61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 2:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. Will the Members please be in their seats? Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Assistant Pastor of the Victory Temple Church in Springfield."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray as we lift up our hearts and minds before His presence. Most gracious and most kind, Father, we honor You as the great Jehovah, the great Jehovah Shalom, the God of a perfect peace. Father, we pray that You would grant to us a peace that will pass all of our understandings. Help us to understand the things that we do not understand. Father, I pray that You would rule us and that You would govern us by Your grace, Your spirit of wisdom, and Your spirit of counsel. I pray that You will forever keep our eyes and our minds stayed upon You. For they that do so, You have promised us that You would grant them and keep them in perfect peace. We ask this in Your son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Millner."
- Millner 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."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Rich Bradley and McKeon are excused today."

 Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Jerry Mitchell and Shane Cul... and Cultra are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 114 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 527, offered by Representative Beiser."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If we could have order in the chamber? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was called to my attention... called to my attention Friday of the death of United States Army Private Jeff Wallace of Hoopeston, Illinois. Hoopeston is in Vermilion County which is my home county. Private Wallace was 20 years old and a graduate of Hoopeston High School where he played football and was described by one of his teachers as a pleasure to have in class, very nice and polite. While information is still being gathered by the United States Department of Defense, it appears that Private Wallace was killed last Monday when his convoy was hit by a terrorist roadside bomb. I extend my deepest sympathy to his

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

parents, Brian and Leona Wallace of Hoopeston, and to his sister and to his wife, Sara. Sara is expecting their first child in September. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's young men like this that let us gather in a free society, in a representative body, and to discuss freely and openly our differences as we try to work together toward common ground. His sacrifice, I hope, will never be forgotten. I hope you'll join me in a moment of silence to the family of Private Wallace and to Private Jeff Wallace's memory. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black. Okay, we're going to start on page 12 of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences. And we'll start at the top of the list with House Bill 27, Representative Mitchell. Okay, we'll just go on down the Calendar. Representative Munson, would you like to concur on House Bill 128? Representative Munson."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment 1 of House Bill 128, which simply adds a member from... to the Social Security Task Force from the Department of Aging. Ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Represen... Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in this Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Boland, would you like to proceed on House Bill 130? Representative Boland."

- Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur in Amendment #3... Senate Amendment #3 which just makes a technical change, replaces certain references to 'physician' with 'healthcare professional' and then defines 'healthcare professional'. And this was done at the request, I believe, of the Medical Society."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in this Senate Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Delgado, would you like to proceed on House Bill 215? You're up. Representative Delgado."
- Delgado: "Yes, on 215... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. On House Bill 215, I'm looking for a concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. And the... Senate Amendment #1 adds to... adds and provides that the courts consideration of the impact of multiple trials is subject

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

to constitutional limitations. This Amendment seeks to address constitutional concerns of the... of the opponents at the time and would remove any opposition to this legislation. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final passage. 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 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate And this Bill, having Amendment #1. received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Burke, would you like to proceed on House Bill 315? On the Order of Concurrence. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 315. Ladies and Gentlemen, this matter has gotten quite a bit of discussion and there are no fees, there is not tax, there is no increase in anything. It's simply a matter that's good public policy with respect to the overpopulation of stray animals in our society. I'd be happy to answers any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

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

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

Black: "What Senate Amendments are on the Bill?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you advise the Body of the Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "On House Bill 315 there is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 on this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Does that answer your question, Representative Black?"

Black: "Yeah, I'm sorry, I was looking at a Floor Amendment.

Trying to figure out how Floor Amendment #3 could become the Bill and we were adopting 2, but the Floor Amendment was in the House. So, we'll start the day off with another apology, I guess. One of these days I'm gonna get the hang of this. I... I apologize for the delay."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Granberg, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes' and 25 voting 'no'. And the House does Concur in Senate Amendment #2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black. Representative

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black is recognized on House Bill 325 on a Motion to Concur."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #7 returns House Bill 325 to basically the form that it was in when it left the House with an overwhelming vote. What this does is to transfer 30 acres of property from the University of Illinois, actually only 10 of those acres are involved, to a citizen who purchased the land in good faith in 1972. The university then discovered many years later that they, in fact, owned the land. However, the family has been paying taxes on it for almost 35 years. The family cemetery is on the land as well as the house that the 90year-old mother of this family lives in. There is a... the speaker required a... an appraisal. That appraisal has been filed. The owner of the land, the current owner, will pay the university fair market value. And it's my understanding that they have reached an agreement on an easement in perpetuity for the University of Illinois. And I believe that that will solve this problem that has been festering for some time. Be glad to answer any question that you have."

Speaker Hannig: "And on the Motion to Concur, Representative Franks is recognized."

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

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

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Franks: "Representative, when this came on the floor before I was one of only a few people who voted against it. And I'm wondering now that it's... it's... it appears that the University of Illinois has now agreed with your constituents and they've agreed now to an easement. Why is it that we need to pass the law if they've agreed to do everything?"

Black: "Representative, all I can tell you is in talking to the Vanderport's attorney, nothing has yet been signed. With the easement provision understanding, the university has no problem with the Bill. But the Vanderport family attorney is simply more... I don't know what the legal term would be, but he's comfortable... would be more comfortable if the Bill goes to the Governor's desk. It's my understanding that if it gets to that point I think this fiscal transaction between the university and Mr. Vanderport will most likely be solved and the easement granted probably before the Governor has to make a decision on whether or not to sign or veto the Bill."

Franks: "I think you've done a very good job for your constituent. I think because of your efforts, that's probably why the easement came around. And you ought to be congratulated."

Black: "Well, thank you."

Franks: "However, my initial reticence in this Bill remains. I just don't think that the General Assembly ought to be getting into private land disputes when we... when there are legal measures that can be taken. And people can be

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

protected as well by buying title insurance, which I guess they didn't do for whatever reason. I applaud the Sponsor for what he's done. I just think it's bad public policy to be voting 'yes' on this matter."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

McCarthy: "Representative, I assume Senate Bill 7 is how the House version was, only... so it took out, like, that Senate Bill... or Senate Amendment 4, had something to do with Chicago Park District."

Black: "That..."

McCarthy: "That's... that's not in here, right?"

Black: "That's correct. It's my understanding in talking with your side of the aisle, the Chief of Staff, and in the conversation with the Speaker much earlier in this Session... the Speaker indicated to me he didn't want this to become a land conveyance Bill. He... he had looked at the university and the ownership issue here. I won't speak for him, but he decided to let that go. But he, I think, made it very clear he didn't want it to come back with 3, 4, or 5 other conveyances on it."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Black: "And it took us awhile, but I think we have met the... the Speaker's wishes in our conversation earlier in this Session."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

McCarthy: "Well, the Bill's being called, so I'm sure you met his wishes. But..."

Black: "Yeah."

McCarthy: "So, the property in Kane County, the same answer would be there then?"

Black: "Yes. There is no other... no other conveyance in this Bill other than this 35-year-old dispute..."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Black: "...between a family and the University of Illinois that basically covers about 12 of the 30 acres involved in this parcel."

McCarthy: "Okay. And it says that it's an easement for educational and research purposes on our analysis?"

Black: "Yes. Well..."

McCarthy: "Is that the whole land or just a certain section of the land?"

Black: "The... the university says that this land abuts the Vermilion River, which is a research area. The... the owners of the property have said that they have never seen anyone from the University of Illinois on that property or the banks of the river. So, that started the dispute. However, I think we have an agreement in principle that the university and the Vanderport family have reached an agreement in principle for an easement in perpetuity so that the university can access the river if they should choose to do so at any time in the future."

McCarthy: "So, mainly just for access to get to the river, but not the entire..."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "That's correct."

McCarthy: "...property cause of the..."

Black: "That's correct."

McCarthy: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Black

to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I... I appreciate Representative Franks' position and also his kind words. This has been a particularly difficult situation. We just could not get the parties to negotiate in good faith until this Bill started to move. And... and as to the issue of title insurance, the family didn't want money or damages, they want the land. It's where their home is. It's where the family cemetery is. And so, there was just no way to work this out. But because of your cooperation and the Bill advancing, I believe that this will be agreed to by the parties in the very near future. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House Concur in Senate Amendment #7?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Representative Stephens and Eddy, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes' and 9 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #7. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

declared passed. For those of you who are following along, we're now gonna go to the top of page 13 and work down that page on the Calendar. So, the first on the list is House Bill 369. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Simply put, Senate
Amendments #1 and 2 violate the equal protection clause of
the United States Constitution. I'd ask that we
nonconcur."

Speaker Hannig: "So, the Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Could someone help me get Representative Hoffman's attention? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes, I... I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1.

What this does is it... the Bill itself creates the Blindness

Prevention Fund as a tax checkoff for the Department of

Revenue. It... it also, through the Amendment, would require

the Department of Revenue to determine the exact amount of

funds committed to the fund. Once the department

determines the total checkoff contribution, this section

requires the department to notify the Treasurer and the

Comptroller. Also, the... it makes... the Amendment clarifies

the Blindness Prevention Fund and indicates it'll provide

public education for the importance of eye care and

blindness prevention and provide eye care to children,

seniors, and other needy people. I ask for a concurrence."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Bill, which has a 'recommended be adopt... be adopted' Motion from Rules, is House Bill 487. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Representative Granberg on House Bill 509."

Granberg: "Thank you. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 509. Senate Amendment #1 is an initiative of Senator Frank Watson. It deals with a not-for-profit rural water district in his district. I believe that's the only area that is affected by this. It would allow a not-for-profit water system use an existing easement for water line purposes. And I know of no opponents to the legislation. I'm sorry, the... the Farm Bureau had an issue, but they... they're not actively opposing the Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' And all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Granberg, do you wish to concur on House Bill 511? Representative Granberg."

- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move that we concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 5 to House Bill 511. House Bill 511 passed this chamber unanimously. In the Senate some concerns were expressed by two pharmaceutical companies about the timetable to prohibit the use of mercury in certain vaccines. The Senate addressed their concerns. These Amendments address those issues. There is now no opposition to the Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 5?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 5. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Graham, you're recognized on House Bill 523. Representative Graham."
- Graham: "Oh, okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 523, Senate Amendment #1 combines 523 and 3467, which was Milt Patterson's Bill.

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

523 initially determined drop-off spots for sharps. And House Bill 3467 required that the Department of Public Health and Environment establish some regulations. So, I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to 523."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Reprementative Black is recognized on House Bill 551."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 that the Veterans' of Foreign Wars want it changed and Senator Righter added the Amendment at their request in the Senate. As amended, it provides that a member of the Illinois National Guard or any military reservist who is called to active duty as an Illinois resident shall not be deemed delinquent in their property taxes if they were on active status when the taxes were due. It also provides that the individual does not have to pay those taxes for a hundred and eighty days after their return from active duty. And that's the Senate Amendment. When it left the House it said thirty days, the Senate Amendment says a hundred and eighty days. I believe this

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Bill was passed by the House unanimously. I believe the Senate Amendment makes it an even better Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

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

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, just a quick question. I just wanted to make sure that Senate Amendment 1, which became the Bill, that it includes your original provisions."

Black: "That's a good question, Representative, hang on just a second. Yes, as I read it, Representative... and thank you for asking that question since I can't keep House Amendments and Senate Amendments straight lately. Senate Amendment #1 becomes the Bill but reinserts all of the provisions of the engrossed Bill with the following changes: it made... made sure they were an Illinois resident and then extended the thirty days to a hundred and eighty days. Thank you for asking."

Lang: "That's fine. It's a good Bill. I just wanted to make sure you didn't lose the original language. Thank you."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then Representative Black is recognized to close. Representative Black to close."

Black: "Thank you very much. I can think of no better Bill to pass on Memorial Day weekend with property tax bills now

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

coming out and literally thousands of Illinois residents in the Guard and Reserve on active duty in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places throughout the world. This takes one more burden off of them and their family about not having to pay their property taxes while they're thousands of miles away from home. I think that's one of the things we can do for them. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative Wait, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ryg. Is the Lady... Okay, out of the record. So, continuing on the Order of Concurrences and turning the page to 14, House Calendar page 14, is House Bill 668. Representative Tryon. Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a... I'd like to make a Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 668. And essentially, House Bill 668 combines... the Senate Amendment combines House Bill 668 with House Bill 1043. House Bill 668 originally was a Bill that allowed for the oversight of a county board with a population of 300 thousand... it allowed them to set the levy of a conservation district within their borders. And House Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

1043 provided for an... the voters to have a referendum to elect a conservation district board. It was decided in concurrence with the Sponsor of House Bill 1043, Representative Franks and myself, to combine these two Bills and allow for the conservation district trustees not to be elected, but for the voters to convert them to a forest preserve district. This increases no taxing authority. We think it's a pro-taxpayer Bill, pro-voter empowerment Bill, and is good for conservation districts that are in large communities. I should point out this only affects conservation districts that are in counties adjacent to a county of 2 million. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Franks: "Representative, this Bill we worked on together and I appreciate... I had drafted the original Bill. And we had talked about this awhile ago. And I wanna go through some of the provisions to make sure that everyone understands what's going on here. First of all, this will allow the county board to turn the... a conservation district into a forest preserve district, correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Franks: "Okay. Now, forest preserve districts historically have a higher taxing authority than a conservation district, isn't that correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

Franks: "But what you did in this Bill, with our agreement, is that you limited the increase... or the taxing authority to the exact same as the conservation district, correct?"

Tryon: "That... that's correct."

Franks: "So, there is no possibility for a tax increase?"

Tryon: "There is no... no additional tax increase that even the voters could empower from what they have now as a conservation district."

Franks: "Okay. And the reason why we did this is because in McHenry County, for instance, the executive director just gave himself a \$50 thousand increase. And this is the second largest taxing body that we have in the county, but they're not directly accountable to the voters."

Tryon: "That's correct."

Franks: "And the reason we're doing this is now the county board will also wear a second hat and they'll also be members of the new... newly created forest preserve district, correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

Franks: "So, as a result, our voters now will have direct accountability and the forest preserve district will be held directly accountable to the voters?"

Tryon: "If... that is correct. If the voters choose to empower that type of government they will ensure that the

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

conservation efforts have legislative oversight and are represented through elected representation rather than appointed representation."

Franks: "And there's only five conservation districts right now in the entire state, correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

Franks: "And this would only affect McHenry County?"

Tryon: "Only McHenry County is the only county with a conservation district ne… that's next to a county of 2 million. And there are only five conservation districts in the entire state. Most of... four of which are... or three of which are downstate, south of I-80, and one in Boone and one in McHenry."

Franks: "Okay. So... and this is agreed upon by you and I, as well as Senator Althoff, who represents McHenry County, as well as Representative Beaubien, who has McHenry County, and Senator Peterson, correct?"

Tryon: "Yes. And this also has the support of our county board. We have received no Resolution objecting to it and they have commented actually that they support it. And the oversight authority was actually... to increase the population threshold was brought to us by the conservation district themselves."

Franks: "Well, thank you. This has been... we've been trying to get this done for a long time. And I appreciate your help on this. And I'd encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Tryon, would you like to close?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Tryon: "I think Representative Franks handled just about everything and I, too, would like to urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia, you're recognized to concur on House Bill 712. The Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. The summary of legislation... the legislation requires courts to consider whether one of the parents is a sex offender in determining the best interest for cust... custody visitation purposes. What Senate Amendment does is Senate Amendment #1 clarifies the original intent of legislation, corrects a technical error by making House Amendment 2 the Bill instead of just adding it into the Bill. Senate Amendment 1 further amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act by making it an exception to the 2-year waiting period for filing of a modification of custody motion for a party who has been informed of the existence of facts, requiring notice to be given under this section concerning a remarriage or residency with a sex offender. It provides that existence

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

of facts required, the notice of a marriage and residency of a sex offender shall be considered a change in circumstances for purposes of reconsideration of custody arranged by the courts. I want to thank Representative Rose for helping me and allowing me to use some of his legislation enrolling into this. And I... I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Hannig: "So just to clarify, Representative, your Motion is stated both ways on the Calendar. Your Motion is to concur, is that correct? Okay. So the..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Speaker Hannig: "So, the Lady moves to concur in Senate

Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from

Cook, Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Representative, this is commendable legislation. I think as a parent... and almost all parents would wanna know if our ex-spouse is gonna marry a sex offender or stay with one. But sometimes in these relationships, there is physical threats to them. What is the penalty to this spouse who does not report to their ex-spouse that they are living or marrying a sex offender?"

Chapa LaVia: "I... I'd like to refer that question to Representative Rose. He helped me on those sections of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to your question, Representative Parke, what we're trying to do here is allow petitions of custody to be modified. So if, in fact, you didn't... you fail to make that request or you find out later on, you can immediately go back to court and petition the court for custody of that child or modify the custody order, given the new facts and circumstances. I have a constituent of mine who's in a si... this particular situation, actually, where the ex-husband's new girlfriend is a registered sex offender. And now they... under current law, there's a 2-year rule that applies to custody. this would allow them to go in and petition the court to modify custody within that 2-year rule. So, rather than a penalty per se, this is empowerment of the noncustodial parent to return to court and petition to modify the custody order and... and... for redress of what's going on in an attempt to move that child from that situation."

Parke: "So, there's no crime? It's not a Class A misdemeanor or a... or a felony not to report?"

Rose: "No. This... this is about a..."

Parke: "But it allows the noncustodial parent to go to court for regress, is that right?"

Rose: "Correct. In the custody order."

Parke: "Okay. I think that's fair and reasonable. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "The goal of the legislation is to allow courts to determine whether or not a particular living situation is

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

detrimental to a child, and living with a sex offender is. The legislation is intended to protect children and we need to give courts the authority to keep kids safe and prevent them from becoming a victim. This legislation does not automatically prohibit any parent from being involved in their child's life. It simply allows courts to determine if allowing a parent to have custody is the children... child's best interest. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question... the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan, would you... okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Leitch, you're recognized on House Bill 720. And could you state your Motion? Is it to concur or not concur?"

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Amendment #4..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Leitch: "...to House Bill 720. The Amendment has the original body of the Bill within it, which enables municipalities to annex over of a old railroad right of way that has been converted to a trail, as in the Rock Island Trail. It also gives the Department of Natural Resources oversight of any

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

prospective developments... not oversight, but review of any prospective residential developments that would be along the trail. It retains the status quo with respect for annexations over forest preserve districts, taking Will County out because of the increase in their population in the last census. And it allows municipalities within a county of 500 thousand or more to annex across a river on a heritage trail. I don't know of any opposition and I would ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #4?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative McGuire, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment And this Bill, having received a Constitutional #4. Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hassert. Does the Gentleman wish to concur on House Bill 930? Representative Graham, would you like to Concur on House Bill 991? The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 991 deletes any reference to the obligation of a child's physician providing approval for a child to use his inhaler at the… at recreational camp. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano is recognized to concur on House Amendment #930 (sic-House Bill 930)."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 930. This Bill we've passed out in a previous... in other Bills. It's coming back from the Senate. What it simply does is it requires anybody who wants a... a plumbing permit from a municipality, county, or village must show proof of being a licensed plumber before that... that city, village, or county issues the plumbing permit for work to be done in their town. And I'd ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 930."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative Granberg, do you wish to be recorded? Representative McGuire, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fritchey, do you wish to concur on House Bill 1173? Okay, out of the record. Representative Graham, you have House Bill 1350. The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

- Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1350, Senate Bill... Amendment... Senate Amendment #1, the Amendment just states that the trauma unit would do the reporting rather than the hospital. I move to concur."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes' and 31 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chavez, you're recognized to concur on House Bill 1469. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chavez."
- Chavez: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the committee. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this honorable House, I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

and #2 in House Bill 1469, the Human Trafficking and Servitude Bill. Senate Amendment #1 removes language making it... it possible for defendant to be sentenced to the act for the violation of resulting in the death of the victim. It also clarifies how the... how the computation of damage will be based. Senate #2 provides that a defendant convicted under the Bill shall forfeit to be... to the Senate in (sic-State of) Illinois any profits or proceeds or any interest in property acquired from such process. I believe this Amendments make this Bill even better and ask for your support. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Boland, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman, wish to concur on House Bill 1562? Out of the record. Representative Lang is recognized to concur on House Bill 1588. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2, which basically take the original Bill and rewrite it so it does what it did originally, if that makes any sense to anyone. This is a Bill that I'm working

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

on with DHS, which is enough reason to support a Bill, Lou Lang and DHS working together on a Bill. This protects public employees while they're in the performance of their official duties. It covers all public employees. I would ask for your support on the Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

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

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

Lindner: "Representative, is that the only thing the Bill does, is change public employees? Does it change the definition or what does it do?"

Lang: "My reading of the Bill is that they just rewrote the Bill and it ends up doing the same thing in a slightly different way. And then it... it goes in... and even though judges are... are covered under the original Bill, they rewrote that section and specified judges in a separate section, which they didn't even need to do. So, the bottom line is it creates enhanced penalties for assault against public employees in the performance of their official duties."

Lindner: "So, it put that in the same section so that it would have an enhanced penalty, is that correct?"

Lang: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the question."

Lindner: "I said, it put that in the same section as the other so it would have the enhanced penalty?"

Lang: "I believe that's what..."

Lindner: "With the public employee?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Lang: "I believe that's what the Senate did, yes."

Lindner: "Okay. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McGuire, you're recognized to concur on House Bill 1589. Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there are no questions, I would request that the… the recommendation that we concur in Senate Amendment #1. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, why would you agree to take out the option that a person calling a state office, that the first option they wouldn't... that they would not now get is to talk to a real person?"

McGuire: "It's at the request of some of the state offices that we delay implementing some of the changes that were

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

originally thought of in the Bill. So, it's to make the Bill more agreeable to the state offices and departments."

Black: "Well, that that's an honest answer and I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"I... I think in recent... recent history... I liked Black: Representative McGuire's Bill when it left the House. don't think it's too much to ask that government who... we work for the people who pay all of the expenses of government. And I don't think it's too much to ask on an automated phone system that the first option you get is how to connect to a person who can direct you through the myriad of extensions and people and agencies and offices that you often have to get... go through to get somebody to actually answer the phone. If you've called the Department of Professional Regulation in the last 2 years, if you're calling long distance you're gonna have a big bill because their automated message goes on for 5 minutes. It's no wonder people come in to our district offices madder than heck because they can't get a hold of anybody in state offices, their calls aren't returned, we overuse voicemail. And I know the old stilted answer, it saves money. I think all voicemail does is to let people turn it on in some state offices and then refuse to answer the phone. I... I think the Senate Amendment took a good Bill and watered it down to a point where I will not and cannot support it. And I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative McGuire, with all due respect, this Bill is called the Human Voice Contact Act. And with the Amendment from the Senate... I don't know, is that your Senator? I don't know who... who did that. The Senator that amended it?"

McGuire: "No, I... I don't know who gave it the title. I don't believe it was myself, but..."

Mulligan: "Well, anyway, that's what says... that's what it was when it went out of here and that's what the press releases are. This Bill no longer does that, period. In fact, it exempts the department... and this is a CMS Amendment. all certainly respect CMS at this point. This Bill does absolutely nothing now. And to be called the Human Voice Contact Act, with all due respect, is a total misnomer. I... I don't know how... I mean, the object when it went out of here was a very good idea. We wanted people to get someone to talk to on the other end of the phone. Now it exempts... it says, 'Provides that field offices, telephone lines dedicated as hotlines for emergency services, telephone lines dedicated to providing general information, and systems designed to provide a complete transaction with a state agency solely through touchtone telephone keys and automated prompts are exempt from compliance with the live operator requirement.' What telephone systems are left? Particularly on emergency lines, one always likes to dial an emergency line and have to wait through dial one for

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

this, dial two for that. There's nothing left in this Bill. I mean, I... why are you concurring? Why don't you just send it back and say it's awful?"

McGuire: "I... I guess that was a question, I'm not sure.

But, I... I think what... what we're trying to say here is that
the state offices have asked for a little more time to
change their phone systems and whatever they have to do to
implement the Act. And I didn't see anything wrong with
that. And that's... that's the premise that I accepted the
Amendment."

Mulligan: "Well, I... I usually respect the legislation that you put out. I don't understand this. It was a good Bill when it left here, it's terrible now. I would urge a 'no' vote.

And I don't know why you're concurring."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman..."

McGuire: "I would request an 'aye' vote."

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

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

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

Lang: "Representative, I know you didn't write the Bill, but I have to ask you a question because it's the only way I can get my point across. So, this Bill deals with state agencies that use automatic equipment to answer telephone calls, is that correct?"

McGuire: "Yes."

Lang: "Is there anything in this Bill regarding state agencies or state officials who use electronic equipment to make automatic telephone calls?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

McGuire: "Not at all."

Lang: "Have... have you heard that there's an... the executive branch elected official who's been making robo calls in our state to try to get a point across to people?"

McGuire: "I've read that in the paper, but that's all I know about it."

Lang: "So, you don't think the making of electronic calls by a state agency or a state official oughta be part of this Bill along with the answering of calls?"

McGuire: "No."

Lang: "All right. I was just asking."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McGuire to close."

McGuire: "It's a simple Bill. We simply want someone to answer the phone. Some of the state agencies have said, give us a little time to change our phone systems, et cetera, et cetera, whatever it takes to accommodate the Bill. And I agreed to that. So, I would appreciate your trust in them and I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 68 voting 'yes' and 43 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Molaro: "Thank you. As a... just an announcement. It looks like with 11 laps to go, Danica Patrick is in second place, from Roscoe, Illinois, and with 11 laps. But, someone's going to have to come to my desk and tell me where Roscoe, Illinois, is cause I have no idea. But she's from there. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kelly, you're recognized on a concurrence on House Bill 2417."
- Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate

 Amendment #2 on House Bill 2417. It takes care of the

 conflict regarding countywide offices with Municipal Board

 of Election Commissioners."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Black: "Representative, in a rural area... if you can explain to me why... why do you want to abolish all canvas boards?"
- Kelly: "Actually, this Bill is strongly supported by the County Clerks Association, the DuPage Election Commission, and many municipal and township clerks. They feel that it's just really a rubber stamp returning the election authority provides to them. And that it's good government to abolish them because it's just an extra layer dealing with election results."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Black: "It's good government to abolish a canvas board? If I have an election dispute in a township, I'd go to the township canvas board first. Who do I go to now since the canvas board will be eliminated?"
- Kelly: "Someone else will still be doing the canvassing or verifying the election results. This just takes one of the layers out."
- Black: "Well, I assume someone else will have to take the part of the canvas board. But what I'm interested in is who? Who's going to do it? How's it set up?"
- Kelly: "It'll be the county clerks."
- Black: "The county clerk is a highly partisan office. If I'm a Republican and I want to file an election complaint on a procedural question and the county clerk is a Democrat, then who makes up the rest of the canvas board? Does the county clerk appoint all members of the canvas board?"
- Kelly: "Representative, it was the County Clerks Association
 that wanted this Bill."
- Black: "Well, Representative, I really don't give a diddly doo what the county clerks want. I've been around for a long time. The County Clerks Association is a political body. I asked you a specific question. That is a partisan office. And if I have a complaint on an election procedural error and I now have to go to a county clerk who is either a Democrat or a Republican... who makes up the rest of the canvas board? What gives me some assurance that I'm going to have a fair hearing?"
- Kelly: "Just a minute, Representative."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Kelly, do you have an answer for Representative Black?"

Kelly: "Representative, the aim of 2417 is to transfer the function of proclaiming results from these local canvassing boards to election authorities, either county clerks or Board of Election Commissioners."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get an answer to the question. So, I'm gonna speak against this concurrence Motion. If you currently go to a canvas board in a both parties township election, are quaranteed representation. Under this Bill... and she didn't answer the question and I don't see it in the Bill. If there's a Democrat county clerk and I bring an election dispute to the county clerk, it appears to me that the county clerk could appoint all Democrats to the canvas board. Now turn that around. If you're a Democrat and you have an election dispute and the county clerk is a Republican, it appears to me that the Republican can appoint all Republicans to the canvas board. There's got to be something in the Bill that guarantees equal due process or you're gonna hit... you're gonna take every election dispute to the circuit court. That costs money. And if you're a local candidate or running for a township board, you don't have the resour..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Black: "Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very poorly drafted and it puts Democrats in jeopardy and Republicans

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

in jeopardy because she didn't answer the question and the Bill, as amended, is silent. I want some guarantee of due process and representation from both parties. And this Bill does not guarantee that. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

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

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

Winters: "Under your legislation, what exactly... who is going to be deciding the election disputes under this? The county clerk and what other offices make up the..."

Kelly: "The impact of abolishing the local canvassing boards would be to give the same canvassing operations to all counties that do not have a Board of Election Commissioners."

Winters: "So, if you don't have a Board of Election Commissioners, the way I understand it, it would be a panel of the county clerk, the county treasurer and the state's attorney. Is that the standard practice that we use if there is no canvassing board?"

Kelly: "In those counties, only the county clerk would canvas
and proclaim election results."

Winters: "Can... what was that again?"

Kelly: "In those counties, only the county clerk would canvas
and proclaim election results."

Winters: "So... so, we've turned it away from a canvassing board that often is bipartisan and we... we've put it up to one individual, the county clerk? Now, I... I have a Republican

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

county clerk who I implicitly trust. But I'm not sure that the Democrats in my county would like to have their fate at the hands of a partisan officeholder. The same thing happens in other counties where a Democrat may be county clerk. We really are turning away from a system in this state that has, in most instances, a bipartisan makeup of the canvassing board. Both parties are represented. Instead, we're allowing whoever controls the county clerk to control elections in that... in that canvassing board. don't think that this is the right move. I think yesterday the Bill that we saw also coming out of Election Committee that empowered the Majority Party in this state even further leading to more potential fraud. Now, if we have fraud allegations, what happens now? If we have more fraud in this state and somebody makes a claim in front of the Election Board, what happens? Now we have the authority in the largest county of this state, the party that's in control now can... now makes the final decision on whether there's any fraud. We are going from bad to worse, out of the frying pan and into the fire. And if this General Assembly chooses to continue down this road we might as well just all go home and let the Democratic Party control this state forever and ever. I think this Bill is just another reach, another little grab of power by those in control today. I think it's the wrong thing to do in a democracy to simply empower the party in power to grab and grab and grab more power the longer they're in power. It's another bad idea and I urge a 'no' vote."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then Representative Kelly is recognized to close."
- Kelly: "Again, this Bill is strongly supported by the County Clerks Association, the DuPage Elections Commission, and by many municipal and township clerks. This Bill was introduced because several local clerks asked if they could be relieved of this purely ceremonial duty. And to do that requires a change in the law. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 27. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 27 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Molaro, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hanniq: "Representative Molaro."
- Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... well, this particular Amendment is purely technical, as Mr. Black would say, as compared to #1. What we'll do is since I withdrew #1 and we didn't speak about it, we're gonna talk about the entire

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Amendment to #2 that was contained in Amendment #1. Amendment amends the Illinois State Pension Funds and we'll get right down to it. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, I'm having a rough time. Basically, we all remember that the years in 1970s and 1980s, prior to 1995, we funded our pension fund in only two ways. The employees made their contributions as required by law and every single year they made 'em. But the employer which should be paying anywhere from 6 to 8 percent, when we went to budget negotiations, at the end of negotiations the pension funds was just given whatever number was left over. There was no actuarial rhyme or reason. We did this in the 70s, 80s and early We did this with Republican governors, Democratic governors, Republicans running the House and Senate, Democrat running the House and Senate. That... that's what we reached critical low did. And levels underfunding. In 1995, there were five Republicans in the Senate, headed by Peter Fitzgerald and a few others, who came up with a system that said we are gonna mandate that the pension systems start their funding. And the way that they did it is they said not only should we pay what's actuarially called for, somewhere between 6 and 8 percent, so we would always pay what needed to be paid just like our employees always paid. They came up with the level. There were discussions for months about what we should do about the underfunding 'cause just paying what we should pay didn't make up for the 25 years of chronic underfunding. So, they said and they agreed that by the year 2045 we

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

should be 90 percent funded. So, it was a 50-year plan that there would be a level percentage of pay. Remember, ordinarily you pay 6 or 8, they added another 6 or 8. So, it would be 12, 13, 14 percent of payroll would go to the pensions for a 50-year plan. I thought it was too... I thought it should be 70 or 80 percent, thought the year should be out. So, I didn't like the plan. But what also happened when they brought it back to Republican Leadership in '95, the price was too high. So, what we did... what we did as a General Assembly is we decided to ramp up to that level percentage of payroll by 2011. We put in a 15-year ramp and we knew that for 15 years we weren't gonna properly fund. But we did it for budgetary reasons, not for actuarially reasons. Not to fund the pension funds. We knew that for 15 years it was too costly. So, for budgetary reasons we didn't fully fund the pensions. of all of the last 10 years we didn't fund the pension funds properly. Now, this is what Senate Bill 27 does. Over those 10 years, whenever we did pension benefits, we voted for 'em over the last 10 years and we didn't pay for 'em. We just put 'em to the underfunding. If for no other reasons, one of the best things that comes in this Bill says for now in the 60-year history of pension systems in Illinois no benefit increase will take place without the funding mechanism in place when we adopt it. No more underfunding. That day is gone and from this day forward if this passes here, passes in the Senate and signed by the Governor, every time we have an... we have a pension benefit

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

increase it has to be paid for. Also, what we're saying is that we are gonna have it have a 5-year sunset. So, if it costs more than it should the General Assembly will refuse to pay for it and it will come back here. This also maintains where fire and police are at. And the other thing it does, it eliminates..."

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro, your time has expired.

 Could you bring your remarks to a close?"
- Molaro: "When we put in all these changes, the biggest one being that no more 20 percent bumps for teachers... You look in the paper today you'll see superintendents retiring with \$250 thousand worth of pensions. And what we do is we save 30 or 40 billion in payments. And what we do is, those 30 billion over 40 years, we're gonna take that savings forward and in '06 and '07 we're gonna lower the payment by about \$2.3 billion that we normally would get. I could go on for 15 minutes but since my time is up, we'll open up to questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... I'll just ask questions when we get this to Third."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman will yield. So, you're gonna...

 Okay. Gentleman does not wish to speak then. On the

 Amendment, is there any discussion? Okay. Representative

 Black wishes to speak."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanna congratulate Representative Molaro for saying all of

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

that gobbledygook with a straight face. He's a better actor than I am."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke. Okay. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Representative Parke, I thought you had wished to not speak?"

Parke: "No, I had my light on thank you very much. And actually, if we could have Representative Beaubien..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black..."

Parke: "You know what, Representative, you are infinitely wiser than I, you're right."

Speaker Hannig: "Thank you."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All Motions have been filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 27, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro, five more minutes."

Molaro: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanna add a couple things to what I said earlier. And there are a bunch of other reforms in here. Last year, year before, one or two times under Jim Edgar, we did not pay what the '95 law said we should pay it. This is the first time the Governor's

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

commission asked for it. This'll be the first time that when we do a restructuring of the payment it's because we did pension reform. I wanted to make it clear that if we do the reforms that are in this Bill, that stops the abuse of 20 percent artificial pay hikes at the end of their careers. Over the next 40 years we will save 70, 80 billion dollars in unfunded liability to state and 20 to 30, maybe even 35 billion of payments to the... that the state has to make. This is the first time that we are doing reforms when we restructure. Every other time we've restructured there were no reforms. May I also point out that in this Bill is the long-awaited extension of the ERO. And what we have in an agreement between IFT, IEA, and the Governor's Office, which brings TRS and the ERO with no cost to the state. So, the teachers keep their early retirement option. It's an employee option and there's no cost to the state and there's total agreement. AFL-CIO and the unions are for this particular Amendment. May I also state that this... last year ... and if you take the 8 percent, if TRS was at 30 billion, after we pay this they will be at 31 billion. There will not be a decrease in their fund. They are going from... and I think they might be at 33 already, they will be at 34. So, this is about using assets is a red herring. They will continue to go on... and also may I remind you that if in the Veto Session or next year we come to our senses and agree to other reforms, there will even be more savings. And if we agree to revenue increases, those revenue increases can be used to

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

the pension system. So, it's a good Bill. It's agreed to by the unions. And I would be ready for any questions if there are any."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 27. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, let me yield to Representative Beaubien.

I'll come back later. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Beaubien will be first."

Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor and I part... participated in the Governor's Pension Commission, which I believe essentially was a sham. The Bill we are voting today... on today does not provide substantial reforms and even less savings. At the end of the day, 81.5 percent of the savings that were presented in the Governor's proposal have been eliminated. But we've increased the raiding of the pension system and ignored the looming pension crisis. I'd like to also clarify another thing because I was on that commission. The commission did not make specific recommendations. We essentially said, 'We urge the General Assembly and the Governor to examine and consider some ideas.' And we felt it was the object of the commission and the belief of the commission the General Assembly and the Governor should work it out. Yes, by the way, can we have some order in the House, please? Of the five pension systems that are outstanding only two are substantially changed by this legislation. The Chicago Teachers Pension is not affected at all. One of the major provisions that

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

was discussed and proposed by the Governor was the limiting of the COLAs for new hires. Under the documents produced in the commission, that provided 51 percent of the savings, they are not in this Bill. They are in a commission in a committee to be heard later. The age 65 provision consisted of 21 percent of the potential savings, that is not in this Bill. Of... the alternative formula has been cut down so drastically virtually all of those savings are eliminated. So, 81.5 percent of the savings that were provided in the Governor's proposal are not in this system. The Governor's original proposal included reforms to the General Assembly, the Judges' Retirement System and the State Employees' Retirement System. The outstanding Bill provides for none of... no fundamental reforms for these systems. It's also our understanding this Bill does... does eliminate the purchase money formula for TRS and SURS and cap the end-of-the-year bonuses. It also benefits the Chicago teachers who are getting 9 more million dollars out of this budget. And again, I would like to emphasize that 81 percent or \$120 billion of potential savings are not That's 120 of the 145 potential savings dollars. there. And I think the other system we really need to consider is the 6 percent end-of-year salary for teachers. If anyone in this room believes that that's gonna change the cost of ... for teachers, they're wrong. They'll simply backload it prior to the 5-year period. They have time to do that until the current contracts run out. So, all they will do is start earlier in raising teachers salaries. They will

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

end up at the same place at the retirement as they're ending up now. That's not gonna save us a dime. There are no real savings in this budget. And to go around and tell people that there is, I think, is extremely disingenuous. The other provisions that will get a lot of press that says we will not increase any future funding for pensions without a source. All of us in this room know the rule of 60, and that means when somebody wants to raise pensions they'll simply make an exception to that rule. To tell the public that that's a real reform, it is not. Again, I'd like to emphasis there are not real fundamental reforms and there is no real savings. And as the numbers run out, because we've only had 24 hours to work on this, when the actual numbers come out you will find that this is not a real pension reform Bill and there's no real savings. For the life of me, based on all of my experience in banking, as a Legislator and as... working on economic issues, for the life of me, I cannot see why raiding the pension funds is the way to solve this current budget crisis. Thank you very much."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope all of you look deep into your souls today and you realize what you are about to do. In 1995, and I was here at that time, the state passed a law that said we would address past failures to fund our pensions by making a continuing appropriation. Whatever

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

the actuary said we needed, we would pay to try and get caught up by the year 2045. And our pensions systems would be at 90 percent of its liability. We were making substantial progress toward that goal. And contrary to what you've heard, the projections that we made in 1995 are less than a hundred million dollars off on where we needed to be to obtain 90 percent funding by the year 2045. Now, there've been some bumps along the way, nobody would deny that. But the current Governor recognized this problem in his budget address when he said, and I quote, 'The problem of pension underfunding is a crisis that we must solve During... during Governor Blagojevich's administration he has missed a pension payment... payment every year, in violation of State Law. In fiscal '04, we increased pension liabilities by \$10 billion because of borrowing. But only 7.4 billion of that went to the pension systems. The rest of it was spent on General Revenue. In 19... in fiscal '05, we shorted the pension system by \$205 million. It's my understanding that with the passage of the legislation that many of you are going to vote for today, you will make Governor Blagojevich the first Governor since 1995 to never make a full pension payment since he was elected. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you will be asked questions about this Bill all summer long and for the rest of your political life. This pension-looting device is the most severe and dramatic ever proposed in the public pension systems of the State of Illinois. Yes, we've made mistakes in the past. We knew what they were and we

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

addressed it in 1995. And now we walk away from it. Walk away from it. And when you say the teachers' ERO has been reinstated, who are you kidding? The Democrat Majority wouldn't let the teachers' ERO Bill be reported out of the Rules Committee for 2 years. I filed a Motion to Discharge. And we tried to overrule the Chair and everyone of you voted against the teachers' ERO program from even being able to be debated. So, don't tell me at this late hour that you've seen the light. And all of the sudden you're reinstating the ERO. What you are state... reinstating is a sham. It doesn't save any money and costs teachers in my districts that are lucky to retire after 35 years, lucky if they can make \$60 thousand a year with a masters plus two. They're the ones that you're cheating, not the superintendents who make 250 thousand or teachers in some of your areas who can retire at a hundred thousand dollars in salary. I never thought I would stand on this House Floor and see a more concerted effort to mortgage our future. You are mortgaging our future, you are playing with fire, you are playing with potential bankruptcy of the pension system. And let there be no doubt about it and you can't hide it. Talk to any of the directors of the pension systems. They will be selling assets this year in order to pay current pension benefits. The savings? I think Mr. Beaubien already addressed that. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm afraid some of you who are new know not what you are about Shame on us. We are mortgaging all of our to do. tomorrows..."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Speaker Hannig: "Could you bring your remarks to a close, Representative?"

Black: "We are mortgaging all our tomorrows for the expediency of adjournment by May 31st. Shame on all of us for what a debt we will pass on to our children and grandchildren. And know... make no mistake about it, those of you who vote for this, I wanna see you vote for a massive tax increase in 2006 or 2007 because that's the only way you are ever gonna address this pension debt and the structural debt that this doesn't even begin to address. You cannot borrow and loot and steal, if that's not too strong a word, money from pensioners in order to spend money that you don't have. Shame on us for what we're doing today."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To Senate Bill 2, what is it... 27 or whatever it is..."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Collins: "...that we're about to vote on. The same thing, you know, is true that this state needs to address the shortcoming. If we don't get new revenue in... and I wanna go on record saying this, we need new revenue coming into this state. And it is time that we vote for a tax increase because everything... inflation have gone up, state workers... the merit employees have not gotten a raise 8 years, this General Assembly have not gotten a raise in 6 years, since I've been here, and the cost of living steadily goes up. But we don't wanna face the real problem and try to figure out a way of how to get revenue until the... into this state.

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

And what's gonna happen if we don't find a way to pay the pension money, it's gonna be our families and communities that's gonna suffer. Because we don't have businesses, we don't own businesses, we don't have all this money to send our kids to school or to continue the lifestyle. So, who wants to work until they're 70 years old? Nobody wanna work 'til they're 70 years old. So, the problem's gonna keep compounding with education, the cost is gonna steadily rise, social service agencies is steadily rising. Now we have a new drug. First it was crackcocaine, now we have methamphetamine. So, now we're gonna be spending thousands and thousands of dollars on Medicare, on... on education, or everything that you need spend because we won't address the problem and bring in new revenue. And Illinois pays some of the lowest tax. We pay what, 2, 3 percent? We can increase that tax about one-half or a quarter. When I'm out in my district and I ask people, 'If you want new social services you need these programs into your community. How you gonna get it? Can you deal with a tax increase?' They say, 'Yes, I can deal with a tax So, it would benefit everybody. increase.' Why? Everybody should pay for this state. Not a certain group of people. Not this group, not this group, but every working individual should be able to pay for this state to get out of this deficit, and not just the state workers or not just this group of people. And everybody deserve a right to increase... cost of living, we're just talking about

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

cost-of-living raises. We deserve that as a state. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke. Representative Terry Parke, the Gentleman from Cook."

Parke: "Could you please go to Chapin Rose?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Repsen..."

Parke: "I'll... I'll come back."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, okay. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Let's talk about what this does. For every dollar that we pay today... that we... that we get from the systems today, the Chicago Tribune this morning quoted TRS Director Jon Bauman, 'It'll cost us \$11 to pay it back.' That's a 30 to 40 billion dollar price tag to taxpayers. No effort has been made to reduce government spending, instead we're just gonna raid our pension funds. This legislation creates pension payment deferral for 5, not the stated 2 years. Legislation will defer 3.5 billion obligations over the next 5 years. And let's talk about another quirk of this legislation. Why on earth is the determination of the money purchase form of interest rate being transferred to the the State Comptroller? Did the pension system do something wrong? Was there some allegation that they did not live up to their fiduciary obligation? Why is it being transferred? And might I add that if the comptroller does something to that... that hurts the current SURS participants, that's in violation of the State Constitution's pension guarantee clause and that will be struck down. Our understanding is

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

that the reforms here are less than \$30 million. we're gonna pull out 40 times that from this systems. Let's talk about who isn't being affected. We're not. Judges aren't being affected. Chicago teachers aren't being affected. State employees aren't being affected in new benefit increases. And the new benefits are gonna go on to the City of Chicago. It is our understanding, Ladies and Gentlemen, that these five pension funds will be forced to sell their assets to cover what we're about to do here today. How much are they gonna sell? I don't know. I'm not gonna look forward to this summer watching system after system sell off its real property, it's stocks and bonds to cover what we didn't do. The bottom line here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is Jim Edgar in 1995 took our state on a path to fiscal responsibility when he began paying back the pension systems. All those proceeding decades, we borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. It's like Wimpy from Popeye, I'll gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today. That's what we did and that's how we got here today. And now we're going back to that ill-fated path."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, let me... let me just try in put this in context. I was here in 1995, I voted with many people on the other side of the aisle to... to make some significant changes to make sure we paid our obligations to the pension system. But we're two days away from adjournment. We've sat around, we've talked about since the Governor's budget address, since he put out real

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

pension reform, real reforms that give us real savings. Seventy billion dollars are forecasted in liability savings because of these real reforms that are part of this Bill. Now, you may say we should make more reforms. We could do more to reform the pension system. We are making real reforms, though. To deny that we're making real reforms when we're reforming the fact that a business agent or a business leader or a business position in the school district in the suburbs can, in the last 2 years of their employment, get away with making \$375 thousand and then ship the bill to the state... and we're changing that in this We're denying that ability to do that. That's a real reform. There are other real reforms in this Bill. When you do real reforms you have liability savings, 70 billion... \$70 billion in liability savings. Real liability savings forecasted by real experts and real actuaries. ERO... people throughout my district... teachers throughout my district are clamoring for an ERO extension. This provides it, but there are real reforms to stop the abuses. this bill isn't always just sent and shipped to the state. If the sky was falling... if we were gonna break the pension systems, if it was so bad then why would the IFT not be okay with this? Why wouldn't the IEA? They're okay with this. ASFCME is okay with this. SEIU is okay with this. If we were stealing their pensions and they were gonna go broke, you don't think that they would be tearing down the statehouse doors saying, don't vote for this? They're not. Do you know why? Because they know the reforms need to be

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

made that are in this Bill and they know there are real liability savings, \$70 billion. Now, we can talk all we want about politics and oh my God, we're robbing the pension systems. We're gonna have to sell off assets. know, really that isn't true. You know what this is all We sat at the table, we sat at the bargaining table. We're two days from adjournment and we're still waiting for your plan. Is it coming over here? Could somebody tell me when's your plan to solve the state budget crisis coming? We're two days away. Do you wanna push us into overtime again? Is that what it's all about? Are you waiting to give us your plan the day after we adjourn? Bring it on, we're willing to listen. This is our plan. Seventy billion dollars in real reforms and it's gonna save us, it's gonna get us outta here. Our education dollars will be paid... \$300 million additional dollars education. And we're making real reforms on the back end. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Poe: "Yeah, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as we stand here each year we make decisions, we oughta be making long-term decisions, not worried about a two-day decision. That seems like the point we are at this... in our Session. I think we gotta look at the future. Do we make the system stronger or we make it weaker? As I talked to some of the people from the pensions systems, we're about 60 percent

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

funding into our pension systems. If we move forward this is gonna weaken that position. And so a long-term solution this is not. I think there's a lot of things we need to worry about the future. I think one of them is our affect, our state's bond rating. Anyway you look at it, when we're adding that liability to the system, it's gonna go down. Another thing that seems to me like what we're doing, we're gonna be taking money from the downstate teachers and forcing it to Chicago to help them bail out the CTA, which is in this Bill. We're shifting the pension liability from downstate to the downstate property tax holders, that we furnish and fund our schools. And I think the one thing we really want to emphasize, this is being sold as a 2-year program. Well, this is more than a 2-year program because if you look, it's gonna be out in '08,'09 and in the What we're doing, we're establishing a new ramp. We're lowering that and each year after that we're gonna be shorting the original ramp. And so we're gonna be shorting this up as much as 7, 800 million dollars a year. previous speaker talked about saving \$70 billion. Whenever you have to start selling assets and you're not collecting interest on that money so that makes that number go up a lot faster. What we're looking at, whenever you amortize that thing over the next 40 years, very possibly we could be up to \$87 billion in new liability. And that far outweighs what the previous speaker said that we would save. As we look... as we look forward here, we wanna make sure we got solutions. We got a lot of state employees.

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

We got state... we got... in every community in the State of Illinois, we have teachers, we've got a lot of universities and we have prison guards. And this is affecting the whole State of Illinois. And we're affecting the future of all the workers and the credibility of hiring new and good employees. So, I'll ask you to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Bost: "You know, one of the... one of the very proud days in my political career was the day that in 1995 when we worked to straighten out the pension system, to make a plan to pay off and catch up on mistakes of the past. It's one of the proud days in my personal life was when my grandson, Spencer, was born, when my granddaughter, Lydia, was born. Kind of this Bill, they're kind of coming together. know, every one of you that's gonna vote for this, you better think about what you're doing. One of the speakers said that this Bill has some real reforms in it. Yeah, okay, fine, then send those reforms out here by themselves and let's vote on them. Let's not tie it with... oh wait, what's this titled? A pension holiday. A pension holiday. A holiday for who? A holiday for who? The IFT, the IEA, all these people that said they signed off. I don't know what kind of deals were cut, I don't know how they signed off. But I have a problem with the fact that they did because they are supposed to be representing their members,

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

too. And I hope that each one of you are thinking about the fact that you're not only supposed to be representing the people that sent you here, that you've been elected to represent, but the future generations. So, guess what? Happy holiday, Spencer. Happy holiday, Lydia. You're gonna be paying for what you all are doing today. I'm ashamed and you ought to be, too."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens. Representative Stephens. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier, one of the speakers said we have been sitting around. What do you mean 'we'? We haven't been part of this process. The Democratic Party controls the Illinois House. The Democratic Party controls the Illinois Senate. And certainly, we have a Democrat in the Governor's Office. We found out about this pension Bill yesterday. Yesterday, Ladies and Gentlemen, we found out about this Bill. We didn't have any part of this. Let's talk about what this is all about. This is about pork. You know it and I know it. Amendment #2 adds \$200 million for 2 years to pay for these pork projects. That's \$200 million ultimately that it's gonna cost the state, \$2.2 billion. You know it and I know it. This proposal will raid... raid the downstate teachers' fund to pay for the CTA bailout in Chicago. We know that. You know it. press knows it. There's no secrets here. It is also our understanding that there are... these projects are guaranteed, guaranteed through secret memorandums of understanding between the Governor and the Democratic

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

These projects will, in fact, be hidden in our budget. We call upon the press to make a list of these pork projects. Sort of like when my kids played, Where's Waldo? Let's look into that budget and see if we can find out where all these pork projects are. The memorandum of understanding and related documents should be filed with the Clerk of the House prior to the vote of this budget. For the purpose of legislative intent, the existing of the project should be disclosed. The new budget will have more than a billion dollars in new spending. Let me remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, one more time, for everybody to be clear on this. On the new budget that will be presented in the next two days, there will be more than a billion dollars in new spending. Let me read you an editorial from today from the News-Gazette outta Champaign. I wanna paraphrase that. No, I wanna quote it. 'The Illinois voters, and especially young Illinois voters, should never forget what the Illinois General Assembly is doing in these closing days of the Legislative Session. It, in the interest of political expediency, in order to protect their own hides, lawmakers are again looting, looting hundreds of millions of dollars from the state's already gravely underfunded pension system. They're taking the easy way out for them by leaving a gigantic, every-growing pension obligation bill for future taxpayers. It may be the most sorry, shameful, irresponsible display ever from Legislature known less for courage and good government than for in timidity and fraud. And this decision, arrived

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

during a Memorial Day weekend when voters attention are elsewhere, is a fraud of the highest order.' Further they say, 'Governor Blagojevich and the Democrats Legislature proposed to do raiding the pension fund of \$1 billion in each of the next 2 years. Just long enough to defer the state's budget problems until after, after the next election.' Ladies and Gentlemen, it wasn't that long ago when we were all proud of our team in Illinois. And we were standing up and all yelling, 'We're #1, we're #1.' Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are #1, we are #1 in the worst funded pension system in this nation. The worst funded pension system in this nation. Our children and our grandchildren will pay the future pension premiums. We are looting hundreds of millions of dollars for our pension payments. This is a sad day and an embarrassing day for the citizens of Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Mulligan: "Let's clarify something about when Governor Edgar took money from the pension system, he did it to pay down Medicaid debt. It went provi... it went to providers who had to pay their own bills. Governor Edgar was considered an extremely thrifty, conservative Governor. And he brought us out of a recession. We currently are expected to have \$1.8 billion in Medicaid debt. This is not paying down that debt. Our state's ability to borrow at a good rate in order to pay providers in timely fashion will be hampered

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

by the excess in debt that we will be carrying. Week in Review, last week on television, talked about United pensions. Retirees in my district in the Northwest suburbs who are United pensioners, when their pension's going under. Then they move to talk about how public pensions are covered. Teachers would be covered by constitutional authority that says that they... we have to pay them. But nothing says in future years that this debt would not be able to be changed by the Constitution in order to require us to pay less benefits to our retirees. They compared the United situation and public pensions to Orange County, California and that San Diego was going to be the next one that would go under. And then do you know who they mentioned next? They mentioned Illinois. Illinois as being the one that has the worst pension system in the country and most likely to be in jeopardy of going bankrupt in coming years. The Members that I serve with on both sides of the aisle, particularly in Human Services, we work together very well. And I think a lot of them take their fiduciary responsibility to the state and to those that we represent very seriously. Many of us did not want to be here all summer after what happened last summer. But there are many of us that would do whatever we could not to end up in this position and take our responsibility to those that we represent very seriously. I am surprised that they are willing to do this. I am surprised that we not willing to come up with a better solution. surprised that we're willing to mortgage the future of this

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

state. Many of the young Members here will be around to see this. Certainly, we have a young Governor. certainly does not compare to Governor Edgar who went out of office in high popularity, brining us into a full system of renewed advantages for this state. This is nothing but in the last 3 years as a culmination of ruining this state, and it's going further. It's gonna ruin for years to come. I think that we should vote 'no' on this. I think everyone should vote 'no' on this. I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who I expect (sic-respect) tremendously would give up whatever benefits they coming for this and vote 'no'. I hope and I am glad that there are a lot of press here. I think people do this on a holiday weekend because they think what will happen is everyone will go home and forget about it in a couple of weeks and business will go on as usual. But let me please ask the press, do not let them forget about it. Do not let them forget about it in the coming months, we will not. I will go home and try to explain this to the people that I represent. And believe me, I am going to feel sorry about it for my family, my grandchildren. This is a terrible thing that we're doing. We could do this better if we really wanted to."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Hannig: "Sponsor will yield."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Stephens: Representative Molaro, a speaker with a lot of fanfare, thank you for your energy level and thank you for wearing a tie. That's great."

Molaro: "Thanks."

Stephens: "This is your last tie-wearing Bill?"

Molaro: "Yes."

Stephens: "Outstanding. The Speaker had a... a series of hearings around the state, a great deal of fanfare about the budget and what we were going to do. And did you get a copy of that final report?"

Molaro: "Did I? No."

Stephens: "Thank you. To the Bill. Well, no. The reason he didn't get one was because there isn't one. Gentleman from Collinsville, you better get home because the rank and file in your district are furious. And if we're saving \$70 billion, well, I would suggest we take a couple of holidays. Let's take three holidays, save \$210 million... \$210 billion and eliminate the state income and sales tax. I think you guys are on to something. The more we waste, the more we save? Well, let's just waste a lot more. We can get out of this forever. Just borrow our way into the future. Talk about pork, Representative from Cook County talked about pork. We have an internal document here. There's an evolving proposal we're told from the House Democrat Press Office, an evolving proposal about what we're gonna doing with that \$200 million in pork. Four hundred million? Oh my goodness, it's growing. It's growing as we... \$400 million in pork? We have an internal

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

document that says, stained glassed windows. Now, there's something the people of the State of Illinois have been... they've been knocking down the doors of my district office saying, can't you get us some stained glass windows? need dance studio equipment, dance studio equipment. You'd... you'd better evolve that proposal faster because we have to use some of that money for parades. Parades, Ladies and Gentlemen. We all love parades. I didn't know the taxpayers had to pay for 'em. And sports teams, you can't spend enough money on sports teams, I believe that's true. But you know, in my hometown of Greenville we've got a sports boosters club. They've got a great club there and they pay for their sports team the way it should be paid for. They don't come to the Illinois General Assembly and say, would you do me a favor? Would you borrow from my grandchildren's future? Would you put my children and my grandchildren so far in debt that the Illinois budget will be an absolute nightmare? So that my grandchildren and their children will never be able to get out from under the stress? Kind of reminds our family of Enron, American Airlines, other pensions plans that have gone broke. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's one thing for a company in America to go broke, it's quite another for a state to go broke. And you can bet that's where we're going. We're anxious to go back and debate these issues in districts. We might even come to some of your districts and have some of those debates. We hope that you can stand up and explain to the voters and their grandchildren and

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

their children how you mortgaged their future because, as one of you said, Well, it's not smart. It might not be smart, but... but it's the only option left out there.' The only option left out there? Well, you know what, some of us believe that maybe we should trim spending. Why would you want to increase spending by almost \$2 billion when you have a budget problem? Why would you wanna do that? 'It's an extremely irresponsible option that's out there', says another on your side of the aisle, 'I hope we don't have to do it.' But we may. And you are and you will pay the price, Ladies and Gentlemen. You will pay the price."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Representative Hannig. A few of the... we've had quite a few comments on the floor today and I don't disagree with a lot of things that have been said. However, we knew in January when everyone was sworn in that we had a budget deficit of \$1.2 billion. Our Appropriations Committees met for months. And the Leaders of all four caucuses and the Governor met for the last month and a half in trying to craft some kind of an agreement of a budget to address shortfalls. And I have... although I've taken shots at... at Leadership, we also bear some of the responsibility in this because we have not closed the revenue gap. Nor have we offered any revenue so that we don't have to cut Elementary & Secondary by \$400 million so that we don't have to cut Higher Education by \$400 million. Pick your numbers. The hard votes that are out there that we get paid to do. Folks in this chamber

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

have talked for a couple of weeks going, I think there's a gambling deal. And actually, for the first time in 14 years the Governor... and the Governor has said there's a possibility of these revenues. The gambling Bill, as all gambling Bills usually did, got bound up. The City of Chicago had their own proposal. Stopped it. I've taken the liberty to actually rewrite the City of Chicago's proposal for their casino as some form of revenue to be offered, and if that discussion does forward it should. the course of doing our jobs, a budget is a spending plan. It can be adopted. It can be amended if you're willing to put the money in there. Does anyone in this room like this Bill? Absolutely not. There's reforms that they needed, some. But, you know what? Most of the Members are saying, 'I don't like this Bill, but maybe not enough to hope that you don't vote for it.' Because we won't deal with the problem of revenue. It's not just on the pensions. It is on Medicaid. We have problems with our pension funds. The city has problems with them. And this is kind of what we as Members are also elected to do. I'll throw something on the table for Veto in here or any day you want to do it. And I'm more than happy to do that 'cause that's what we get paid for. This is a hard vote. It is not a good vote. And right now, there is no one offering other options. That's the reality. That I can't slap the four Leaders and the Governor for 'cause we haven't done it. And that's what we get paid for. I, unfortunately, am for the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro to close."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Molaro: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorta torn here, I feel like taking this Bill out of the record. There might... I'll tell ya why. I think I... I'm considering it because I don't their computers were fixed from yesterday. Because I heard all the political speeches, but they must be talking about a completely different Amendment than what I filed. everything they talked about has nothing to do with my Amendment. Now, they were great political speeches and I wanna thank whoever speech writer are, they were great. But, here's the problem. We're here to debate this Bill. I was asked one question out of 15 speakers. You call that a debate? One question and that was, 'Am I wearing a tie tomorrow?' By they way, I'm not. But, that was the one question. Now, let me say one other thing. Ya know, I don't know why we didn't debate it when everybody's watching because they know the answers are correct. know this Bill is right. The politics... we'll be discussing politics for the next year and a half. But let's get to this Bill. First of all, let's make this clear. The IFT and the IEA helped write this Bill. They are a hundred percent with this Bill. Got nothing to do with Chicago. As a matter of fact, it makes the ERO for Chicago tougher. The IFT and IEA wrote part of this Bill. This is their deal and they're for it. Let's talk about something else. We got numbers in this Bill that are saving \$30 billion. Now, there might be getting the numbers the Republicans from the same place they got us when we voted for the ERI in 2002 that George Ryan wanted and the Republicans. We

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

were told it was \$600 million, it cost us \$2 billion. don't wanna listen to their numbers anymore. Now, let me tell ya what else we did, so everybody's clear. We agreed that we're gonna pay for it so our grandchildren wouldn't it. And everybody to pay for loved grandchildren. Well, let me tell you what we did for those of you who are 'no' and absolutely 'no'. Let me tell you what we did last year. We agreed in 2002 that we were gonna pay 270 million each year for the ERO. So, we didn't do it for 40 years. And we weren't gonna put it on the backs of our grandchildren. Know what happened last year? For no reason except budgetary, we only put in 75 million. That's gonna cost us a billion five. And ya know who voted for that? Every one of you voted for it for maybe one or two exceptions. So, let's at least be honest about what we're going here. Where was Governor Thompson? Where was Edgar when 25 years in a row they didn't even put in what the normal contributions were, let alone... let me tell you what else is going on here. Here's what Edgar averaged. Edgar's highest payment was a billion one. Ryan's administration, the highest, was a billion six. average for Blagojevich is 2.3 billion. When he took over we were 45 percent unfunded, where TRS is now at 60. So, all of this political speeches are great, hone it, you're terrific. You're doing a nice job. You're speech makers should get raises. But it had nothing, nothing whatsoever to do with this Bill. That ERI that we paid for in that boondoggle is absolutely unbelievable. For the first time

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

in 60 years of the pension system we are demanding reforms. We got reforms on the IEA, the IFT. This guy that's gonna return it with 200, 250 thousand dollars a year, \$200 thousand a year for just breathing, this finance quy. this the same quy that decided we didn't have enough uniforms for the band? Is that what we're about? If for no other reason, we should vote for this Bill to stop that practice. And here's the other thing. For 35 years, not one bit of reform. We are saving \$30 billion to the taxpayers. And if you say that's not reform and \$30 billion isn't reform, you're mistaken. Get your speeches right. Start asking questions about this Bill, debate it. This is good for the taxpayers. It's great for this And if we come to our senses someday and do budget. something about revenue, we could take it and put it right back. I wish we could triple this payment. This is sound. This is what you've done for 25 years. Didn't anybody hear at the beginning? The 15-year ramp was put in for budgetary reasons. Didn't we think of our grandchildren when you ran the building in '95? Didn't we come... we come up with and have a percentage level of paying? ramp, Gentlemen and Ladies? Why the ramp? Because you didn't wanna pay it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Molaro: "To dare say that we're not doing it now. This is proper, this is well funded, and this'll bring this

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

building to a close with a good budget and a good, sound fiscal policy. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 27 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? 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 61 voting 'yes' and 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of personal privilege for one of my..."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Winters: "...constituents. Danica Patrick from Roscoe, Illinois, who led part of the Indy 500 today as late as 11 laps from the end she was in the lead, ran low on fuel, and after surviving a collision, finished fourth, the highest any woman has ever finished at Indianapolis. Proud to honor Danica Patrick."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. 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 29, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #5 to House Bill 1921; referred to the Order of Second Reading is House

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Bill 2198, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 208, and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 562."

Speaker Hannig: "Returning to page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, Representative Molaro, you have House Bill 2611. Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you. Are you really calling one of my Bills right now after what I just said?"

Speaker Hannig: "Do you want..."

Molaro: "I..."

Speaker Hannig: "Do you want to take this out of the record or do you want to proceed, Representative?"

Molaro: "All right, let's go for it. We'll go for it. Yes, can we read it?"

Speaker Hannig: "It... it doesn't need to be read... read. It's a concurrence. So, just..."

Molaro: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "...proceed."

Molaro: "On the Motion. Let me explain this Motion. We passed the Bill out of here that said when there are two... when there's a township and there's unincorporated property and the towns near it are gonna enter into a inter-municipal agreement, that they should let the people know in the unincorporated area what town they should go to. It's all agreed to. But what I put in there, that they should send these people registered mail. But the Municipal League and everybody else went to the Senate and they said it might be too costly for smaller towns. So, they changed it to notice by publication. And I guess, there are towns that

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

can't afford the three, four hundred. So, I'm agreeing with this particular motion. Because right now when they enter into these agreements the people in the areas that are affected have no idea that they're being brought into a town. So, at least now, that if they do it by publication, they'll know. That's all the… that's all the Amendment did."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Earlier, this same Gentleman asked why we didn't ask... why we didn't ask him any questions? Why there wasn't any debate? Well, heavens to betsy, he took a minute and forty-five seconds to explain a Bill that has no opposition. That's why we didn't ask him any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

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

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

Bost: "Did... did they talk to you from the Senate before this Amendment was put on? Or did it just come over?"

Molaro: "The Senate... I'm sorry?"

Bost: "When... when the Amendment was put on in the Senate, did the Senate Sponsor talk to you and says, 'Okay, we're gonna put this on', come over and talk to you? Or did it all of the sudden just show up over here and..."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Molaro: "It... his staff called to say that the Municipal League wanted it. But he did not personally call me... or she. I don't even remember what Senator put it on."

Bost: "Okay, I was just wondering. I just wanted to make sure we did ask a question."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Would the Gentleman yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, he will."

Stephens: "Representative, I was wondering what kind of mailing was required before? Was it a first class mailing, certified receipt requested?"

Molaro: "I... first of all, it's by publication."

Stephens: "No, no, no. But no. We're eliminating something in the Amendment. We eliminated a mailing requirement."

Molaro: "Oh, yeah. The first one..."

Stephens: "What kind of mailing requirement... what kind of mailing..."

Molaro: "My Bill said 'certified'."

Stephens: "Certified?"

Molaro: "Now, it's notice by..."

Stephens: "Was that certified receipt requested or just certified?"

Molaro: "I think it was certified receipt requested."

Stephens: "How much does that cost in Illinois?"

Molaro: "Could cost, depending on where it's from, anywhere from .35 to 2.75 or something. I don't know about U.S. Post Office costs."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Stephens: "Thirty five cents? So, it's cheaper than First Class."

Molaro: "No, I guess that would be a wrong answer then. But..."

Stephens: "I was wondering... so this is a cost saving measure, this Amendment?"

Molaro: "Yes."

Stephens: "Outstanding. You know what, I... I'm... I rise in support of lowering the cost of government because we better start thinking that way after your last Bill."

Molaro: "Thank you, Representative. I'm trying to cut it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Representative, it's my understanding that Will County
Government League, the Illinois Municipal League, the Home
Builders Association, and the Illinois Association of
Realtors are now proponents. Is that correct? They...

Molaro: "Yes"

Parke: "...support this Bill now?"

Molaro: "Yes, they do, Sir."

Parke: "So, they have... so this Bill really has no opposition?"

Molaro: "Correct."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first and foremost, I wanna say that I have the complete and total respect for the Sponsor of this Bill. He's always requested it and I am giving it

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

to him on this wonderful Memorial Day weekend for the simple fact that this Amendment was put on this Bill because of a phone call who came from someone out of my district. And Representative Molaro was able to deal with their concerns. I thank him very, very much for that. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jenisch, do you wish to be recorded? Representative McAuliffe, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Mr. Speaker, I... whoever does the maintenance, my microphone is broken... I... to repair."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. On page 16 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, Representative Molaro, you have House Bill 2613."
- Molaro: "I... I'm not ready to press my luck today. So, why don't we... can I just come back later to this?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, you can take it out of the record. Okay, out of the record. On page 16 of the Calendar,

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Representative Dunn, you have House Bill 3648. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask that we do concur on House Bill 3648. This is the Bill that passed out unanimously. There was a constitutional question that needed to be addressed in the Senate. It was amended and all opposition has been removed. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes' and 23 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McGuire, you have House Bill 3755 on the Order of Concurrence. Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3755 is an initiative of JULIE, the Joint Underground whatever, whatever contractors Bill. And there was a concurrence Motion yesterday and due to the fact I had two committees at once, Representative Jack Franks handled the concurrence because it was in his committee. And I would refer to Representative Franks because if there were any questions,

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

I didn't hear him. I was in another committee on another Bill. Representative Franks."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McGuire, would you like to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sullivan, do you wish to be recorded? Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Soto, on page 11 of the Calendar, under the Order of Consideration Postponed, is Senate Bill 1842. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1842 is on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1842 amends the Nursing and Advanced Practice Nursing Act to create a nurse internship program. The Bill provides that the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations must establish a 2-year program to issue an externship permit to registered nurses who have not taken the National Council Licensure Exam. This is a Bill... to my colleagues' attention, this is a Bill that I held in

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Postponed Consideration. I went back to you and explained a little bit more about the nurses' Bill. It's a bilingual nurses' Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote. I'm open for any questions. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1842. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes' and 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order... on page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, is House Bill 2065. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2065, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2065 is the prohibition on Internet hunting. I know that we've already spoken about this before in terms of the Amendments. I would simply ask for an 'aye' vote and would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mitchell, on page 12 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences, is House Bill 27. Representative Mitchell, did you wish to do that concurrence? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill...

I move to concur with... we combined those Senate Amendments so it's... Senate Amendment... would it be 4? Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4. I move that the House concur."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

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

Lang: "Representative, I don't know that I'm opposed to your Motion..."

Mitchell, B.: "Sure."

Lang: "...but I'm not sure what the Senate Amendments do. Could you lay it out for us, please?"

Mitchell, B.: "Yeah. Senate Amendment 1, what it did was it removed Cook County from this Bill. So, Senate Amendment 3 was Senator Geo-Karis and she allows the county board to enter into a land and lease agreement for a dollar per year. And Senate Amendment 4, which incorporates all those and becomes the Bill, leaves the current law in reference

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

to the County Codes alone, amends the Municipal Code to add a new section to allow municipalities other than Chicago to regulate businesses that are adult entertainment, public accommodation, and permit the consumption of alcohol. And includes all the language."

Lang: "Were there any known opponents to any of these Amendments?"

Mitchell, B.: "No. No."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."

Black: "All three Amendments become the Bill. Now, we've...
we've looked at this before. I don't remember concurring
in Senate Amendments when all three Amendments become the
Bill, unless there's language in Amendment 3 that either
incorporates 1 and 2 or... or deletes some language in 1 and
2."

Speaker Hannig: "Represen... Representative, the... you have the right to divide the question, but the Gentleman from Macon made a Motion on 1, 2, and 3."

Black: "No, Mr. Speaker, I... I'm not opposed to the Gentleman's Motion at all, it's just a parliamentary inquiry. I've never been able to quite understand how you can adopt three Amendments in sequential order when each Amendment becomes the Bill. There would have to be some language in one of

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

those Amendments to either incorporate the language of the Amendment above it or strike some language in the Amendment above it. You're adopting three Amendments, all of which eliminate everything after the enacting clause and then becomes the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, that may be a question for the Sponsor, but the Motion that's filed that the Chair is debating is just, 'Shall we concur in the Amendments 1, 3, and 4?'"

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion?

Representative Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the three Amendments."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Then the question is, 'Shall the House Concur in the Senate Amendments #1, 3, and 4?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 3, and 4. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ryg, on page 13 of the Calendar you have House Bill 566? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Fritchey, on page 14 of the Calendar you have a Motion to Concur on House Bill 1173? 1173, Representative Fritchey? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Fritchey: "Thank you. This sincerely is just a technical change that was made over at the Senate. Makes a good Bill better. I'd request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman asks that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 1173. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, does the Gentleman wish us to... does the Gentleman wish to concur in House Bill 1562? Representative Black. Okay, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I talked to Representative Hoffman about this Bill about a half an hour ago. He added me as a cosponsor and said if he was off the floor to present it. As amended by... what he's asking us to do is to concur in Senate Amendment #1. It states that a vehicle rental company may void a damage waiver with regard to damage or loss that is a result of the rental vehicle being operated by a driver under the influence of alcohol, drugs, or intoxicating compounds and is, in fact, convicted of the DUI provisions of the Vehicle Code. Be glad to answer any questions that you have."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, would you read Senate Bill 21? That's on page 6 of the Calendar."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 21, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, so let's hold that on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 357."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 357, a Bill for an Act concerning quick-takes. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, let's hold that on the Order of Second Reading and read Senate Bill 1209."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1209, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, let's hold that on Second Reading and read Senate Bill 2030."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, let's hold that on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1009."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read...
 would you read Senate... excuse me, on Supplemental Calendar
 #1 is House Bill 2198. Would you read that Bill, please?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2198 has been read second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, let's... let's hold that on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 357. Read the Bill, please."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 357, a Bill for an Act concerning quick-takes, has been read a second time, previously. No... no Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read... on page 7 of the Calendar, under House... under Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 229. Would you read the Bill, please?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 229 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 229, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 229 raises the requirements for wearing seatbelts from the age 17 to 18."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady's moved for the passage of... excuse me, the Lady's moved for the passage Senate Bill 229. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, what do you do in the case of a pickup truck?"

Graham: "I'm sorry, Representative?"

Black: "What do you do if you own a pickup truck?"

Graham: "In regards to seatbelts?"

Black: "That's right."

Graham: "If... I guess if the seatbelt is... is in the pickup truck you would be required to wear it, I guess. I'm not sure if there's a special..."

Black: "Are you... are you familiar with a quad cab?"

Graham: "No, I'm not, Representative."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "Has a relatively small back seat. If you have a pickup truck and you have three children, how do you propose that all three children be buckled up in the back seat?"

Graham: "I... I..."

Black: "There isn't... there isn't any room."

Graham: "I guess, Representative, common sense would prevail in that case. If... if... if it's room for the person to ride in the seatbelt, I guess that'll... it would apply in that case."

Black: "I'm sorry, Representative, I can't hear you. It's so noisy in here."

Graham: "Your question again is... you're saying if there's three people in the car and there's not enough room in the back seat..."

Black: "No, no, no. Not a car."

Graham: "I meant to say a pickup truck."

Black: "I'll get to that later."

Graham: "A pickup truck."

Black: "A pickup truck with what we call a quad seat. There's a small back seat behind the front seat. If you have three children, three infants, there's no way. So, what do you do?"

Graham: "I'm not sure. I would think that the mother would or the person would have to error on... on safety. So, I'm not..."

Black: "You can't."

Graham: "I'm not sure."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "There's no way. It's impossible. So do you leave one of the kids home?"

Graham: "I think you would think in terms of safety,

Representative. So, I'm not sure if..."

Black: "So, in other words..."

Graham: "...that would have to be a judgment call on the... on behalf..."

Black: "Yes. Yes."

Graham: "...of the parent."

Black: "A judgment call. So I tell my constituents who own a pickup truck and they have that third baby, they just sell the pickup truck. What... what about a car? What about a standard two-door sedan where a husband and wife have three or four children under the age of your Bill?"

Graham: "And... and the car doesn't have a back seat? Is that what you're asking?"

Black: "Right. I mean, how do you get them all in there?"

Graham: "Again, Representative, I think you would have to... the family would have to error on... on the side of safety. I'm not sure how to answer that question. If there's some special... something that the law could do. But it's just simply raising the age of wearing seatbelts from 17 to 18."

Black: "So, if... if a soldier comes home from Iraq and his sister who is 17 years old picks him up at the Indianapolis airport and drove her mother over to the airport because her mother was somewhat obviously going to be emotional to have her son back home, and the son is 18 years old and on leave from Iraq or Afghanistan. He gets in the back seat

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

of the car and he doesn't buckle his seat belt, so that's a violation?"

Graham: "Yes, repeat what you just said, Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. You're raising this to 18 years of age."

Graham: "Yes."

Black: "That's... that the majority age. I gave you a scenario that's happened many times in my district. A mother, a father, and a younger sibling, maybe... maybe the sibling is almost 17. Drives mom and dad to the Indianapolis airport, that's 80 miles from where I live. 'Cause mom and dad think, and rightfully so, they're gonna be somewhat emotional when they meet their 18-year-old son or daughter who's coming home from Iraq or Afghanistan. They have a family reunion, very emotional. They want their 17-year-old to drive. Mom gets in the front seat, dad's in the backseat, and the 18-year-old soldier or Marine or sailor or airman gets in the backseat and just doesn't buckle up. The drive is in violation of the law, correct? And so is the soldier?"

Graham: "If this... is this piece of legislation goes into law,

Representative, he probably would be in violation of the
law."

Black: "Why... I don't understand..."

Graham: "For safety reasons, Representative, we are requiring that, you know, we wear the seatbelt. So, if he is a soldier and... and wants to continue, he should wear a seatbelt I would think."

Black: "Well, I don't..."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Graham: "He should obey the law."

Black: "...know why we stop at 18. My father is 87, he has a pacemaker and he maintains that the seatbelt bothers him because it goes across where the pacemaker is. So, he rides in the backseat. Why don't we just extend this to anybody who's living has to..."

Speaker Hannig: "Rep..."

Black: "...wear a seatbelt?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, your time has expired."

Black: "Yeah, I..."

Speaker Hannig: "Could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Black: "Yeah, I... that's fine. That's fine. I... I give up. The nanny state is gonna take over. There isn't any question about it. We're gonna run every aspect of your life and my life and everybody else's life. God help us when government wants to protect me from me. I'll vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Hi, Representative. Our analysis indicates that Senate Amendment #1 is identical to a... to a Bill that I'd sponsored, House Bill 1550. Can you tell me what this Bill has to do with that? I'm completely confused."

Graham: "I'm sorry, Representative Rose, can you repeat that?"

Rose: "Sure. Our analysis indicates that Senate Amendment #1 is identical to House Bill 1550, which is a Bill that I sponsored that's already on the Governor's desk and that was then tabled in the Senate. So, I guess my question is..."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Graham: "I don't know where you're reading at, Representative.

My analysis..."

Rose: "All right. It's in our analysis. It's there a Senate...
is there a Senate Amendment #1 attached to this?"

Graham: "This is a Senate Bill, Representative. And on mine, it doesn't show any Senate Amendments to it."

Rose: "All right. I'm gonna check my..."

Graham: "There are no Amendments on this Bill."

Rose: "Okay. I... our analysis must just be confused. So, thank you."

Graham: "You're excused."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Graham to close."

Graham: "I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes' and 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 198."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 198 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. However, a note has been requested and not yet received."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I understand that the other side of the aisle is about to withdraw the remaining request for a

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- note. And I think it's on its way up now and then we can move the Bill to Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, has the requests for notes been withdrawn?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "The requests for the judicial and the mandates note have both been withdrawn."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, do any note requests remain?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further requests."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair. Is

 Representative Brent Hassert in the chamber?

 Representative Hassert for a Motion. The Chair recognizes
 the Gentleman from Will, Representative Brent Hassert."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to reconsider Senate...
 the vote by which Senate Bill 25 failed."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Okay, Representative Hassert has moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 25 failed. All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those against vote 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 78 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion to reconsider the vote is hereby declared prevailed. Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Second Reading, is House Bill 1921. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1921 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Please withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "A Motion to with... a Motion to withdraw Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We've discussed many times on the floor of this House the need to separate the Illinois Gaming Board from the Department of It's something that we've discovered in the Revenue. Illinois Gaming Committee, we've discusses it many times. It's something the new chairman of the Gaming Board wants to do and it's something the Governor has signed onto. We've had several different versions of this. One version allowed a sitting city council member in Carbondale to sit on the board, that failed. We've taken that out of the There was another version of the Bill that had different salaries for the members of the Gaming Board, we've taken that out of the Bill. There was a version of the Bill that transferred all the State Police off the boat, we've taken that out of the Bill. And so now what we have is a Bill that separates the Gaming Board out, makes

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

it autonomous and independent, makes it responsible solely for the administration of the billion dollar program we have from the Illinois riverboats. It provides some ethical consideration saying that members of the Gaming Board cannot involve themselves in partisan politics. That's all it does. But it's very important that we do this. Over the last couple of days both the Chicago Tribune and Chicago Sun Times have indicated this is something they think is appropriate. I would ask your support on the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there discussion on Floor Amendment #5?

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook County,

Representative Skip Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been informed by the... by the Trooper Lodge 41 and State Police are still opposed to this because the Amendment doesn't accomplish in a certain fashion that somewhere down the road the State Police won't be removed from the boats here in Illinois. Now, in every surrounding state that... in our area that has a casino, the State Police was always, always the law enforcement agency that patrols and keeps things safe on these boats and keeps them honest. I don't understand why they're going in a different direction when there... the State Police has done a fine job and there hasn't been any problems when the State Police does that. The other thing is... Representative Lang, I... I don't know if you're fully informed, but currently, in this language it... it for 14 years the Gaming Board has been under the Department of

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Revenue. Fourteen years, since the gaming... Riverboat Gaming Act was enacted. And it seems a little strange... I know there was a few problems, but it still... it seems a little strange that the Gaming Board is promoting taking... taking themselves out of Department of Revenue when there are whistleblower complaints pending on the interim director at the Department of Revenue's IG Office. And I think this is a very untimely time to go ahead and do this. Down the road when these complaints are disposed of and adjudicated and whatever other matter... I believe some of these complaints are about to be filed in civil court and litigated. I don't think this is the time or the place to take out the Gaming Board from under Department of Revenue when these complaints are currently pending. There are also a complaint pending with the Governor's Inspector General regarding the same situation. And I just feel this is not the time or the place to both make it uncertain for ... make certain for State Police being threatened from their jobs on these riverboats and also that these whistleblower complaints are pending. If we could get a disposition on these riverboat... on these whistleblower complaints and see that the executive... the interim executive director has not violated a law or anybody's civil rights or harassed or did any sort of wrong acts towards different employees, I think we should just leave it alone for now and see how all those play out."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "To close? Am I closing?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Speaker Lyons, J.: "I just was... was there any response to what Mr. Saviano said?"

Lang: "I didn't hear a question. So..."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Okay. There's other people that do want to speak to the Amendment. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Indicates he will."

Moffitt: "Representative, are the State Police still opposed to this?"

Lang: "Well, they haven't come to see me. But frankly, there's no reason for them to be opposed to this because there's nothing in this Amendment that changes the state... the State Police's rights, responsibilities, and employment status. A previous Amendment did that. This Amendment doesn't talk about the State Police. Additionally, I have a letter from Chairman Jaffe saying that if the Gaming Board were ever to get in... all the power to do all the hiring on the riverboats, that he would do it by seniority, by status, by experience. And he understands that the... the State Police who are serving on the riverboats are the very people that have the seniority and the credibility and the status and the experience on the riverboats. This Amendment does not do anything to affect the State Police the way it's written now."

Moffitt: "Then are there other Amendments that do? That when we... when we talk about the main Bill, that we should..."

Lang: "No, Sir."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Moffitt: "Do you know if Troopers Lodge 41 is still opposed?"

Lang: "They... again, they have not come to see me, Sir."

Moffitt: "Then you... but you don't know the answer to the question?"

Lang: "I don't know the answer to the question, but if they're still opposed they're not reading Amendment #5."

Moffitt: "And you don't know the answer to the first question, either?"

Lang: "Sorry?"

Moffitt: "You don't know the answer whether or not the State Police are opposed either?"

Lang: "The State Police..."

Moffitt: "You said they hadn't come to you..."

Lang: "The..."

Moffitt: "...but do you..."

Lang: "The State Police were opposed to the Amendment that came out of committee, which was Amendment #3. This is Amendment #5. The language that concerned them has been removed from the Bill."

Moffitt: "Representative, if the State Police were in any way...
if their supervision was changed, if they were removed, if
there were any changes from present policy, who would
provide for the security, investigations, and all police
needs?"

Lang: "You mean if we did Amendment 3..."

Moffitt: "Yeah. Yeah."

Lang: "...which has been withdrawn?"

Moffitt: "Right. Who would have done it?"

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Lang: "Well, my original vision of the Bill was to give all of the power to do everything to the Gaming Board. So, they would be completely, 100 percent autonomous. But because the State Police and Troopers Lodge 41 had some major issues with the employment portion of that, we took it out of the Bill. In my original vers... vision of this Bill we should give the Gaming Board all of these powers. But, I'm willing to back off on this issue because it's been... an issues been created and that's not in Amendment #5."

Moffitt: "Okay. Representative, I think this is a real serious issue. To my understanding, State Police are still opposed... and Troopers Lodge. I really would like to get that answered. I think... I think the Members of the Legislature deserve an answer on whether or not they're opposed. You said had it been in the form where Amendment 3, is that correct... the Gaming Board would have hired the police. You're making it more independent. And you can say, by the way, we'll hire our own security and investigation and police. I mean, that's what that would have amounted to?"

Lang: "That's what Amendment 3 would have done."

Moffitt: "Yeah."

Lang: "Amendment 5 does not change the status of the State

Police on the riverboats. I don't know how..."

Moffitt: "Yeah."

Lang: "...any clearer I could say it."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Moffitt: "Okay. But could we get the answer on whether or not the State Police are still opposed? The prior speaker... would you be willing to get that answer before we vote?"
- Lang: "Well, let's continue to debate it and let's see if we get an answer before you sit down. My view, Sir, is that even if they are still opposed, to what end? For what purpose? I'm telling you that Amendment 5 doesn't affect them."
- Moffitt: "Okay. Your question..."
- Lang: "So, you could tell me that the, you know, the America

 Tire is opposed to the Bill, too. It doesn't affect him

 either."
- Moffitt: "Representative, I'd like to use your direct quote,
 'Why are they opposed, if they are?' And that's exactly
 what I would like to know. So, that's the question I have.
 We've just received a call and they are still opposed."
- Lang: "That's fine. There's no reason for them to be opposed.

 It's a short Amendment. I would suggest you read the changes in the Amendment from the current law. And you will see there's nothing in there that impacts the State Police."
- Moffitt: "Okay. I think it's... it's a critical that we find out what the State Police are opposed, the very agency that provides the investigation..."
- Lang: "Well, then perhaps, if the State Police are still opposed they should have come to me and they should have come to you."
- Moffitt: "Right. I agree."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Lang: "And they should have not just said, hey, Representative Moffitt, we're opposed. Perhaps they should have told you why they were opposed. But since they haven't, we have no idea, do we?"
- Moffitt: "There's a real good way we could get that answered.

 And we could just hold off until we get that answer. I

 think if we're trying to make this independent and add

 credibility, that'd be a good way to do it. And you know,

 there's a way to describe... we wanna be real careful. On

 your original... original Amendment, I know you say that's...

 we want to be sure we know who is investigating, watching,

 and providing protection. I just ask for a Roll Call vote,

 if we proceed. And I would like to get..."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative Moffitt, you can bring your remarks to a conclusion. We have your Roll Call request on the… on the issue. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

 Speaker Lyons, J.: "He indicates he will."
- Stephens: "Representative, in committee when you presented this

 Bill you had the interim director with you, is that right?"

 Lang: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."
- Stephens: "Was it the interim director that was with you when you presented this Bill in committee?"
- Lang: "The interim director? No, we had the executive director... you talking about the witness?"

Stephens: "Yes."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Lang: "Jeannette Tamayo, the... the Executive Director of the Gaming Board... or the admin..."

Stephens: "She informed the committee that she was not aware of any investigations in response to whistleblower cases that were pending. And in fact, we know that there are two."

Lang: "Was that a question?"

Stephens: "I wondered if... I just wondered if... I think she kind of blindsided you there. She... she responded that she didn't know. You... you would have no reason to know that, but she is in a perfect position to know. And I wonder..."

Lang: "I would respond to you by saying, it doesn't matter.

Here's why it doesn't matter. This Amendment transfers everything the Department of Revenue is doing to the Gaming Board: the whistleblower cases, the right to buy equipment, the right to make contracts, everything. These cases aren't gonna disappear. Someone else will handle them."

Stephens: "I'm just..."

Lang: "And if you believe..."

Stephens: "I was just..."

Lang: "If you believe in the theory that the heavy hand of the Governor's Office should not be controlling the billion dollars that comes to the taxpayers out of the Illinois riverboats, then you need this independence."

Stephens: "When I think of the Governor, heavy handed, light, Governor light, that's kind of the phrases I think about.

Representative, we... we still have concerns that Trooper Lodge 41... understanding that what you're saying is that you've removed the language that affected all that? They

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

tell us right now, live and in person on the phone, they remain opposed."

Lang: "Did they tell you why? Don't we have a responsibility to read the Bills ourselves?"

Stephens: "We do."

Lang: "And don't we have a responsibility to ask people who are opposed to Bills, why?"

Stephens: "No, Representative..."

Lang: "Why are you opposed to the Bill?"

Stephens: "No, Representative, I'm already opposed. I... I agree with them. I... I am very nervous that... what we might be Ya know, when we put the... the State Police... the State Troopers on the boats to begin with, the Legislature spoke volumes when they made that decision. that's separate and unique and on their own and not impeded by internal politics that happens with any... any... any directors purview or a board or a commission's purview. Representative Sacia, I believe, is going to point out for us what the Troopers Lodge 41 specifically opposes in this Amendment. I'm just telling you that I oppose it for my own reasons. I'm asking you if you thought that the... the board and its controlling agents right now were up to anything? Because there's an investigation going on and the executive director doesn't know anything about it. That makes me just... I don't know, I'm just a little confused. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "To the Bill."

102

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Stephens: "I think we should probably just take a deep breath right now. We're a couple of days from agend... from adjourning. I would like to ask the speaker to take the Bill out of the record. I think we should clarify exactly what it is we're doing before we do damage that will be... that we will not be able to undo in future years. Thank you."

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

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm gonna speak to the Bill, if I may. This Bill came through my committee. And at that time, we had heard House Amendment #3, which the troopers were opposed to because they didn't... they were worried that they may not be included anymore. As I'm reading the Amendment #5, which we're voting on now, and I'm looking at Subsection C... and I'm not sure... it's way at the bottom, talking about appropriations. In that line, under Subsection 2 of that paragraph C, it talks about appropriations for distribution of the Department of Revenue and the Department of State Police for enforcement of this Act, meaning that the troopers are going to be kept there. That was a concern that we had in committee. The... I know that the Sponsor worked to make sure that the troopers would still be on the boats. And if you'll look here in the language, it says appropriations are for the State Police. So, I'm okay with that. And let me tell ya, we need to pass this Bill. need an independent Gaming Board. Let's look what happened

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

this year with our Governor. He did not put enough people on the board so they could meet. But why, at a time when he did not have enough for a quorum, he directed the Department of Revenue to hire a liaison for a board that couldn't meet because it didn't have a quorum? board when I asked them in committee, 'Did you want a liaison?' They said, 'No.' They didn't want a liaison. But the Governor hired one for them anyway. This is the same board where the Governor sent his chief fundraiser, Chris Kelly, to negotiate on the Emerald deal. We need an independent Gaming Board so this type of action does not occur in the State of Illinois. The troopers are gonna be kept there. We need to let these guys have independence so they can do the job that they're supposed to do and quit being interfered with by our Governor. Please vote for this Bill."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Julie Hamos."

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

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Indicates he will."

Hamos: "I also have talked to the State Police and they re… and they remain opposed to this Bill and I think I understand why. Now, I want to ask some questions to make sure that we are all at least understanding what this Bill does. So, Representative Lang, is it your intent to transfer the powers of the Gaming Board… to transfer all of the powers that the Department of Revenue currently has with respect

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

to the Gaming Board directly to an independent Gaming Board?"

Lang: "Yes."

Hamos: "Does it... does that include the power to hire their own...

I don't know what they're called when they serve on a boat
and they serve in a security. What are they called? What
are those personnel called?"

Lang: "Investigators."

Hamos: "Those are called investigators?"

Lang: "Yes, Representative."

Hamos: "So, does this include the power to transfer the power for the new independent Gaming Board to hire its own investigators whether or not they are State Police? Is it your intent that the new independent Gaming Board would have the power to hire its own investigative force, whether or not they... the State Police or any other group? Their own independent investigative force. Is that your intent?"

Lang: "Our original intent, as indicated by Amendment 3 which we haven't proceeded with, would have been to give the Gaming Board complete autonomy over everything including all of the employees. But that's been taken out of the Bill. We've made no change in the law regarding who works on the riverboats."

Hamos: "But... okay. So, that... I understand you're saying that, but your Bill gives them a set of powers and you haven't made any exceptions to their being not allowed to hire their own investigators who are on the riverboats. So why couldn't they just, the day after this Bill is enacted,

105

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

decide no longer to use the State Police, instead to hire their own investigators? What would prevent the Gaming Board from doing that?"

Lang: "Today, under the current law, there are State Police that work on the riverboats, but there are also other people that work on the riverboats. Everyone that works on a riverboat is not a state... a member of the State Police. There are people that work on the riverboat are ASCFME employees. There are regular, white collar people who are trained to do investigations on the riverboat."

Hamos: "Okay, so..."

Lang: "This Bill... this Bill would give the Gaming Board the power to hire new people as they saw fit, but it does not take the State Police that are currently on the riverboats, under the control of the government... under the control of the Governor, off the riverboats. I don't know how to be any clearer than that."

Hamos: "Well, I... I'm still not clear in what even... what you just said. Couldn't this... the new independent Gaming Board, if it so chose, decide no longer to use the State Police? What would prohibit them from doing that under your Bill? I un..."

Lang: "The Department of Revenue controls the actions of the State Police on the riverboats. There's been no change in the law that allows the Department of Revenue to deploy State Police on the riverboat. So, the department would still have that option."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Hamos: "Well, so, in other words, the Department of Revenue, under your... what you just responded, could if it wanted to just do duplicative police... use the State Police, but the Gaming Board would have a whole different group of people on these riverboats? So, ya know, I mean, we just have too many investigators then on these riverboats?"
- Lang: "The answer to that question would be 'no' because under this Bill the investigative powers for the riverboats would still be under the Department of Revenue."
- Hamos: "Well, that's what... for... you know gaming better than any of us know gaming, Representative Lang. And you make reference in your Bill to investigators appointed to conduct investigations. Are investigators appointed to conduct investigations the same people as the investigators that are on the riverboats?"
- Lang: "Well, I think these people are all called investigators, but some of them are law enforcement people with guns who are State Police and others are more white collar types who are not State Police. And so, this... that's the current..."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative Hamos, your five minutes are over. We'll let Representative Lang complete the answer to that last question. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. That's the current state of the law in the State of Illinois. This Bill does not change anything relative to the relationship of the State Police to the riverboats and/or the Illinois Gaming Board. Mr. Speaker, if I might finish my answer?"

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Go ahead, Lou."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Lang: "On... on page... on page 14 of the Amendment, it... it transfers everything from the Department of Revenue to the Gaming Board with one exception. It says, 'Except for the powers, duties, assets, liabilities, employees, contracts, property records, pending business, and unexpended appropriations related to investigators... related to investigators appointed to conduct investigations, searches, and seizures', et cetera... et cetera. All right, Mr. Speaker, we've had a nice debate on this. We're gonna come back to it. Please take it out of the record."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 930. Senate Bill 930."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 930, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Move that Bill to Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, hold that Bill on Second Reading. Hold that Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 2072. 2072."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2072, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Hold that Bill on Second Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago. Representative Sacia, for what purpose do you rise? Okay, does not seek recognition. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

going to do the Order of Resolutions, House Joint Resolutions on page 16. So, if you have a Joint Resolution under the Order of Resolutions, I'm starting on page 16. Please be aware that we'll be running right down the list on page 16, 17, and 18. First House Joint Resolution is House Joint Resolution 17. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 17, offered by Representative Cross, urges the Governor to convene a summit on Children's Nutritional Health and Well-Being."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "House Joint Resolution 17 urges the Governor to convene a summit on Children's Nutritional Health and Well-Being to explore the status of children's nutritional health in Illinois, develop policy recommendations, and explore possible funding streams for programs and awareness campaigns. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution... House Joint Resolution 17 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 17 is adopted. On page 16 of the Calendar, Representative David Reis has House Joint Resolution 18. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 18, offered by Representative Reis, creates a Workers' Compensation Reform Task Force."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "At request of the Sponsor, out of the record. On page 16 of the Calendar, Representative Patti Bellock has House Joint Resolution #20. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 20 directs IDOT to conduct a statewide assessment of current future needs related to senior transportation in Illinois."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Patti Bellock. Representative Bellock.

 Representative Patti Bellock on House Joint Resolution 20."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution on behalf of the people of AARP who are seriously concerned about transportation within... for seniors throughout the State of Illinois. And what this would do would be to allow different groups to come together to study how we could have more coordinated services throughout this state for seniors. It's supported by AAA who said they have a lot of resources that they could help with in doing this and it would be subject to appropriation."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any question on House Joint Resolution 20? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson, like to be recorded? Representative Granberg. Representative Lang. Representative Granberg, wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there's 113 Members voting

61st Legislative Day

- 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 20 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 17, on the Order of Resolutions, is House Joint Resolution 21. Representative Eddy. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 21 urges Congress to preserve the right of state and local governments to operate pension plans for their employees in place of the Federal Social Security System and develop legislation for responsible reform for the Federal Social Security System that does not include mandatory participation by employees of state and local governments."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 21 recognizes the fact that with over 375 thousand different state and local employees covered by public pension plans that do not participate in the Social Security System, that Congress should not include mandatory Social Security participation by those employees of those state and local governments in any proposal for Social Security reform. I'd appreciate a positive vote on this Resolution."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is anybody seeking recognition on House Joint Resolution 21? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "He indicates he will."

61st Legislative Day

- McCarthy: "I tried to read the Resolution very quickly and it seems like it's... you're gonna send the Resolution to the House of Representatives in Washington and the Senate in Washington, but you're not sending it to the President in Washington. Is there a reason for that?"
- Eddy: "Well, as... as you know, Representative, the legislation that would affect the ability for state and local governments to operate pension plans for their employees outside of Social Security, that legislation would have to come from Congress. So, that is... that is aimed at the body that would be responsible for the legislation."
- McCarthy: "Well, it seems that Congress is being a little bit more responsible in some of the changes proposed for Social Security. I think the thing would do a lot better if you sent it on to the President and maybe we could convince him to stop badgering Congress to do some of these changes that you're afraid might happen. Thank you, Mr. Representative."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 21 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 21 is adopted. Continuing on page 17, under the Order of Resolutions, we have House Joint Resolution 22. Representative Bill Mitchell. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 22 designates U.S. Business Route 51 in Decatur, Veterans Parkway."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bill Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House. House Joint Resolution 22 designates U.S. Business Route right through downtown Decatur as Decatur's Veterans Parkway. This was done... I've talked to the Operation Enduring Support in Macon County. We've had two veterans just in this recent war pass away. So, this is a way that we can honor all veterans of Macon County. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 22? Seeing none, the Motion... the Chair recognizes the... Representative Flider. Representative Flider, the Gentleman from Macon."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons, J.: "Indicates he will."

Flider: "Representative, I believe that this highway that you're renaming is in my district."

Mitchell, B.: "I beg your pardon?"

Flider: "I say, is this highway that you're renaming in my district?"

Mitchell, B.: "Yeah, it would be. Yes."

Flider: "Thank you for informing me."

Mitchell, B.: "I beg your pardon?"

Flider: "On the... on the... thank you for informing me on the floor."

Mitchell, B.: "I... I couldn't understand you, Representative."

Flider: "Thank you for informing me of such on the floor."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Mitchell, B.: "You're welcome."

Flider: "I would certainly appreciate the opportunity to be a cosponsor of your legislation."

Mitchell, B.: "You're... you're welcome."

Flider: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Being no further discussion, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 22 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, do you wanna be recorded on this? Representative Granberg? Representative Hannig? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 22 is adopted. On page 17 of the Calendar, Representative McCarthy has House Joint Resolution 24. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 24 creates a joint task force on community colleges to review the present community college system and its future."

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

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a initiative of the Community College Board to form this joint task force in order to look at the... the needs of community colleges into the future so that we can certainly address the needs of the young people of our state. So, I would ask for an affirmative vote on House Joint Resolution 24."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 24? Seeing none, the question is... Those in favor of adoption of House Joint Resolution 24 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 24 is adopted. On the Order of Joint Resolutions, on page 17 of the Calendar, Representative Dan Beiser has House Joint Resolution 28. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 28 creates a study committee to investigate and hold public hearings about the effects of U.S. trade policy on Illinois jobs and farms."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Dan Beiser."
- Beiser: "Yes, this is a Resolution. Since 1994, this state has lost over 143 thousand jobs. It just asks for this trade... trade study to be commissioned and to look into ways that we can stem that tide."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Reso... Resolution #28? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution #28 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner? Representative Younge? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 113 Members are voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 28 is adopted. On

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

page 17 of the Calendar, Representative Jim Meyer has House Joint Resolution #29. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 29 creates a... creates a task force to review the operations of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Foster Care Division and related laws and rules impacting the Illinois foster care system."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Joint Resolution 29 creates a joint task force to undertake a comprehensive and thorough review of the operations of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services in relationship to substitute care and related laws and rules impacting the Illinois foster care system with the intent of making recommendations that would improve the system of the department and private agency accountability, improve department functioning within the constraints of limited budgets, quarantee necessary medical psychiatric care to wards within the depart... department, increase foster care support. And this comes out of a hearing that I had in my district of concerned parents that... who are foster care parents with some of the things that were going on within the system. Department of Children and Family Services attended that meeting, participated in it, and at the meeting agreed that perhaps what we should do is to form such a task force.

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

The department is neutral on the Resolution here in Springfield."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 29? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there's 113 Members are voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And House Joint Resolution 29 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 17, Representative Lou Jones has House Joint Resolution #31. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 31 directs the Department on Aging, in collaboration with the Departments of Children and Family Services, Public Aid, and Human Services and any other relevant agencies, to complete an assessment of existing state and federal assistance programs in relation to child care provided by grandparents for their grandchildren."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Lou Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Joint Resolution 31 creates a ten-member joint task force on grandparents raising their grandchildren that will hold hearings... that they will hold hearings throughout the state regarding services needed by and available to grandparents who are raising their grandchildren. The task force must issue a report to the General Assembly by January 1, 2006. There is a disparity... a great disparity between

61st Legislative Day

- grandparents who are raising their grandchildren and the benefit they get through public aid versus the ones that are raising their grandparents (sic-grandchildren) through DCFS. And I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 31? Seeing none, the question is... Those in favor should signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 31 is adopted. On the bottom of page 17, Representative Sacia has House Joint Resolution 33. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 33 urges the U.S. Congress to enact legislation extending a federal farm subsidy program for dairy farmers."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm joined by all the Members of the Agriculture Committee in asking the United States Congress to extend the MILC Program, which is a federal subsidy to protect dairy farmers when prices fall exceedingly low. I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Don Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons, J.: "He indicates he will."
- Moffitt: "Representative, we had an authority down here on the dairy business, used to serve in here, from up in your

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

area. His name was Representative I. Ron Lawfer. Have you consulted with him on this legislation?"

Sacia: "I certainly have and he's very supportive of it."

Moffitt: "He's supportive of it?"

Sacia: "Absolutely."

Moffitt: "Is Pat also?"

Sacia: "Pat is also."

Moffitt: "Then it's gotta be a great Bill. Thank you.

Resolution."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor of adopting House Joint Resolution 33 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 33 is adopted. On the bottom of page 17, Representative Verschoore has House Joint Resolution 34. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 34 designates that portion of Illinois Route 92 in the City of Rock Island, extending from 46th Street to Andalusia Road, as the Rock Island Parkway."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pat Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Resolution does is change the name from the Centennial Expressway to the Rock Island Parkway. And I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy,

 Representative Careen Gordon."

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

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "He indicates he will."
- Gordon: "Representative, is this part of the road located in your district?"
- Verschoore: "Yes, it is."
- Gordon: "Thank you, Representative. Excellent Resolution. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor of adoption of House Joint Resolution 34 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Representative Poe? Would you like to be recorded, Raymond? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 Members are voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. House Joint Resolution 34 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 18... is Representative Annazette Collins in the House? Annazette? Mr. Clerk, on page 18 is House Joint Resolution 38. Representative Mendoza. Representative Susana Mendoza, is she in the chamber? Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 38 urges Congress to preserve the Community Development Block Grant Program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development and provide FY 2006 funding of at least 4.7 billion overall, with no less than 4.35 billion in formula funding."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Lady Cook, Representative Susana Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 38 urges Congress to preserve the Community Development Block

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Grant Program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development and provide at least 4.7 billion, with no less than 4.35 billion in funding formula for fiscal year '06. Basically, if the President's fiscal year '06 budget proposal were enacted it would affect the state's CDBG program by reducing the number of housing developments, reducing business development in urban planning, and eliminating youth violence prevention health and homeless services that serve millions of people annually. I would hope that we could be supportive of the Resolution and ask for your support."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 38? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 38 should say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 38 is adopted. On page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Franks has House Joint Resolution #40. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 40 resolves that the Auditor General shall conduct a management audit of the process followed in negotiating and entering into the contract with Ecosse Hospital Products Limited in establishing and operating the I-SaveRx Program."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We put this Resolution together, Representative Stephens and myself, in... in response to some hearings we had in our committee on State

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Government Administration. We had heard about the idea to buy flu vaccines last year but we weren't told of the... of the contract for three months later. The state's now being sued for \$2.6 million for vaccines we hadn't received. And we'd like to look at whether the procedures were followed and all the applicable rules and regulations. Additionally, we'd like to check into the I-SaveRx Program, which as you know is requiring state funds to be used to accredit foreign pharmacies. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 40 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there are 113 Members voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And House Joint Resolution 40 is adopted. On page 18, Representative Sandy Pihos has House Joint Resolution 41. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 41. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Pihos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Sandy Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This

 Amendment has been crafted with the State Board of

 Education to support their work with the U.S. Department of

 Education for the state Accountability Workbook that would

61st Legislative Day

- keep the provisions more flexible. I would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any questions on House Joint Resolution 41...

 Amendment... Amendment to House Joint Resolution 41? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 41 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Lady from DuPage, Representative Pihos."
- Pihos: "Yes, again, I would urge you to support this House Joint Resolution that has been crafted with the State Board of Education to support their work with the U.S. Department of Education."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution 41 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House adopts House Joint Resolution 41. On page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Jim Meyer has House Joint Resolution 43. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 43 creates a joint task force on... joint task force on deaf and hard of hearing education options."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mever: House Joint Resolution 43 is introduced on behalf of the commission of Options Committee created by the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing Commission comprised of early intervention and educational professionals, Illinois House of Representatives, individuals with hearing loss, parents with individuals with hearing loss. During this last summer, Representative Nekritz and myself were asked to sit with the... on this Commission Options Committee... or Communications Options Committee. We held a series of four meetings, I believe it was, at which time that committee decided that they had accomplished so much of what they wanted to accomplish, but there was more to accomplished, and asked for Representative Nekritz and myself to jointly introduce this... this Resolution to create It... the duty of the task force is to undertake a very comprehensive and thorough review of education services available to the deaf and hard of hearing children in Illinois with the intent of making recommendations that would recognize communications as a fundamental to a deaf and hard of hearing child's most basic needs; ensure communication-driven service delivery of the early intervention system in the public education system of programs and services addressing the unique needs of each children through communication assessment, development, and access. I would just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is... Those in favor of the adoption of House Joint

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Resolution should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Granberg, to be recorded? Thank you, Representative. Take the… take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And the House adopts House Joint Resolution #43. On page 18, Representative Chapa LaVia has House Joint Resolution #52. Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. On the bottom of page 18, Representative Calvin Giles has House Resol… Joint Resolution 54. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 54 creates the task force on dropouts to examine policies, programs, and other issues related to developing a variety of successful approaches using best program practices to re-enroll, teach, and graduate high school dropouts."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Calvin Giles."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution, as the Clerk just read, it created the task force on dropout. We have an extreme dropout rate among our educational institutions in this state. And we're going to try to look at ways that we can reduce the dropout rate among high school. We plan to have hearings across the state. This task force will have hearings and also they will report to the General Assembly no later than January the 10th, 2006. I urge for its adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on House Joint Resolution 54? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 113 Members voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And House Joint Resolution 54 is adopted. On Motions of Concurrences, Representative Franks, on page 13 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, has House Bill 655. Representative Franks in the chamber? Yes, he is. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for, regrettably, nonconcurring in Senate Amendment #1 and 2. We had passed the underlying Bill 106-7. There's some question on the Senate Amendments 1 and 2 and I'd ask for nonconcurrence."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Motion is to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 655. All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House votes to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 655. Representative Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 90 and Senate Bill 96 can be heard in the Executive Committee, Senate Bill 1180 in Judiciary II, Senate Bill 1211 in Executive, Senate Bill 1435 in Executive, House Resolutions 394, 404, and 424 in State Government Administration, House Resolution 433 in

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Human Services, House Resolution 436 in Environment & Energy, House Resolutions 438, 439, and 443 in State Government, House Resolution 448 in Public Utilities, House Resolution 457 and 458 in State Government, Resolution 462 in Human Services, House Resolution 463 in Transportation, House Resolution 466 in State Government Administration, House Resolution 473 in State Government, Resolution 476 to Veterans' Affairs, Resolutions 491, 492, 493, and 499 to State Government, House Resolution 502 to Adoption Reform, House Resolution 527 to Public Utilities, House Joint Resolution 56 to State Government, House Joint Resolution 58 to State Government, House Joint Resolutions 59 and 61 and Senate Joint Resolution 9 to Human Services, Senate Joint Resolutions 10 and 14 to State Government Administration, Senate Joint Resolution 20 to Human Services, Senate Joint Resolution 38 to Agriculture, Senate Joint Resolution 41 to Elementary & Secondary, and Senate Joint Resolution 45 to Elementary & Secondary."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Any questions? Seeing none, the question is... All those in favor of the Motion should say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 526, offered by Representative Osterman."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "All those in favor of the Agreed Resolutions signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

- 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to continue with the Order of Resolutions on page 19. On page 19, Representative Miller has House Resolution 83. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 83 urges the State Board of Education, the soft drink industry, and the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance to eliminate soft drink beverage sales and junk food products from school settings."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Miller."

Miller: "We just ask for favorable adoption of the Resolution."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "All those in favor of House Resolution 83 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 19,
 - Representative Soto has House Resolution 90. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 90 urges the Illinois Department of Labor to determine the extent to which Illinois workers are exposed to harmful chemicals at microwave popcorn processing plants. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. Last year there was a factory that had was... that had these chemicals there at their company and people were... had to have lung transplants. As like the

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

analysis say, this is a... I'm urging the Department of Labor to determine to the extent to which Illinois workers are exposed to harmful chemicals at a microwave popcorn processing plants. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 90? Seeing none, the question is... all those in favor signify... of adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 90 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative Soto. All those in favor of adopt... adoption of House Resolution 90 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Resolution 90 is adopted. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Jack McGuire has House Resolution 117. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 117 urges President Bush to reinstate full funding for Amtrak."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Gentleman from McGui... the Gentleman from Will, Representative Jack McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... the Resolution is very short and it urges President Bush to reinstate the full funding for Amtrak. We would certainly appreciate your vote and thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is... All those in favor of adoption of House Resolution 117 should say 'yes'; all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of

61st Legislative Day

- the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 117 is adopted. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Beth Coulson has House Resolution 120. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 120 honors the accomplishments of Frances Willard and declares that the month of March be known as Magnificent Mentor Month."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "House Resolution 120 honors the accomplishments of Frances Willard and declares the month of March to be known as Magnificent Mentor Month. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no questions, all those in favor of adoption of House Resolution 120 should signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 120 is adopted. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Cynthia Soto has House Resolution 141. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 141 urges the Secretary of State to more frequently update the lobbyist registration list on the Secretary's website and to include additional and accurate and timely information."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Recognize the Lady from Cook, Representative Cindy Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 141 urges the Secretary of State to update its lobbyists list website more frequently. The Secretary of State must maintain a list accordingly to the Lobbyist

61st Legislative Day

- Registration Act 25 Illinois CS 170. The information is vital to the Members of the General Assembly and to the citizens of the State of Illinois. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Okay. All those in favor of the Lady's Motion should say 'yes'; all those (opposed) say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 141 is adopted. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Hoffman... is Representative Hoffman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, on page 19, Representative Hoffman has House Resolution 143. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 143 calls on the Illinois Congressional Delegation to protect Illinois' interest in and to pursue funding for passenger rail service."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Jay Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "This just encourages the Federal Government to provide more money for Amtrak."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 143 should say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 143 is adopted. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Connie Howard has House Resolution 144. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 144 recommends that the Governor appoint an Illinois Technology Czar to coordinate State Government information technology, create a better state information technology infrastructure, and recommend to the

61st Legislative Day

- Governor and to the General Assembly technological changes within State Government."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "This Resolution asks the state to recognize the serious issue of making certain that our state does not fall behind in the area of technology."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of adoption of House Resolution 144 should say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 144 is adopted. On the bottom of page 19 is House Resolution 145. Representative Jim Watson. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 145 urges the Department of Public Health to develop a model community coalition effort to combat methamphetamine abuse."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Jim Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 145 stems from the Meth Task Force chaired by Representatives Brady and Chapin Rose. It simply encourages the Department of Public Health to develop a model community coalition effort to combat methamphetamine use. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 145 should say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

And House Resolution 145 is adopted. On top of page 20 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, Representative Ruth Munson has House Resolution 147. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 147 urges the Department of Children and Family Services to establish internal protocols for their own employees to identify (sites) used to manufacture methamphetamine and to identify methamphetamine addicts and children of methamphetamine addicts."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ruth Munson."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 147 is also a product of the Methamphetamine Task Force. And it just urges the Department of Children and Family Services to set up protocols for their own employees to help identify the manufacture of methamphetamine addicts and children of addicts and also to protect their employees. Ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no one seeking discussion, the question is... All those in favor of adopting House Resolution 147 should say 'yes'; all those (opposed) say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 147 is adopted. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz. For what reason do you rise?"
- Reitz: "Just a question, Mr. Speaker, a few people back here.

 We're moving through these fairly quick. Do we have time

61st Legislative Day

- to... to read these Resolutions first before we take action on 'em or...?"
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "We'll take that under consideration, Representative..."
- Reitz: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "...and get back to you. On page 20 of the Calendar, Representative Dan Brady has House Resolution 149. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 149 urges Congress to enact a law creating one nationwide standard on the retail distribution of pseudoephedrine."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Dan Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 149 is part of the package of legislation introduced by the House Republicans resulting from our task force dealing with methamphetamines. This simply calls for a unified approach to the retail sale and interaction with pseudoephedrine, which is one of the main ingredients in production of meth in this state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 149 should so indicate by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 149 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, on page 20 of the Calendar, Representative Munson has House Resolution 151.

 Mr. Clerk."

61st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 151 refers to a Department of Central Management Services study that suggests the operation of the Area-wide Law Enforcement Radio Terminal System (ALERTS) be transferred to the Department in a convergence of ALERTS with the Illinois Wireless Information Network take place, which would dismantle ALERTS. States that ALERTS is a product of local government cooperation and urges the State not to expropriate the products of their cooperation."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ruth Munson."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 151 asks the State not expropriate the Area-wide Law Enforcement Radio Terminal System created by local public agencies across the state. More than 300 public agencies use this system in their daily activities and were instrumental in its creation. The ALERT System had its start in the 1980s as a mechanism to foster cooperation among the public safety entities within munici... multiple local governments. The system was paid for by local government and those fees deposited in special trust fund for the purpose of maintaining and upgrading the ALERT System. There was a total of \$2.2 million in the fund until last year when 300 thousand was swept from this public safety fund. The remaining amount is scheduled to be swept this year, leaving nothing left to provide upgrades to a system on which many police and fire departments depend. The Resolution also thanks the units

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

of local government who took the farsighted cooperative action to create and foster ALERTS to provide for the safety of the people of Illinois. They set an example of intergovernmental cooperation of which the State of Illinois should take note. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Don Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lyons, J.: "She indicates she will."

Moffitt: "Representative, this... I assume this legislation then is supported by local government and by, like, the Sheriffs' Association. Is that correct?"

Munson: "The Sheriffs'... yes, Sheriffs' Association supports this."

Moffitt: "And... and this would... I mean, we're taking a position in support of them. I know a group of them were down here, they're very concerned about what the attempt had been to do to take that away. And so you're... you're stepping here in support of the Illinois Sheriffs' Association and local government in general?"

Munson: "Yes."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

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

Speaker Lyons, J.: "She indicates she will."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "Representative, what does this do to the State Police?"

Munson: "It doesn't do anything to the State Police at this point."

Black: "Well, can they still... it doesn't take them off the riverboats?"

Munson: "No, Sir."

Black: "Well, I thought the State Police was in charge of the ALERT System?"

Munson: "The... there are funds that are controlled... it's in a trust fund in which the criminal justice division controls that."

Black: "Oh, they're in a trust fund?"

Munson: "Correct."

Black: "Kind of like pension money?"

Munson: "Correct."

Black: "Ahhh. I see. Yeah. So... so, who's gonna get into this trust fund?"

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

Black: "Well, I mean, is your... your Resolution spells out how the money will be spent in a reasonable fashion."

Munson: "This Resolutions says the money stays with the ALERT System for public safety officials to be able to update their..."

Black: "It stays with the ALERT System? That's not what we're about here, Representative. Take the money out of the ALERT System and buy 500 new trooper cars. And if we're short, borrow it. Can we just amend it on the face?"

Munson: "No, Sir."

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

Black: "Oh, for crying out loud."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Seeing no further discussion, those in favor of adoption of House Resolution 151 should say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 151 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 25? Mr. Clerk, committees."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately upon adjournment: the Executive Committee in Room 118, Judiciary II Committee in D-1, and Revenue Committee in Room 114."
- Speaker Lyons, J.: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk,
 Representative Barbara Flynn... Chair recognizes the
 Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Michael Bost. For
 what reason do you rise, Representative?"
- Bost: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I'm a little concerned. Earlier this evening I... I made sure that you knew that my 'mike' here needed to be fixed and nobody got down here and fixed it.

 And I was a little concerned about that. We're... is somebody gonna get that taken care of?"

Speaker Lyons, J.: "I've been assured..."

Bost: "And..."

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "After Session, Representative, it will be taken care of."
- Bost: "And I was a little concerned also. Earlier we moved two Resolutions, one dealt with Amtrak in one way and one dealt with Amtrak in another. What were the difference between...

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

I was a little concerned about that. I'm wanting to know if... if maybe we knew..."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative, I'm sure in the Body of those Resolutions the differences would be obvious to either one of us, if we wanna take the time to go through either one of 'em."

Bost: "But, now... now of them was carried by Representative Hoffman and one was Rep... Representative McGuire. And I'm just... I... one... one... I am... I am concerned, 'cause one dealt with the fuel and one dealt with what?"

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Representative, I'm sure if you would like to ask..."

Bost: "Is it..."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "...Representative McGuire and Representative Hoffman, they'd be more than happy to explain the differences..."

Bost: "I'll just..."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "...in their Resolutions."

Bost: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons, J.: "Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk...

Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Bill Black. For what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Lyons, J.: "State your inquiry, Representative."

Black: "What was Representative Bost talking about?"

Speaker Lyons, J.: "You'd have to ask Representative Bost..."

Black: "Thank you."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons, J.: "...Mr. Black. Seeing no further discussion, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Repre... Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow, Memorial Day, May 30. All those in favor of adjourning signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. And the House stands adjourned until the hour of 11 a.m., Memorial Day, Monday, May 30. Have a safe and enjoyable evening."
- Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 63, offered by Representative Molaro. Senate Joint Resolution 40, offered by Representative Coulson. Senate Joint Resolution 45, offered by Representative Giles. These Resolutions are referred to the House Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 507, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 955, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. First Reading of these Senate Bills."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Committee Reports. Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 29, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' Senate Bill 1625.

 Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II Criminal Law, to which the following

61st Legislative Day

5/29/2005

measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 29, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2062; and 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 1180. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 29, 2005, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 1211; 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' Senate Bill 90 and Senate Bill 96; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 1435. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 1246, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning business. First Reading of this Senate Bill. On the Order of Second Readings-Senate Bills. Senate Bill 90, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 96, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1211, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1435, a Bill for an Act concerning land. And Senate Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."