Bills by both Democrats and Republicans, repeatedly. The changes are slight but we're being held hostage. Just because DPA backs this Bill does not mean it's particularly good. DPA can't even seem to solve its bill... stop paying problems this year. So, I have real concerns over the fact that you're putting these on and you're putting it on a Floor Amendment now that you kicked out of Rules and we have had no time to go back and talk to them within our own caucus Members. There's an underlying Bill that benefits hospitals, benefits this state. The last time they threw a nursing home Bill on the hospital assessment, this time you're throwing this on it. I think this is a blatant fact of you have the power so go ahead and take it and do what you darn well please."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm joined by the requisite number of Members on my side of the aisle to request a record vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Turner: "Your request is honored."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Black: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, without this Amendment this Bill would've passed the House unanimously. No question about that. But let's look at what House Ame... excuse me, what Floor Amendment #2 really is. It embodies most of the language of House Bill 1044, which received 41 'yes' votes on this floor. It failed. It also embodies language that was in House Bill 1578 that was called for a vote in the Health Care Availability and Access Committee twice, and it failed in committee both times."

Speaker Turner: "Representative. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Speaker, I think that the Representative is speaking to Amendment 1, which is already on the Bill. If he'd like to address that Amendment on Third Reading, that would be dandy. But Amendment 2 is technical and includes some recommendations from the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. You are, of course, welcome to vote 'no' either orally or on the electronic record. But I would be surprised if, in fact, you want to. So I just would like him to talk..."

Black: "You're right."

Currie: "...to the Amendment that's before us."

Black: "You're right, Representative. I apologize. I was looking at Committee Amendment #1. And my apologies to you and to the Body. One of the problems we're having, my fault, not staff, they're doing the best they can to keep up with Amendments that are being kicked out of Rules and then try to get us an analysis within a very short period

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

of time. So, that is certainly not our staff's fault, that was my fault and I apologize. I would never try to intentionally mislead anybody on what the Bill does. Again, I would go back simply to the ... to the premise of my opposition to these Amendments. If... if this Bill would be... were to be kept clean it would pass the House unanimously. is... the current Amendment Amendment that discussing, Floor Amendment #2, still has significant opposition from the business community who feel that this is a violation of their right to keep employee records out of the proceedings. I don't know why we want to add Amendments to what otherwise would be an agreed Bill. With a... again, with apologies to the Body for confusing the Committee Amendment. This Amendment is not necessary. There's an Amendment to follow that's more technical in nature. I don't... I just don't know why we do this when we have a Bill before us that many of you on both sides of the aisle has worked on all... all Session and we would then be able to... to pass it unanimously with... with no trouble whatsoever. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "To..."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir?"

Black: "With apologies to the Body and apologies to the Sponsor, who I have great respect for, I feel I have made a... a grievous error and have confused the issue. If the Sponsor would be kind enough to take it out of the record, you're the Majority Party, give... give our staff five

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

minutes to come up with a clean, clear, and concise analysis. You control the process, we can get back to this Bill in five minutes. We need about five minutes for staff to really analyze this. And I think I have already unintentionally... and I apologize and I'm embarrassed, I've confused the issue by looking at the wrong Amendment. If the... if the Sponsor would be kind enough to take it out of the record for five minutes so staff could analyze it, we could take another look at the Bill and then debate it on the actual merits without me adding to the confusion that obviously we're having on my side of the aisle, and that's my fault. If she'd be kind enough to do that we'd be very grateful."

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "...you, Speaker. It's a very short Amendment. I'd... I'd be happy to take it out of the record and give him four and a half."
- Speaker Turner: "Take the Bill out of the record. On page 8 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 501. Representative Rita. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 501, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita, before the dance, on Amendment #2."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Rita: "How's... how's that? Did I get it? I'd like to withdraw

 Amendment #2 because Amendment #3... which will become the

 Bill then."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it.

 And Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita, on Amendment #3."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 addressed some concerns that come up in committee and it's technical, taking out the language of other outstanding debt owed to the city and also taking out that a representative from a relocator must be visible from his shoulders up. And this was brought up in committee and we said we'd address it."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Representative Rita, Amendment 3 becomes the Bill?"

Rita: "Yes. Yes."

Parke: "And does this Bill now only apply to the City of Chicago?"

Rita: "Yes. It... it... when we did it in committee that's what it was. And it's... it's a..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Parke: "Can you explain to me what the... the program that you're gonna... that the City of Chicago's gonna establish whereby the owner of a lienholder is entitled to any proceeds from the disposition of the vehicle? Can you tell us, do they have a program in place already that they're gonna mirror or are they gonna come up with something that were to be determined later on?"

Rita: "They're gonna set up a program that... what it first does is gives a second notice to these cars that have been towed and changes the dates from 15 to 18 and then with it... with the disposi... when they sold these vehicles or demolished them or whatever, the proceeds would be entitled back to the people."

Parke: "The other thing that I... ya know, we have had for years complaints from citizens, both in the City of Chicago and the suburbs, about unscrupulous towing companies that really either set people up or towed them illegally and good citizens have been abused. I want to make sure that whatever's established is not established under the basis of simply putting more money into the coffers of the City of Chicago budget but is compassionate towards the citizens of Chicago and those suburban and downstate citizens that will come to the city. Is it your intent to... to encourage the city to come up with a fair and comprehensive program?"

Rita: "Yes. And what... what has happened was this Bill started before the... they did the big investigation of all this towing stuff. And it really doesn't hit the heart of the problem but I'm intended to come back with something that

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

has... that addresses more that... than what has come out in an investigation of the illegal tows and everything. This is... was a start of something else that needs to be addressed with it."

Parke: "Well, if I get on in the city and my car's towed, I'm gonna look you up, buddy. So I hope this works fine."

Rita: "And I'm gonna come out and help ya."

Parke: "Okay. Very good."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "Just ask that Amendment #3 be adopted."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor
Amendment #3?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all
those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the
'ayes' have it. And Amendment #3 is adopted. Further
Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 501, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "As we just stated in the Amendment, this Amendment became the Bill. It sets up a program for the City of Chicago. It mandates them to set up a program, give second notices to cars that have been relocated. And I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "This is final action on this Bill. The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 501?' All

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, we have 1693. Representative Granberg. Senate Bill 1693. Representative Granberg. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1693, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Macoupin... Montgomery,

 Representative Hannig, on Amendment #1."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I was working with Representative Granberg on the Bill and I guess I filed it under my name. But the Bill basically is something that we worked out with most of the organizations that represent county government along with the Fraternal Order of Police. It would double the employee contribution from a half a percent to one percent and it provides the local governments with the option of... of levying beyond the caps. So, that's what the Amendment does. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tyron... Tryon."

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

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Tryon: "Yes, Representative, having been a former county board member, I know what the impact the pensions can have. In fact, I've worked on this... on this pension plan several years ago, thought we had come to an agreement and we hadn't and our intent was to try to make it as close to budget neutral as we could. So, I'm wondering if you have an idea of what the impact on property taxpayers in Illinois is in the way of dollars? How many... how many dollars is this gonna cost property taxpayers?"

Hannig: "Representative, it would depend on each county. I mean, some counties aren't capped and so they would levy this amount if they wish, and other counties may wish not to levy it, perhaps they can absorb it. So, in each county it's gonna be different. It's also gonna be based upon how many people they have on their payroll in law enforcement."

Tryon: "But this, in fact, is gonna be a... a cost that the local governments are gonna have to pick up, correct?"

Hannig: "They have the option of levying for it or they have the option of absorbing it."

Tryon: "Well, here's the problem that I have. This was initially presented as a pension parity Bill which was gonna bring the sheriffs in line with the police. And the problem is that the police contribute 9.9 percent of their income to their pension plan and the sheriffs contribute six and a half percent. They also receive in their pension plan Social Security, which the police don't receive. So, in my opinion, this is almost a pension superiority plan.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

And so, what I would be looking for was for this to be somewhat budget neutral with an increase to half a percent to bring them up to seven and a half percent instead of their six and a half percent. This is still gonna be a rather costly to a unit of government. In fact, I asked IMRF what this would cost and they're saying that taxpayers across Illinois are gonna have to absorb somewhere around \$75 million, and I think that's quite a bit of a tax increase. Is there... was there any attempt in the negotiations to make this a budget-neutral request?"

Hannig: "Representative, there... there was. Let me just say that I think the Amendment makes the Bill better. So, maybe you'll wanna reserve some of your... your comments for Third Reading."

Tryon: "Okay. I will check that out."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want everybody to hear what the previous speaker pointed out. This is ambhis'll be a tax increase for some counties. It's 73, 74 million dollars, folks, and it's opposed by the Metro Counties, the United Counties Council, the Municipal League, and the DuPage County. This will require a tax increase in certain counties. Be careful on how you vote on this. I... it gives me no pleasure to point it out to you, but you better know what you're voting for. This Amendment will go on and then I will oppose it when it's on Third Reading."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

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

Jenisch: "I'd like to... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Jenisch: "Just one clarification on this Amendment,

Representative. This Amendment that you're placing on will

allow an exemption to the property tax caps, correct?"

Hannig: "It will allow an exemption if that's what the county board chooses to do."

Jenisch: "So, the answer is 'yes', it does allow an exemption and... which really is a backdoor referendum."

Hannig: "And... and I... it's my understanding that DuPage County is neutral on... on the Amendment and on the Bill with the Amendment."

Jenisch: "From my... To... to the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "To the Amendment."

Jenisch: "From my understanding, DuPage County is neutral on the concept of the Bill of the SLEP benefits, but they have not taken a position on the exemption from tax caps. And I would urge Members of both sides to remember that this is exempting pension from the tax caps. And I request a 'no' on the Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig, to close."

Hannig: "Ye... yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As the Bill came over from the Senate, it provided for these benefits which are still in the Bill and basically had a... had a contribution from the local

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Fraternal Order of Police at a half a percent. Now, after some negotiations, the police decided and agreed that they would increase what it was that they would contribute towards the cost of this enhancement. And at the request of a number of counties around the State of Illinois, we've given our local governments the option, the option if they choose, to levy for this on their property taxes. So, no one will be forced to do it. If a county board in DuPage County wishes not to, God bless 'em, they are not required to do it through this Amendment. So, this is... this is the product of negotiations to make this a better Bill. And I'd ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

- Schmitz: "Speaker, I apologize. We hit the light a little bit ago. We had intended earlier that we did ask for a... would like to have a Roll Call on that Floor Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call vote. And we will grant the Roll Call vote. So, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1693?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 46 'ayes', 65 'noes', 1 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

60th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, remove the Bill out of the record.

 On the Order of Second Readings, on page 6 of the Calendar,
 we have Senate Bill 157. Representative Currie. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 157, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I renew my Motion to adopt Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 157. I think it's been thoroughly discussed on this House Floor. And I suspect everybody now knows exactly what the Amendment does. Technical and responsive..."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate the Majority Leader's kindness in letting us have a few minutes to look at the Bill. And I, again, apologize to the Members of this Body. I would never intentionally try to confuse the issue. I do that enough unintentionally, I think. But it was my error, my mistake. I looked at the wrong Amendment, I apologize. I withdraw my request for a Roll Call vote on the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Amendment. And I will simply let those who have questions and problems with the Amendment debate it as they see fit. And again, I thank the Majority Leader for her courtesy."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no ques... no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 157?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 157, a Bill for an Act concerning hospitals. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the measure that provides a new hospital assessment for Fiscal Year 2006. As you remember, the assessment we've been operating under, we were told by the Federal Government, was not sufficiently redistributive to meet federal standards. The Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois Department of Public Aid worked very hard over the last several months to try to craft a measure that we hope will meet federal standards. I believe that the provisions in Senate Bill 157 do just that and I appreciate the help and hard work that both the Hospital Association and the Department put into this task. The... this measure does two additional things. First, in order to find out how we can help people get access to health care insurance, it's going

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

to require hospitals to collect data about employers, about employment status, and about access to health care among the clients they serve. Second, following a Minnesota model, we are creating a... a program so that hospitals may report adverse outcomes. This language is collaborative and we hope that the language will help us identify systemic problems and use them... use the analysis of those problems to do a better job of preventing serious drug and other problems in a hospital setting. As I say, this measure has the strong support of the Illinois Hospital Association, of the Illinois Department of Public Aid. The budget for the coming fiscal year depends on replacing the revenues that will be lost by the present assessment. I encourage your 'aye' votes."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Bellock: "I'd like to ask, Representative, if IRMA and the Illinois Chamber are still opposed to the Bill?"

Currie: "I have not heard from the Illinois Chamber. Amendment 2 just adopted, did respond to some of the concerns that IRMA raised. I don't think that means they're for the Bill but we did go out of our way to try to respond to the issues they raised."

Bellock: "I'm not sure. Yesterday in committee we had some concerns even though we wanted to support our hospitals and

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

the hospital assessment. You know what our concern was with that Amendment 1 and that is still in the Bill, correct?"

Currie: "Yes, but I would point out that the language in this Bill is different from the Bills that Representative Black referenced in an earlier speech on Amendment 2. The language is not identical by any means."

Bellock: "But according to the Bill now, it still requires that if a patient who is on Medicaid comes into a hospital, they must report who their employer is..."

Currie: "No, no, no, no."

Bellock: "Oh, it doesn't?"

Currie: "Representative, look at the language, they 'may'.

They 'may' report."

Bellock: "They may report."

Currie: "And... and let me just remind you that in any hospital I've ever encountered, they ask not only your name and your address and your Social Security number, they also ask you the name of your employer."

Bellock: "We went over that question yesterday with Howard Peters. But the difference, I think, is that I'd like everybody to be aware is that not only will they report who their employer is but then the hospital must... they are required to give that data registry of the employers of those people to the Department of Public Health, which has never been done before. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct. And again, the Amendment we just adopted, Amendment 2, at the suggestion of the Retail

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Merchants, provides a context for that reporting. The hope here is that we can find out where there are holes in the health insurance safety net. Perhaps we can find some incentives that will help employers provide health care to their employees. It would be useful to know whether the problem is greater in the retail community than the manufacturing, whether the issue is part-time help or whether it's full-time. There are many things we can learn from this data that I think would help us, as policy makers, discover if there are ways we can help see to it that our citizens have access to health care. That's the purpose of that language and the help... the Hospital Association is backing it a hundred percent."

Bellock: "But I think that IRMA and the Illinois Chamber are definitely still opposed to the Bill. That's what I was just told."

Currie: "Well, less so..."

Bellock: "Even with the Amendment."

Currie: "...than they were yesterday, by a good deal. Have you heard from them this morning? My understanding is they were not contacting Members to say one word about the Bill."

Bellock: "It puts us in a difficult position because I know all of us wanna support the hospitals. I still have concerns about giving that information about private employers of people that come into a hospital to a government entity, but that's my concern. Thank you."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in order to discuss the Bill or just talk to the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "To the Bill."

Mulligan: "Thank you. To the Bill. For the most part, the hospital assessment Bill, which we've worked on recently... the figures which have been put back and forth for the hospitals and what we need to do for this Bill seem to be fine. We know now that federal CMS would not go along with what we did the previous time, which actually would have continued to keep the winners that we have. But what there is is we needed more losers, that we were making out to well on it. So, we arranged for that and we dickered back and forth and we came up with amounts that certainly benefit hospitals in Illinois and benefit the revenues and coffers of Illinois. So, the majority of the Bill is fine with our Members. And although, we were very unhappy with two of the Amendments that were added on, I would suggest that the Members on our side of the aisle vote in favor of their hospitals if they need to. The other issue I would like to speak to, which should have no bearing on what happens at the federal level because, quite frankly, we do need Republican votes on this Bill in order for it to be negotiated at the federal level. The other issue I would like to speak to is something that's happening in Springfield routinely. But I thought that we had gone around a little bit of that last year. I feel very

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

compromised by adding two Bills onto this Bill that have nothing to do with the hospital assessment, Bills that have repeatedly failed here in the House and even though they've tweaked, are still bad Bills. I would like to remind you that that's one nice thing to do when you're in the Majority but I think it's a really bad thing to do on a Bill that impacts revenue. In order to be cooperative to help our hospitals and to help the people of the state, but certainly not to help the other side of the aisle, I would suggest that our Members vote if they need to vote for this. Be unhappy about the fact that we were crammed with the underlying Bills, but to go ahead and vote in favor of our hospitals. I think this is a poor way of doing business, but that's how things are. Hopefully, we'll change it next time."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure is critical if we're going to have a responsible budget for the coming fiscal year. Help our hospitals. Help our poor. Vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 157."
- Speaker Turner: "This is final action. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 157 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received a

60th Legislative Day

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reitz, on Senate Bill 1814? It's on page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1814, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. On the Order of Second Readings, page 7 of the Calendar, Representative Lang, we have Senate Bill 198. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 198, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speak... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw all Amendments and move the Bill to Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 198. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed.

 Correction, a fiscal note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."

60th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Bill shall remain on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, for what... On page 4 of the Calendar, we have... on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, is Representative Cultra on House Bill 3092. 3092, Representative Cultra. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3092, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Iroquois, Representative Cultra."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Cultra: This Body has a long-standing tradition supporting voluntary school consolidation. House Bill 3092 simply allows the high school district of Crescent Iroquois to consolidate with the grade school district of Crescent City to form a unit district, K-12, with the same tax rate that it currently has. This is an agreed Bill with the language coming from the Office of the Governor. also supported by the Illinois State Board of Education. And there is no tax rate increase by passing this legislation. In fact, the first 2... after the first 2 years, a 10 percent rate reduction will occur annually until a 4 percent rate increase is reached. And finally, this is a front door referendum which, in this case, was held in April and the voters of the district approved it by a 90 percent rate. I would pause for any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3092?' All those in favor should

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bailey. Colvin. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Sacia, would you be interested in calling House Bill 3814? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3814, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3814 is a very important piece of legislation. And I would like to start by thanking the Speaker's Office, Rob Uhe, Trent Johnson, and several others who have worked for the past several months regarding this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could call your attention to the monitors, House Bill 3814, what you are seeing... Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, what you are seeing is currently fully legal in Illinois law. If you own a pickup truck and go downtown and buy yourself a camper and hook your boat on the back, you are fully legal because it's a recreational vehicle. Under current Illinois law, this is not allowed. That's a pickup truck, if you can make that out, pulling a

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

stock trailer with another smaller trailer behind it. legislation allows a CDL, in other words, a professional driver, to pull two trailers either into the State of Illinois or through the State of Illinois. I would point out to ya, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this has nothing to do with semitrailers or heavy trucks. maximum weight of all three vehicles cannot exceed 40 thousand pounds. One of the initial concerns that the Speaker had was that this would be an effort for the farm community to haul livestock. This deals with new vehicles either on their way to a dealership or being returned to the manufacturer for warranty type work. I would share with you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that all five states surrounding the State of Illinois allow this type of transportation. All of the initial organizations who were opposed are now onboard. The Township Officials, the Municipal League, the Illinois State Police, all have gone neutral on this Bill because it's a.m. it's a Bill dealing with fairness to simply facilitate interstate commerce. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote and I would welcome any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3814 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Cal... The Gentleman from Effing... the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. You're all over the state."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Saline. An inquiry of the Chair, if I could."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Thank you, appreciate this latest bulletin. Mr. Speaker, I've already given away my tickets to the Indianapolis 500 tomorrow. I need to do a little laundry and I appreciate the fact that we're coming in on Sunday at 2, but there's still no time for Monday. You know, if we had some idea of when we come in Monday and whether or not we'll be here on Tuesday, it would certainly help with decisions we have to make about laundry, whether we need to go home and come back or whatever the situation may be."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your point is well-taken. As you said and spoke earlier, tomorrow, Sunday, we will be here at 2:00. And it looks like on Monday we will probably be starting at 10 or 11:00, Monday morning."

Black: "All right. Do you have any idea on Tuesday yet?"

Speaker Turner: "Tuesday will probably be the same time. We will start early Tuesday morning."

Black: "Well..."

Speaker Turner: "But we could be done."

Black: "...will we have time this afternoon... will we have time this afternoon? I need to go out and get a new stick of deorderant."

60th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "You can, Representative, you got a little time this afternoon. You've got between now and 2:00 tomorrow."

 Black: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "I think there's a few stores still be open.

 We're gonna move to the Order of Nonconcurrences. We're

 gonna do a few of those. The first Bill we'll do is House

 Bill 1316. Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, in the spirit of my friend from Vermilion, would like to apologize for last night's presentation. The obvious Motion on House Bill 1316 was to nonconcur and I mistakenly said to concur. So, at this point, I'd like to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1316. And please accept my apology."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Gentleman asks that we nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1316. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 1316."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representat... Representative Hannig is in the Chair. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, is House Bill 3871. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3871, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3871 is a Bill that was brought to me on behalf of the City of Chicago. And what it does is it clarifies their role in some emergency services dealing with IEMA and things that they may have to do. It allows local health departments to submit some requirements so they may perform some certain duties in... in the event of an emergency. This is an agreed Bill. There are no opponents. And it's just to clarify languages in terms of how we will deal with emergency disasters here in this state. And I move for the adoption of House Bill 3871."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

- Parke: "I just have a question. It says something about the City of Chicago. Does this only apply to the City of Chicago or statewide?"
- Turner: "It's statewide, Representative. I did misspeak on that. It covers all the local governments in regards to dealing with disaster relief throughout here in the state."

Parke: "Okay. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Turner's recognized to close."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the Bill... I just ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Will Davis, do you wish be recorded? Representative Delgado, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 13. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 13 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were approved in committee. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 13, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was brought to us on behalf of the President of the Senate, Senator Jones. And it deals with the Prompt Payment Act regarding subcontractors and their relationship with con... major contractors in terms of filling their requirement for payments to those subcontractors. The Bill sets up a procedure whereby a subcontractor can file his complaint with the department. And it spells out how the department will, in fact, handle it. There will be a... like an administrative judge who would then sit in to here those

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

distributes. And it lays out what the penalty will be if, in fact, a major contractor does not pay a subcontractor. And I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 13."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Parke: "Representative, now, this is a prompt payment and it says that we're gonna double the monthly interest charges for late payments, from 2 to 4 percent or from 24 to 48 percent annually. Is that... is that what this Bill does?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative. It was the feeling of the Senate Sponsor of this legislation that if the penalty was punitive enough, it was... hopefully, it would discourage a subcontractor from not paying. We did discuss the possibility of lowering the interest rate, but the realty is if that... that person does not pay the subcontractor in a timely fashion, whether the interest is 2 percent, 4 percent or 10 percent, he's not going to pay. But there was a feeling of the... of the Senate Sponsor that, in fact, this was a... an interest rate that he wanted to have on the Bill."

Parke: "So, this is a prompt payment from a subcontractor to whom?"

Turner: "No, it's prompt payment from the contractor to the subcontractor. In many cases, little... a lot of the little guys have gone out of business because the prime contractor refuses to pay in a timely fashion or to resolve any

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

disputes. And so, this is an attempt to try to make certain that the prime contractor does what he should be doing in terms of paying out the subcontractor for work performed."

Parke: "Why is it gonna cost the State of Illinois \$200 thousand annually to do this?"

Turner: "It doesn't cost the state \$240 thousand. That penalty is on the… the prime contractor."

Parke: "What happens if the State of Illinois doesn't pay their bills on time to the contractor? I mean, what if the contractor has a... has a bid..."

Turner: "This would be..."

Parke: "...with the State of Illinois?"

Turner: "This would..."

Parke: "I understand right now that we're ninety to a hundred and twenty arrears of paying some of our bills."

Turner: "This would be adjudicated by a third party and that person would make the determination as to whether there was some problem with the subcontractor... with the contractor not paying or whether it was a problem with the state not paying the contractor. So, the third-party person, the adjudicating judge in this case, would determine whether the contractor was withholding because of his negligence or if there was something else included or there was another reason, i.e. the state or another party that has not paid, in particular, a... a bran... a unit of government, then the... the adjudicator, in this case, would make the determination as to if there, in fact, should be a penalty imposed."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm gonna... I'm gonna rise against this Bill. Ya know, it's hard enough for contractors, subcontractors, the people doing business to the State of Illinois. We already have penalties. Now you wanna double the penalties and they have to go bettor... before some kind of an adjudicator. Ladies and Gentlemen, how difficult do you wanna make it to do business in the State of Illinois? Doubling from 2 to 4 or from 24 to 48 percent annually just makes it so much more difficult for our contractors and subcontractors to do business in this state. I think this is misguided and I'm going to ask... Yeah, well, that's true. Well, I mean with... the state doesn't pay their contracts on time, why do we have to force this upon our contractors in the State of Illinois? I rise in opposition to this legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "He indicates he'll yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, does this apply to road contracts as well?"

Turner: "Yes, it does."

Davis, W.: "Well, and then to the... to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Davis, W.: "The previous Representative talked about how difficult it was and that we may be encouraging contractors not to do business with the state. But when we've got larger contractors who are hanging on to money and

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

preventing smaller entities from making their payroll and paying their bills, that also makes it difficult for small contractors who wanna work here in the State of Illinois. So, this is the type of legislation that unfortunately we need because business don't want to act right and they're acting in a manner that... that does not benefit small contractors. So, I appreciate what the previous Gentleman said, but we also have to look at how we can help smaller contractors here in the State of Illinois. And hopefully, this legislation will work to address that particular problem. So, I rise in very strong support of this Bill and ask for all Members to support it, as well. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "So, we're gonna move this to the Order of Standard Debate. And on that question, Representative Kosel is recognized."

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

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Kosel: "Can you tell me if this Bill has a definition of what a
 'subcontractor' is and could a subcontractor have a
 subcontractor?"

Turner: "Could you... could you repeat the question? I didn't... it wasn't clear."

Kosel: "Can you tell me if there's a definition of what
 'subcontractor' is, because a subcontractor could have a
 subcontractor and would he be subject to the Bill?"

Turner: "Well, a subcontractor, Representative, is a person
 who..."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Kosel: "I understand what a subcontractor is. I wondered if it was just defined in the Bill and if it would apply to subcontractors who have subcontractors."

Turner: "No, I don't think it applies to subcontractor who has a subcontractor."

Kosel: "Does it apply to the suppliers who supply the subcontractors? So, if a subcontractor gets the payment on a timely manner from his contractor but he then doesn't pla... pay his suppliers."

Turner: "Yes, it does... it ... the same with the supplier."

Kosel: "So, it would apply to subcontractors' suppliers...

Turner: "Right."

Kosel: "...or contractors' suppliers?"

Turner: "Right. It does."

Kosel: "Both or one?"

Turner: "Ab... both."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you. I don't know if it's too late in the day to start reading Bills but this seems pretty straightforward to me. I mean, I... I don't know what the problem is. You have a major contractor..."

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative."

Molaro: "...that's..."

Speaker Hannig: "You're up, I'm..."

Molaro: "Thank you. He has to get paid by the State of Illinois. If he doesn't get paid, well, of course, the subcontractor doesn't get paid. That's simple. All we're

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

saying is that if the contractor gets paid, okay, it might take him a week or two to pass it on. After he gets paid, he's gotta pay the subcontractor within 15 days. That just makes a world of sense. That seems common sense to me. And if the con... subcontractor doesn't get paid, they go to these abduct... adjudicators, say, 'Where's the payment?' This is a simple, straightforward Bill and there should be all 'yes' votes. May I also point out that it was sponsored by the President of the Senate, who happens to be talking to our Speaker right now. And he'll probably look up on the board after we vote. So, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens, in response? Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Please. To... to the Bill. The concept of forcing people to pay and pay interest if the payment is late is an honorable one. But I wonder why we just don't make this effective for all state contracts. How about the nursing homes and the hospitals and the doctors? People that need... deserve to have their payments made, we're not invoking the current law of interest added to those payments. How about capital projects like in Albion, Illinois, where this administration pulled out on a commitment after a contractor put \$150 thousand roof on a senior citizen center? But you think we can pay that bill? You think there's gonna be any interest? He'd just like to get his cost back. But we can't do that. This administration is driving us into debt further and further everyday. They're not paying people who provide service and capital to this

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

state. And it's an outrage. The… the Gentleman's Bill is all right but why don't… I guess we'd all like to be paid 48 percent. I said the Gentleman's Bill's all right, I don't know that 48 percent… that's higher. We have a usury rate law that I… that I think is less than that. I would hope that we could find a balance here where providers of services and goods to the state, whether through a subcontract or a direct provider to the state for state services, should be paid in a timely manner. The Governor that's running this state budget is making it harder and harder to be fair to business in Illinois. But his solution is just to chase business further out of Illinois. And I guess maybe that'll be, in some sick way, more fair."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do understand what some of the previous speakers have spoke but this issue deals with the relationship of sub... contractors not paying subcontractors. And in many cases, a lot of little guys have gone out of business waiting for the con... major contractor to pay. In the case for the state doesn't do it in a timely fashion, we're still allowing some safeguards here where we can deal with those particular cases. But we're just talking about blatant outright cases where this contractor... major contractor refuses to pay the subcontractors. And I move for the passage of Senate Bill 13."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes' and 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, Representative Feigenholtz has House Bill 114. The Lady... the Lady's recognized for a Motion."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to Motion to Nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1. The Lady from Cook, the Majority Leader Representative Currie, is recognized for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move that we suspend the posting requirements so that House Bill 1009 can be heard in Personnel & Pensions, Senate Bill 21 also in Personnel & Pensions, Senate Bill 357 to Executive, Senate Bill 930 in Registration & Regulation, Senate Bill 1209 in Executive, Senate Bill 2030 in Executive, Senate Bill 2072 in Registration & Regulation, and Senate Joint Resolution 3 in Judiciary I."
- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk,

 Committee Reports."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Committee. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' on the Order of Concurrences is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2596."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, read the committees that will meet after Session and the schedule for the rest of today."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Meeting immediately after Session is the Environment & Energy Committee in Room 114, the Executive Committee in Room 118, Judiciary II-Criminal Law in Room D-1, Local Government will meet in Room C-1, Public Utilities will meet Room 122-B, State Government Administration in Room 115. Fifteen minutes following Session, the Environmental Health Committee will meet in Room C-1, Judiciary I-Civil Law will meet in Room 118, Personnel & Pensions will meet in Room 122-B, Registration & Regulation will meet in Room 114, and Revenue will meet in Room 115."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 505, offered by Representative Collins. House Resolution 506, offered by Representative Joe Lyons. House Resolution 507, offered by Representative Joe Lyons. House Resolution 508, offered by Representative Miller. House Resolution 511, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 512,

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

- offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 513, offered by Representative Kelly. House Resolution 514, offered by Representative Kelly. House Resolution 515, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 516, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 517, offered by Representative Dunn. House Resolution 518, offered by Representative Lou Jones. House Resolution 519, offered by Representative McGuire. House Resolution 521, offered by Representative Hamos. House Resolution 522, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 523, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 524, offered by Representative Flowers. And House Resolution 525, offered by Representative Cultra."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoptin of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Reso... and the Motion is adopted. Any announcements? Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to remind Members that we are having a going away reception for the Director of the EPA, Renee Cipriano, tonight at 5:30 at the Pasfield House. And you are all cordially invited to attend."
- Speaker Hannig: "Are there any further announcements? Then Representative Currie would move that, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, that the House stand adjourned until Sunday, May 29, at the hour of 2 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned."

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is Resolution 509, offered by Representative Currie, House Resolution 510, offered by Representative Stephens, House Resolution 520, offered by Representative Hoffman, House Joint Resolution 62, offered by Representative Scully, and House Joint Resolution 35, offered by Representative Poe. Committee Reports. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 509, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 668, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2611, a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2613. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health... Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 5 to House Bill 511. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 357 and Senate Bill 1209; 'do

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Bill pass amended Short. Debate' Senate Representative Saviano, Chairperson from the Committee on Registration and Regulation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 930; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 2072; 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 930. Representative Richard Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1009 and Senate Bill 21. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: Senate Joint 'recommends be adopted' Resolution 3. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3755. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II - Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to

60th Legislative Day

5/28/2005

Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1588. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 523 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1814. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 28, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1589. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."