82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "The House shall come to order. 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. Today we have the privilege of having two gentlemen lead us in prayer. First, we shall be led in prayer by the Reverend Frederick Aigner with Lutheran Social Services of Illinois in Des Plaines. Reverend Aigner is the guest of Representative Currie."
- Reverend Aigner: "Let us pray. Merciful God, You hold the whole creation in Your loving embrace. You've endowed humankind with gifts necessary for the care of creation and have made us stewards of Your vineyards, Your people, especially the widows, the orphans, and the strangers in our communities. Bless this day and these men and... (recording malfunction) ...gathered here to do the people's work. Give wisdom to those who make laws, compassion to those who carry them out, and conviction to all who work for greater justice in our state. Keep before us, Oh God, the face of those who are most vulnerable and least represented in this Body. Embolden all Your people to raise our voices and our votes for a more just and a more sustainable world, for ourselves, our children, and for the generations who will steward this land after us. In Your Almighty name we pray, amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you. And we'll also be led in a second prayer today by the Reverend Dr. Richard Tolliver with St. Edmund's Episcopal Church in Chicago. Reverend Tolliver is the guest of Representative Dunkin."
- Reverend Tolliver: "Let us pray. Oh God, the fountain of wisdom, we beseech Thee to guide and bless the Members of

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

this Legislative Body assembled here today. Grant to them at this time special gifts of wisdom and understanding that they may bring to their work brains that think and heads and hearts that feel. That they may have ideals, imagination, wisdom, and courage. That they may never be enslaved by routine and convention and popular opinion. May the Governor of this state and all persons possessing legislative authority be ever mindful of their high calling to enact laws that promote the welfare of the citizenry. Grant to them the spirit of unselfish service, which alone can make them great and Your work advanced. Amen."

- Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Munson, will you lead us in the Pledge today."
- Munson et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Delgado and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Bassi and Tenhouse are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are... there are 114 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, would you read your Committee Reports."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is House Bill 4425; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4315. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill Representative Delgado, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4135 and House Bill 4526; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4302; 'recommends be adopted' House Joint Resolution 75. Representative Giles, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4696. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 849, offered by Representative Acevedo. House Resolution 851, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. And House Resolution 852, offered by Representative Bellock."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We're gonna go to page 4 of the Calendar under the Order of House Resolutions. Under the Agreed

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Resolutions List is House Resolution 772 by Representative Kosel. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 772, offered by Representative Kosel.
 - WHEREAS, In an exciting double overtime finish, the Lincoln-Way East Griffins defeated the Maine South High School Hawks by a score of 30 to 24 to win the IHSA Class 8A State Championship football game on Saturday, November 26, 2005; and
 - WHEREAS, This is the first Class 8A championship game to be played in overtime; and
 - WHEREAS, To reach the championship game, the Griffins defeated Thornton, Lincoln-Way Central, Brother Rice, and Wheaton Warrenville South in the IHSA playoffs; the team finished the season with a record of 14 wins and no losses; and
 - WHEREAS, The Lincoln-Way East Griffins are the first football program in Illinois history to win a State championship within five years of playing their first game; and
 - WHEREAS, Lincoln-Way East is the first high school football team to have played in the State playoffs in each of its five seasons; and
 - WHEREAS, The head coach of the Griffins is Rob Zvonar; his assistant coaches are Joel Pallissard, Jack Eddy, Mike Franta, Ron Tomczak, Steve Tomczak, Ryan Gabey, Dave Woodburn, Lance Lokanc, Brian Newcomb, Dave Murray, Josh Kreske, Eric Doornkaat, Louis Lee, Mitch Nowicki, Jeff Maurer, Scott Reid, John Piazza, Steve Bauer, Kyle Jakubek, and Jeff Winefka; student coaches are Ben VanPelt and Mike Czarnowski; Philip Duckworth is the team's ballboy; and

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

WHEREAS, The trainers for the Griffins are Cody Cowman, Matt Zalewski, Dr. Aaron Wolfe, Dr. Mike Corcoran, and Dr. Brad Katzman; and

WHEREAS, The members of the Griffins are Marvin Cosby, Pat Geary (captain), Anthony Kropp (captain), Andy Gerritsen, Austin Zenere, Paul Bria, Andrew Ramus, Mike Charles, Blake Hammond, Matt Walenga, Kyle Geary, Dan Cebula, Dan Fiorenza, Kyle Grossheider, Marty Pokorney, Gersi Hoxha, John Griffin, Al Mau (captain), Gian Angelo, Brendan Mulheran, Ben Petrassi, Andy Mau, Cory Swaim, Matt Paez, Noel Borg, Kyle Oskielunas, Isioma Ebiringah, Gus Olofsson, Tom Lilja, Michael Boettcher, Jeff Grunwald, Sean Lynch, Chris Lozynski, Kyle Bewley, Ryan Weber, Jon Olofsson, Max Moore, Kevin Wittl, Landon Wallace, Tom Lynch, Joe Turek, Dan Pirkle, Steve Elkow, Steve Nwokocha, Dan Pammer, Ryan Ruiz, John Koszulinski, Shaun Grady, Jake Popovich, Nick Slager, Sean Smith, Josh Reid, Josh Soliday, Steve Sims, Kyle Harke, Nick Tadros, Phil Wing, Will Villasenor, Andrew Tagli, Wade Novak, Kyle Liston, Blake Lucas, Dave Denardo, Kyle Houlahan, Tom Raines, Keenan Clifford (captain), Dan Giordano, Jerry McInerney, Adam Gettis, Sam Pranckus, Joe Mau, Hank Johnston (captain), Erick Starke, Steve Tepper, Phil Dixon, Tim Brooks, Cory Dybas, Corey Smith, Dave Liston, Jake Bewley, Terry Kuzel, Casey Luther, Colin Luczynski (captain), D.J. Pirkle, Alex White, Mike Wheatley, and Bill Clemens; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Lincoln-Way East Griffins football team on

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

winning the Class 8A IHSA State Championship; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be presented to each of the members of the 2005 Lincoln-Way East Griffins football organization as an expression of our esteem."

Speaker Hannig: "Congratulations, gentlemen. The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to add Representative McCarthy to this Resolution, I thought that that had been done. Representative McCarthy also represents some of the areas that are represented by this absolutely fine football team. Let me... let me tell you a little bit about our community. This is a brand new school, it's only 5 years old. And as the Resolution said, they have been in the playoffs every single year. One of the trustees from one of our local towns wrote a poem about it and I'd like to share you... share that with you because I really think it has ... it shows the spirit in our community. ''Twas the night... was the week before Thanksgiving and all through the land, large creatures were stirring led by one man. Coach 'Z' had them ready, a remarkable bunch. They'd be state champs, we all had a hunch. From the valleys to rooftops, the sound was quite clear, Coach had their attention as they could all hear. Now Bewley, now Johnston, now Mau, now Kropp, this team won't quit until we come out on top. The playbook was locked in the office with care in hopes Maine South players would not find it there. Down I57 drove our Mayor Joe with thousands of Lincoln-Way faithful in tow. During the game, none of us quivered. We were

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

quite sure this team would deliver. With one foot to go, the crowd led a roar. No doubt in our minds, these Griffins would score. The football was snapped and they charged in like beasts, the champions now hail from Lincoln-Way East.' Truly remarkable bunch of young men and we have the captains with us here today. Thank you very much for coming down. It's a pleasure to honor you and receive the congratulations of the House of Representatives."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy."

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to add my congratulations to the... to the team and the coaches from Lincoln-Way East. It was quite an accomplishment to do this in only their first 5 years. And I think it's something that is definitely deserving of this Resolution. So, congratulations to the all the men and their coaches. So, thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "Repre... Representative Kosel moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Okay. So, we're gonna start on page 2 of the Calendar as we did yesterday on House Bills-Second Reading and proceed through the list. The first Bill is House Bill 1744, Representative Currie. Do you wish us to move 1744 from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1744 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. House Bill 2414, Representative Acevedo. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Flowers,

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- you have House Bill 4125. Out of the record. Representative Feigenholtz, on 4134. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4134, a Bill for an Act concerning civil liabilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Boland on 4137.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4137, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Yarbrough, you have 4172. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4172, a Bill for Act concerning consumer fraud. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lang on 4202.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4202, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Ramey on House Bill 4204, from Second to Third. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4204, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill.

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Amendment #1 was approved in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Franks, you have House Bill 4205. Out of the record. Representative Flowers, you have House Bill 4306, from Second to Third, Representative."

Flowers: "We..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Is there an Amendment? There's Amendment to House Bill 4306."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr... Mr. Clerk, what is the status of 4306? Are there any Amendments pending here... here in front of us?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendments 1, 2, and 3 were adopted in committee. No other Amendments are pending on this Bill."

Flowers: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "Do you wish to move it or hold it, Representative?"

Flowers: "No, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Hold it? Okay."

Flowers: "Yes, please."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Burke on House Bill 4345. Okay.

Out of the record. Representative Lang on House Bill 4350.

Out of the record. House Bill 4377, Representative Hoffman.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4377, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative D'Amico on House Bill 4419. Representative D'Amico, do you wish us to move this Bill from Second to Third? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4419, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Bost, you have House Bill 4444. Representative Bost. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Sacia, you have House Bill 4521. Out of the record. Representative Rita, you have House Bill 4699. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4699, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Mendoza, you have House Bill 4736. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4736, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status now of House Bill 1744?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1744 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. That was inadvertently moved to Third.

 Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

the Sponsor. Okay. Moving on to the Order of House Bills-Third Reading on page 3 of the Calendar. Representative Froehlich, you wish us to call House Bill 1295? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1295, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Froehlich."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1295 is aimed at reducing underage drinking using fake IDs. I do that by protecting liquor retailers from liability if they act reasonably in confiscating suspect IDs and turning 'em over to police. I have a broad coalition of support for this measure and I'd ask my colleagues for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone wish to speak in response or remove it from Short Debate? Gentlemen? We... we can remove this from Short Debate. There's a couple of people who would like to speak. So, let's put it on the Order of Standard Debate and Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We talked about this in committee. The only problem that I had was these kids who go there and someone looks young and the bouncer, manager, whatever it is says, 'I think he looks young. Let's con... we're gonna hold it, we're gonna call the police.' And within the next couple of days, right now in this... the way we are doing things under this terrorist pact, you walk around without a valid state ID, you're... you're dead in the water. You can't even come in this building without it. So, if someone was gonna have a

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

class trip but some bouncer has it, I... I'm looking for some kind of assurances which probably you can't give. But to make sure that when they hold it, now remember you're not... what they used to do and what this Bill allows them to do, they'd have to call the police sort of. Now, you're letting them do it, as a matter of fact, wherein by this Bill, encouraging them to people who are really not trained because I don't see anywhere in the Bill that we're gonna train these bouncers or doormen. So, they're just going on what they feel that they're gonna confiscate this and hold it for the authorities and there's nothing in the Bill that talks about how long they gotta hold it. Do they have to return it after 2 hours? I just don't want it to be that we're creating a nightmare where kids are gonna have... they are 21 or 22, they just don't look it. Some bouncer thinks it's suspicious, grabs it, holds it for three, four days, and they have no recourse. So, I'd at least then want something from the Sponsor, even then as part of the record, that we don't want that to happen at all. So, as they say on talk shows, I'll sit down and hang up and let you respond."

Froehlich: "All right. Thank you, Representative Molaro. You...
you raised some valid concerns. And the... the practice now
is that when somebody is innocent and the ID's taken that
they would typically call the police themselves that night
and get their ID retrieved. So, I do think training's a
great idea. I'm not sure we're ready to mandate it,
however."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey, do you speak in response or in support?"

Fritchey: "I believe in response, Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, 5 minutes, Representative."

Fritchey: "Thank you. Representative, you and I have worked together on a lot of legislation and it's the exception rather than the rule that you and I are on the other side. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would submit that you pay attention to this legislation because it's more problematic than you Representative Molaro was onto a very valid may think. We are giving private individuals, not enforcement, not licensed individuals, private individuals the ability to confiscate upon reasonable belief, whatever that may be, an individual's identification. I have a staffer who I believe is probably over 21, he looks like he's about 16. If he went to a bar... let's say he was from out of state and came to a bar in Springfield and he may be, let's say, from Idaho. A bouncer in an Illinois town may not know what an Idaho driver's license looks like. he's gonna look at an Idaho driver's license, which looks foreign to him, he's going to look at a young-faced kid and say, 'This is not a real ID. And in good faith, I'm going to confiscate your ID.' As Representative Molaro just indicated, you now have an individual, an adult, that's done nothing wrong, that's committed... or no illegal act ... that has not attempted to commit an illegal act, who has now found himself stripped of his lawfully issued state identification for what could be hours, but what could be days. that this is not only an unwarranted intrusion on personal

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

rights, but it's also going to, I think, unquestionably open up bouncers, retailers, owners of these establishments to litigation. I know you well enough; I know your intention is good. You and I've done a lot of similar type of work with our positions on the Illinois State Crime Commission and this fits very well in the intent with doing that. But I would submit to you, Representative, and I'd like to hear your response to this... and I would really suggest that the other Members of this Body pay attention to what we're about to do here. This is a significant departure from the law in this state from the concepts of individual liberty and from in this state and in this private rights Representative."

Froehlich: "Sure. Thank you, Representative. Always appreciate your thoughtful comments. The practice now, there are nightclubs and bars that currently confiscate IDs. And sometimes they currently make mistakes and here's what happens. When... when a young adult is, in fact, innocent and police take their real ID, they will often go and call the police themselves to try and get the card retrieved, and... and they typically do it that night. And I think that's a great idea. The fact is, if a kid's underaged they're not likely to try that. It's only a kid who is... a young adult who looks young."

Fritchey: "I... I understand. But you're... but you are shifting the burden onto a individual committing a lawful act to have to take affirmative steps to get their identification back, and that's what's problematic to me. Is it your understanding that statutorily today a bouncer or a retail

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

clerk has the authority to confiscate a government-issued identification from a private citizen?"

Froehlich: "Well, that's a little grey area because..."

Fritchey: "I don't think it... with all due respect, I don't think it is grey."

Froehlich: "Well..."

Fritchey: "I don't think they have the authority to do it today."

Froehlich: "Well, the practice is many are doing it. Okay?"

Fritchey: "I..."

Froehlich: "On the argument that it's contraband that it's... if it's a fraudulent card it's actually a felony for somebody to... to have it. And they..."

Fritchey: "Well, let me... with all due respect, I apologize for cutting you off, Paul... Representative. But at that point right there, that it's contraband and should be confiscated. A private individual, by virtue of being a retailer or by virtue of being a bouncer, does not have some type of vested rights as a law enforcement officer to confiscate contraband items, even if it was clearly illegal. Now, they may do it knowing that the possessor of that identification, as you said, is not going to take any steps to get it back, but please keep in mind that they are not empowered under the statutes today to act in the stead of a law enforcement officer. They are empowered to refuse entry to that person. They are empowered to call law enforcement and say, 'I think this kid's trying to get in with a fake ID', which is an illegal act, and have law enforcement look at that ID and take that. But they do not have the authority today to take

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

that ID. Does it happen? It happens all the time and more often than not it probably prevents underage kids from getting into bars. However, we are giving statutory authority under this legislation for these retailers, for point-of-entry individuals or point-of-sale individuals to act as de facto law enforcement officers in confiscating an ID based upon their reasonable belief that it is not a valid ID. That is a signfi... that is a significant departure from law today and that significant empowerment of a retail clerk that may have basic training but, as I said, give my... to give my previous example, they may not know what an Idaho driver's license looks like. And you couple an Idaho driver's license with a young-looking possessor of that license and all of a sudden a lawful individual has been stripped of their government issue ID by a civilian."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, Representative Fritchey, your time has expired."

Fritchey: "I... I think I made my point, Representative. I believe you understand me. We may agree to disagree.

Ladies and Gentlemen, please pay attention to what we're about to do here. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Monique Davis, are you a proponent or in response? You're recognized on the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I have one question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman will yield."

Davis, M.: "Those people who have signed on in support of this legislation, were they in support prior to your Amendment?"

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Froehlich: "The… my Amendment… yes, they were. My Amendment only affected the trial lawyers. They… they said they would not oppose it if I added the term 'except for willful and wanton misconduct.' So, that's what I added with my Amendment. So, they… they are now neutral on it rather than opposed."

Davis, M.: "But they're not in support of?"

Froehlich: "No, the trial lawyers aren't."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Froehlich: "But law enforcement is, the liquor retailers, the liquor manufacturers..."

Davis, M.: "Okay."

Froehlich: "...and the prevention people are all supportive."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. think I have to concur with my colleague who just spoke, Representative Fritchey, because if one views a piece of identification as fraudulent and yet it is not, where is the redress for that individual? I know a lot of us in here don't resemble the pictures that are in those handbooks... those government handbooks. You know, we don't kinda look like those pictures. And that same thing could occur with a person who has some identification and a picture on there. You know, in fact, the picture on my driver's license is getting older and older, but I'm not. I think it's important as we look at this issue that we don't add to the things that violate the civil rights of the people in the State of Illinois. I know that this very respectable, honorable Representative has an excellent intent, but I think the result will be a number of incidents in which a

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

police authority will be called, a number of incidents in which court cases will be held unnecessarily. You know, we just passed the law in reference to the methamphetamine and there are places where people have to go and sign their name and they have to show identification. And I think as we conclude in those instances where a person's identification is truly of great value, then we, in my opinion, will put forth some penalties rather than giving one other person the authority to say this is fraudulent. You may not really have that expertise, you may not just like the way I look. So, I agree with my former colleague, Fritchey, that even though I know you have the best intentions, this is dangerous legislation. I urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, we are operating under the rules of Standard Debate which provide for three in... three to speak in favor and three in response. We've had three in response: Representative Molaro, Fritchey, and Monique Davis. Does anyone rise in support? Representative Black, would you like to speak in favor of the Bill?"
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what you said. I can't hear a thing. I... I can hear you speaking but I wouldn't know if you were saying there's free chicken in the back. What did you say?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, I was simply reiterating that under the rules of Standard Debate we've now had three speak in response. The rules do not provide that any additional speakers may speak in response, but there's still room for two to speak in favor. And if you had wished to speak in favor, I would recognize you for that purpose."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Black: "I... Mr... in all due respect to the Chair, I'm not sure. I need to ask him some questions and then I may be in favor of the Bill, I may not be in favor of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So we'll put you down temporarily in favor and proceed."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, it appears from the debate that I have tried to listen to, although it's impossible to hear most of it, what you are doing is taking a practice that happens today... I don't think I... well, I haven't been in many campus bars lately but I live 30 miles from a major university and in the press they... they just busted a major fake ID ring in one of our college campuses. I don't what... I don't think it was the University of Illinois, but one of And it was done because an alert employee detected a potential fraudulent ID. Took the ID, called the police, the police looked, it was obviously fraudulent, did some questioning, found out that there were people making and selling them. And so they put somebody out of business who was selling fraudulent IDs. So it's... it's my understanding all... is it... is it your intent to simply codify a practice that is already going on in almost every bar in almost every college town in the State of Illinois?"

Froehlich: "Yes. Yes. We're... it's already going on in many places but the reason it doesn't happen in more is the fear of liability. So because there is a chance that a bartender may make a mistake, the attorneys say, 'Well, ya better not grab the 98 percent that it's very clear are phony or don't belong to the person using it and turn those into police.' Okay? 'Because there could be liability.' All I'm saying

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- is, you won't have liability if you otherwise act reasonably. Now, if you act unreasonably, ya know, I'm not protecting ya. But if you have reasonable belief, you take it to give it to police, you're protected."
- Black: "So, the preventative factor from what... what the other Legislators were saying, if you act in a capricious manner, you don't like the person, you don't like the person's dress, you may not like the person's ethnicity or racial characteristics, and so if you just say, 'That's a fake ID. I'm taking the ID and you're not getting in', you then could be subject to legal action, correct?"
- Froehlich: "If... if you were caught with a fake ID, is that your question? Yes. If... if you can... if police can prove that somebody had and used a fake ID, they're subject... we already have substantial penalties in the law. The problem is, from my point of view, not enough violators get caught and punished because the cards aren't being confiscated in many cases 'cause of the fear of liability."
- Black: "Okay. So, the person taking the ID should have some reasonable expectation that the ID is, in fact, fake or he or she will face potential legal problems in a civil lawsuit, right?"
- Froehlich: "If there's... the wording we have is 'willful and wanton misconduct.'"
- Black: "Okay. All right. So, for those of us who can remember our campus days, what you are doing with carefully-worded language is to codify a practice that has been going on for a long time in this state, and I don't see anything wrong with that. So, Mr. Speaker, after those questions, I rise

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

in support of the Gentleman's Bill. It simply codifies with basic protection from somebody being capricious and arbitrary. Something that the liquor business, the bar business, the law enforcement entities, all in support of the Bill, have been after for years. If you suspect... have reasonable expectations to suspect that the ID is, in fact, fraudulent, take it and call the authorities. I think that's a reasonable addition to trying to stop underage drinking, underage admittance to bars. I think the Bill, as amended, offers sufficient protection to the public at large. I stand in favor of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've now had two speak in favor.

Representative Durkin is next on the list. Are you in favor?"

Durkin: "Yes. I speak in favor. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Okay. Five minutes, Representative."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we've been around here... I've been around here a number of years and during a heated debate we often describe these doomsday scenarios on every Bill. This is a very reasonable, ya know, piece of legislation that the Representative's presented. think the arguments they've made, I think, are a little bit beyond the realm of reality. Now, just yesterday we passed a Bill which made it a Class II felony for someone to present a false identification card to purchase pseudoephedrine when... to stop this methamphetamine craze. Now, we're asking the retailers and also distillers to take on this responsibility, something that they clearly do. now as a Legislator, but also as a father, I think this is

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

very responsible and I think we should all support this Bill 'cause it's going in the right direction. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, now under the rules of Standard Debate, all that are allowed to speak have spoken. Representative Fritchey, you have spoken in debate. For what reason do you rise?"

Fritchey: "Speaker, my name was used repeatedly in debate. like to clarify one issue with the ... with the Sponsor for the record. Representative, I just spoke to your staffer and I'd just... I'd like to put something on the record to see if you're amendable to this. The concern is that once that driver's license gets pulled it could set up a chain of events from that individual being forced to unnecessarily drive without a driver's license to being able to catch a flight back home because they don't have ID, et cetera. What I think would give a number of us in opposition to this a comfort level will be a requirement that if this civilian does confiscate the ID from a person, that they be required to immediately call law enforcement so law enforcement can then come out and make that determination. You don't wanna strip government ID from an innocent person, I know that. And I think that we need some type of law enforcement mechanism here. Would you agree that that would be a reasonable Amendment that you'd be willing to do either here or commit to doing it on the Senate side?"

Froehlich: "Representative, I don't think that particular formulation would work that well. In a busy nightclub where they may have hundreds of customers and may confiscate a

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

stack in a given night, you'd have police there all night. I... I mean, I would be more amendable to the idea of putting it in the wording if you'd like that if... if a customer feels that they've been... had their real card wrongfully confiscated, that they may call the police to try and resolve it right then and there. I don't think the other would work, with all respect, to... I think it would still deter retailers if they knew they had to have the police there all night long."

Fritchey: "All right. Rep... Representative, the intention is great but to put the burden on a individual who's done nothing wrong, I think, is improper. We can respectfully agree to disagree. Thank you."

Froehlich: "Thank you for your suggestion."

Speaker Hannig: "We've now had a full debate under the rules of Standard Debate and Representative Froehlich is recognized to close."

Froehlich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd request I... we move this Bill back to Second so... there may be a couple of issues I can work on to try and perfect it. And so, I'd like to move it back to Second."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll take the Bill out of the record. And Mr. Clerk, return this to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Holbrook, for what reason do you rise?"

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Purpose of an announcement.

Environment & Energy scheduled for 4:00 today will not meet,

will not meet. We have no business to conduct today. We

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- will not meet today. The… E & E has been canceled. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 1681. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1681 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was approved in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is not a new issue, we've dealt with this issue in the Fall Veto Session."
- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Currie.

 Representative Churchill wants to make a point of order, is that correct?"
- Churchill: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Is it your intention to proceed with this Bill at this time?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Yes, it is."

Churchill: "Then I would have three points of order that I would like to question the Chair on individually and separately."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed, Representative."

Churchill: "Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 2005, the House voted on Senate Bill 1681, which resulted in a vote of 62 'for', 54 'against', and 0 'present'. Under Rule 69(a), a Bill passed after May 31 which contains an earlier effective date than June 1 of the next calendar year must receive 71 votes for passage. Senate Bill 1681 contained an immediate effective date and it was after May 31, so it required 71 votes for

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

passage. In fact, I asked the Chair if it would require 71 votes and the Chair answered in the affirmative. When the Bill received less than the requisite 71 votes, the Chair declared the Bill lost. According to the transcript of the House debate on Senate Bill 1681, the Chair stated, 'On this question, there are 62 people voting 'yes'; 54 people voting 'no'. The Bill is hereby declared lost.' With the Chair declaring the Bill lost, the Bill is considered dead and may not be moved back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Therefore, I would ask the Chair to rule that it is out of order for the Speaker to call Senate Bill 1681 for consideration of this House at this time."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Churchill, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, when Senate Bill 1681 was declared lost, immediately thereafter the Sponsor asked that the... the Clerk move the Bill back to Second Reading under that same rule that you cite, which allows for automatic reconsideration without a vote where a Bill fails to receive the extraordinary 71 vote Supermajority. That has happened in this case. The Bill was moved back to Second Reading, having been reconsidered, and now may be amended and reconsidered further, as any other Bill."

Churchill: "I appreciate the parliamentarian explaining that to me. So then, Mr. Speaker, under Rule 69(b), only the principal Sponsor has the right to move the Bill back automatically for reconsideration, just as you just said, and have it moved back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment to change the earlier effective date. At the time of the recorded vote on Senate Bill 1681, and, in fact,

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

it is still the case now, the principal Sponsor of this Bill is Representative Yarbrough. However, it was Majority Leader Currie who spoke on the legislation and it was Majority Leader Currie who asked that it be automatically reconsidered when the Bill failed to receive the required 71 votes. According to the transcripts of the House debate on Senate Bill 1681, upon the Bill receiving less than the required 71 votes, it was declared 'lost' by the Speaker. It was then Leader Currie who asked the Speaker to move it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an effective date Amendment under Rule 69(b). As it was not the principal Sponsor who asked that the Bill be automatically be reconsidered and returned to Second Reading, the Bill is considered defeated. It is, therefore, out of order to take this Bill up for consideration in this Legislative Body today, the legislation that was not properly reconsidered in accordance with House Rules. And I would ask that the Chair so rule."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative Churchill, again, as a matter that is exclusively within the province of the House to interpret its own rules, at the time that reconsideration was taken there was no objection, no point of order taken from any Member of the Body concerning the principal Sponsor's consent to that. Therefore, to the extent you're asking the Chair to rule now, you're request is untimely. And in any event, the Bill has been properly reconsidered and is before us today."

Churchill: "I would... I would debate that with the parliamentarian as to the fact that I was standing here

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

making objection. I was not called upon for that purpose and the Bill was rammed through at that point. It's hard to state an objection when... when you're not called upon. this point, I'm raising it still as an objection. But let me go on to my third point of order. Mr. Speaker, under Rule 69(b), if after May 31 a Bill that states an effective date earlier than June 1 of the next calendar year, the Bill must receive 71 votes. If the vote fails to receive 71 votes then the principal Sponsor may have the automatically reconsidered and returned to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Under the rule, it may be moved back to Second Reading for an Amendment that removes the earlier effective date, that's the language in the The rule does not allow the Bill to be returned to Second Reading for a substantive Amendment, which House Amendment #2 is. The only Amendment that may be adopted to a Bill returned to the Second Reading under Rule 69(b) is an Amendment removing the earlier effective date. In fact, according to the transcripts of the House debate on 1681, Majority Leader Currie states the following, 'Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under Rule 69(b), I have the right to have reconsideration of this measure and the opportunity to move it back to Second Reading for the purposes of an effective date Amendment.' Leader Currie asked that the Bill be moved back for an Amendment changing the effective date and House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1681 goes beyond a simple effective date Ιt is clearly substantive change. legislation and it is in violation of Rule 69(b) of the House Rules. Therefore, I would ask the Chair to rule that

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

this is out of order to consider Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1681 at this time."

Parliamentarian Uhe: "Again, Mr. Churchill, on behalf of the Speaker and in response to your inquiry, your point of order... your inquiry again relates to a matter that is exclusively within the province of the Chair in terms of the interpretation and enforcement of House Rules. And on the point you have raised, the rule cited does not preclude further Amendment once it has been reconsidered. It does provide that the effective date may be changed. In this case, because we are now into a new calendar year, the effective date did not have to be changed to address the Supermajority vote requirement. Nothing in the rule prohibits any further Amendment once a Bill has been reconsidered, as any other Bill."

Churchill: "But I would argue that the purpose of the rule to bring it back is only to change the effective date. The rationale for that rule is that you are not permitted to get a vote of less than 71 votes during that period of time. And it's the effective date that is messing up what it is you're trying to accomplish. So, by... by having the ability to bring back only for the effective date it corrects your problem and allows there to be less than 71 votes. That's the only issue here. And the rule clearly says, 'for the purpose of changing the effective date.' Otherwise, there would be no reconsideration. Because as you know, once a Bill is normally declared lost you do not then go back and reconsider it."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Parliamentarian Uhe: "Representative, I... I point out one other thing. The Chair has ruled, but in further answer to your question, if automatic reconsideration had not been taken, it would have been with the option of another Member voting on the prevailing side to ask that it be reconsidered. In that case, they certainly could have further amended the Bill. Because this route was taken should not preclude a Member, the Sponsor, from having their Bill amended simply because the reconsideration happened automatically."
- Churchill: "So then, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I would have to move that we overrule the Chair and I would ask for a verification of that vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The que... Okay. So, Representative... Representative Churchill would make a Motion that the Chair be overruled. The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor of sustaining the Chair vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. So this requires a three-fifths vote, Representative Churchill. It requires a three-fifths 'no' vote to overrule the Chair. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. So, Representative Churchill, the Motion fails. Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "I'll withdraw the verification request. Thank you." Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Representative Tryon, for what reason do you rise?"

Tryon: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Why don't... why don't we go back to this Order of Business. And Representative Currie, would you

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

briefly present the Amendment and then we'll allow you, Representative Tryon, to question the Sponsor. Representative Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Currie: Amendment is similar to one we considered in the Fall Veto Session. Some time ago, we created subcircuit judges in Will and McHenry and Lake Counties and there was some confusion on the part of the State Board of Elections as to whether we intended to increase the total number of judges in those... in those circuits. The answer was, we had not. But what this Amendment would do would be to clarify that in Lake County we will, in fact, create one new judge that we did not intend to create with the earlier legislation. Also the same in McHenry Country, but clarifying that we're reducing from two... two to one the number of additional circuit judges. And then finally, in Will County we are speeding up the point at which the fourth subcircuit assignment can be filled. And then when that... when the next vacancy occurs after that that will mean that there is not therein, thereby created an additional judgeship in Will County. So, that's what the nature of this is. Similar to what we voted on in the fall except that there are some goodies here for people who live in Lake County and McHenry County, and that is that, in fact, they will get ... each of those circuits will get one new judge. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Tryon, did you wish to ask questions of the Lady?"

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

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

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

Tryon: "Will she yield? Okay. Leader Currie, I have a... I have a question that relates to the election cycle that we're currently in. And the election cycle, in my opinion, could be started when somebody files for a position or when somebody... like the State Board of Elections takes an active role in certifying the ballots or even certifying the positions. Have those positions been certified by the State Board of Elections?"

Currie: "You know, I believe they have. But the reality is that they weren't supposed to because the legislation that created the subcircuits did not, in our view, expand the number of judgeships."

Tryon: "Well, when we voted on that legislation, a judicial note and a fiscal note was filed. And that... this legislation was Senate Bill 75 that was done in the 93rd General Assembly. And that fiscal note actually outlined what McHenry County and Lake County would receive in the way of judges and the cost of that."

Currie: "And we missed that, Representative, and we should certainly have... have seen that and that should've alerted us that maybe some clarifying legislation would be appropriate. But we still think, reading that Bill, that that was an inappropriate... erroneous interpretation."

Tryon: "Okay. But that... that... the language that was clarified in the judicial note, which I will briefly state for you, created the at large circuit judges to be two in McHenry County and three additional ones in Lake, correct?"

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Currie: "Yes."
- Tryon: "All right. And that put Lake and McHenry County on equal status with all other counties that met that population threshold, is that not correct?"
- Currie: "Ya know, the population still varied to a degree across all the circuits in the state."
- Tryon: "Well... well, it specifically says that in Mc... for in the 22nd Judicial Circuit, it would be a circuit with a population of over 270 thousand. And the law specifically states that in... in full circuit counties where the population exceeds 270 thousand in population, these would be the number of judges those full circuits would receive. Is that not correct?"
- Currie: "Well, when it became a county circuit then I think the numbers work. But they didn't necessarily work when it was combined with other counties."
- Tryon: "That's correct. So, once the division was created by the operation of the law that was passed by the General Assembly, the county... as stated in the fiscal note, McHenry County and Lake County were entitled to the additional judges, correct?"
- Currie: "No. The whole point that I'm making is that the legislation that we adopted did not intend to create new judgeships."
- Tryon: "That... that legislation that created the new judges was in place long before we adopted this legislation, correct?"
- Currie: "Right. But those divisions should not have been triggered by virtue of the passage of the law that created the subcircuits."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

- Tryon: "Yeah, but the... but the law that created the additional judges was... was done in 1993, which separated the two counties into full circuits."
- Currie: "Yes."
- Tryon: "That's correct. And that... that operation of that law created the additional judgeships that you're trying to undo now."
- Currie: "But we did not intend to nor do we believe our language triggered the operation of the 1993 law, therein lies the dispute. And the point of this measure is to... to not do exactly what we intended to do and what we thought we did and still think we did in that legislation creating the subcircuits... in fact, we are going to give an additional judge to Lake, an additional judge to McHenry. So we compromised with ourself. You oughta be grateful and you oughta vote 'yes'."
- Tryon: "But we... if we did nothing, my county would be getting two judges, correct? If we don't take any action today?"
- Currie: "Yes. But that would, I think, violate what was then the will of the General Assembly when the subcircuits were created."
- Tryon: "That it would... it would, in fact, if we did nothing today and they got the additional two judges, put McHenry and Lake County on equal footing with all other... with all other circuit courts of that size population, correct?"
- Currie: "You know, I really can't answer because the last time I looked at the map there were such variations in populations from one circuit to the next that I don't think you could say that 'x' population triggers 'y' numbers of judges."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Tryon: "Well, it... it actually is very specific le..."

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

you bring your remarks to a close?"

Tryon: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Amendment."

To the Bill. I believe that... that one of the Tryon: "Okay. things that separates us is our ability to... to have an election process that isn't interfered in. And if it... if the State Board of Elections has certified these positions and it is compliant with the ... with the law to ... to equally treat all circuit courts the same, I think we should allow that to happen. I don't think the operation of the law should be interfered with during the middle of the election cycle. There's no precedent for this, not only in Illinois but in any other... in any other state in the country. I mean, the General Assembly can create the... the positions but there's... but the General Assembly can't decide it's not gonna hold the election while the election process is going It would be similar to saying we're gonna have an election for State Representative in all districts except one district. And we... and we can't do that and we shouldn't do that. And I don't think it's right and that's why I oppose this Bill. I'm thankful for the consideration for one judge, but I believe that we should be treated equal under the law with all other counties and full circuits. And therefore, I would have to opposed to this. And I would like to ask for a Roll Call after this debate is finished. Thank you."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Under the rules of debating Amendments, we're provided that two can speak in favor and two can speak against. Representative Tryon has spoken in opposition. Representative Osmond, you're recognized in opposition?"

Osmond: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

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

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

Osmond: "Representative Currie, how is it determined how many judges are needed in a... in a circuit to represent the citizens of that circuit?"

Currie: "First of all, it's the Legislature that determines how many judges in a circuit and it depends on what the legislation says. There are some population guidelines, but as I say, they are not... it's not like... not as... for example, in the House of Representative each of us represents about a hundred and five thousand people."

Osmond: "So you're saying the population doesn't have a play in this?"

Currie: "Of course it plays a role. My point is... two points. First, the Legislature establishes the number of judges for each circuit. And second, population is not the sole criterion."

Osmond: "At the beginning of the subcircuit Bill it was determined that the judges should be elected from smaller areas to allow minorities to be able to run for judgeships. Maps were drawn and redrawn to accomplish this task. When the subcircuit Bill was finalized, it was noted that more full circuit judgeships would be possible. In fact, two

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

days before the vote was taken a fiscal note was presented to the Sponsor at that time and it was noted that five more judges were made for this... or openings were available for this because of the division of the one circuit into two. How does Lake County caseload compare with other counties across the state?"

- Currie: "Yeah. It... I don't have a map in front of me. Again, I would reiterate that population alone does not determine the number of judges. And again, the whole point of that earlier legislation was not to create new judgeships, but make some of the judges run in districts so as to ensure they would be more responsive to the people and might give minorities and other groups a greater opportunity for electoral success."
- Osmond: "I just want... I just want to clarify something about the caseload. This particular draft... a draft that's given to me was from the Administration Office of the Illinois Courts. It shows that Lake County 2004 has the highest caseload in the entire state, 8,322 cases per judge. Cook County has 4,777 case... cases. The state average is 4,936. Downstate is 5,076. If... if this Bill goes through today, it is saying that the Members of this Illinois General Assembly voted to deny the first African-American associate judge to run on the ballot for a full circuit judgeship. The judge is running in seat 'C'."
- Currie: "Well, of course, we don't believe there is a 'C', we don't believe there was a 'C'. I'm sorry to learn that the citizens of Lake County are as litigious as you tell me they are. And if, in fact, there is a need for additional

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

judges, we will consider that in a separate Bill. Again, I remind you that under this measure, unlike the one we voted on in the Fall Veto Session, there will, in fact, be a new judge in Lake."

Osmond: "If the Members of the Illinois General Assembly today vote 'yes', they are saying that Lake County residents are second class to all other counties. They're not letting them have the access to the court systems. You are giving us one judge; we are entitled to three. We're asking that you reconsider this and allow not to have this passed today. I'm asking for a 'no' vote and... and I need to have this verified, please."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Now, we have had two speak in opposition, one in favor. The rules provide for one additional supporter. Representative Franks, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm gonna speak to the Bill. I worked on the original Bill to create the new district, the 22nd District in McHenry County which split off from the 19th District in Lake County. The reason we put together that... why we passed that law was so that McHenry County could have its own circuit. McHenry and Lake had been joined, and Lake being twice the size of McHenry County, the voters in Lake would be the ones who would determine who were the judges in McHenry County, and that didn't really equate for one person, one vote. So what we did is we split it up so the folks in Lake County could vote on their own judges and elect their judges and the folks in McHenry County would be able to do the same. Because if you

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

were gonna run for a circuit judgeship in the former 19th Judicial Circuit, you had almost a million people you had to reach out to. It was very costly, prohibitive for people to do it unless you were really well-connected. This gives real people the ability to become a judge. And not whether it's Democrat or Republican, that certainly wasn't our intention. Our intention was to bring it closer to the people. And at the time we passed that Bill, there was extensive testimony that that Bill was created only to allow a new district and not to create any additional judges. knew that there was some question because of a fiscal note that there was a claim that there could be additional judges, that they could be asked for. But this is not a right and this is not an entitlement. What I believe happened is we ran out of time to fix the problem because we hadn't considered it when we first drafted the Bill. because of our inartful drafting, we find ourself in this Now, knowing that we were not entitled and position. knowing that we were not intended to get additional judges, I think this is a very sound compromise. McHenry County will get an additional judge, as will Lake County. does not preclude the fact that we now are gonna come back again and ask for more judges. And I wanna put that Bill in with Representative Osmond and Representative Tryon and let's work together to get more judges next year. But right now, we oughta be looking at this as a real gift, that we've done well by our constituents to get additional judges that were not intended and that are not entitled. So that's why I'm voting for this Bill, because we're getting additional

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

judges, we're helping people get access to the courts. Obviously, I agree with what Representative Osmond said. We need more judges, there's no doubt about it. I practice in McHenry County and sometimes I cannot get on the docket for over a month. This will help alleviate that. Next year, I'm coming with a Bill with you all from our McHenry and Lake Counties asking for those additional judges. Right now, this is a good start. And that's why I'm standing in support of it and I ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I think Representative Franks made..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, we should... Representative Currie.

Representative Myers (sic-Meyer), we have two in favor and two have spoken in opposition. So... Okay."

Meyer: "...the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you. Representative Osmond asked for a verification. You did not recognize that you heard for that... heard that. I'm asking that..."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah. We will grant you a verification, Representative."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes. Okay. Representative Currie."

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

Representative Franks made an eloquent closing on this Bill.

Not an entitlement, not an intention. In fact, two additional judges: one for Lake and one for McHenry. Let us respect the intent of the original legislation. I would

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

point out that the provisions in this Bill are severable. That is, if some fall then there will be no additional judges in either Will or in McHenry. I appreciate your attention to this interesting discourse and I would appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "So, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' 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. Now, this requires more 'yes' votes than 'no' votes. Representative Osmond, do you still wish to verify? Okay, so the Lady withdraws her request for a verification. And there are 62 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

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

Everything we talked about a minute ago at the Amendment stage is exactly what's in this Bill on Third Reading. So, I think we all know what it is. I would appreciate your 'aye' votes. If there are new questions I'll answer them, but I don't think we even need to explain it one more time."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Lady... the Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1681. And on that question, the Gentleman

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

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

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

Sullivan: "Representative, I was unable to talk the last time around because we were only allowed two in response, so that's why I'm coming to you now. Last year, in Senate Bill 75, in addition to subcircuits in Lake and McHenry County you also made subcircuits in Will County. Is that correct?" Currie: "Yes, we did."

Sullivan: "In that Bill last year, in regards to Will County I'm talking about, wasn't there language specifically reducing the number of judges for Will County? Is that correct?"

Currie: "We didn't reduce judges in Will County. What we did was to specify that there will be five subcircuits and we established how they would be... when the... those judgeships would turn into sub... subcircuit positions. And what this legislation does, actually, is speed up the time that one of... at which one of them goes into effect, which means that temporarily Will, too, will have an additional judge."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, it's your belief that we did not reduce judges in Will County, then?"

Currie: "Right."

Sullivan: "Okay. Okay. So, your intent... you said the intent was... Okay. To kinda... I think it's our belief that there... there were judges reduced in Will County. But... but that's okay. Thank you for your questions. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Sullivan: "One of the rights that we have as Americans is due process under the law. Unfortunately, under this Bill, if

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

you live in Lake County or McHenry County you are no longer gonna have due process under the law. Earlier, one of the Representatives on my side of the aisle talked about caseloads. But ya know what? In Lake County we have 82 hundred cases per judge. The state average is 49 hundred. How can you have due process under the law with that type of caseload? This is not a fair Bill for our counties, it's not a fair Bill for the people that we represent. And I wanna put one thought in your mind. The more you work, the more chances there are for mistakes. God forbid someone goes free because our judges are overworked. And I'll tell ya another thing. God forbid somebody goes to jail because our judge is overworked. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tryon."

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

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

Tryon: "I would like to speak to the Bill. And I... I will tell you that I believe specifically we have regretted passing se... special legislation in the past. I think those of you who have been here longer than I can remember the county option motor fuel tax where we passed a law specifically for Lake, Kane, and McHenry Counties and DuPage Counties. It was challenged in court because it was special legislation, it had problems. This is special legislation that is treating the 19th and 22nd Judicial Circuits differently than any other circuit in the state. We are not being held to an equal status of the other circuits. The question is, do we need the judges? We do need the judges; we have the

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

highest caseloads in the state. The second question is: the election cycle has started, should we interfere with the election cycle? I submit to you that we should not interfere with an election cycle. I do not believe that we even have the authority to interfere with the election cycle once the election cycle has started. There's a separation of powers between the Executive Branch and the Legislative The State Board of Elections is part of the Branch. Executive Branch. We have sent them communications telling them we intend to change the law and we ask that they not certify these positions. This is purely a political division and I oppose this. I believe that we should treat all of the circuit courts in this state equal. We all need fair elections. We all need equal access to our judicial courts. That's what this Bill is doing, it's giving us less than an equal standing in Lake and McHenry County. And I ask for your 'no' vote. And I would also ask for a verification of this vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, Represent... So, there's been a request for a verification. No further... Okay. Representative Beaubien. You just made the cut."

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

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

Beaubien: "I'd just like to make a statistical observation, and this is from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. If the Cook County judges had as many cases as the Lake and McHenry County judges have, you could eliminate a hundred and sixty-two judges and save \$24 million. These

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

are the records of the Illi... Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. And I would suggest to my friends from... from Cook that... and particularly the City of Chicago, they may wanna have these boys work a little bit harder... and ladies."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Currie is recognized to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is straightforward. There's nothing special about this legislation. We treat circuits differently in the statutes in many different arenas. And remember, this is corrective legislation. We do that all the time. Sometimes there are drafting errors or ... or different interpretations of what language actually means. This is our effort to something that we thought was fixed to begin with. State Board of Elections didn't agree. The State Board of Elections is wrong, nobody is being denied anything that they are entitled to. No one is being denied any kind of due or fair process. Help us fix things, help us support... And again, a reminder that the legislation is severable, which means that should some part fall then the two additional judges will not be created in Will and in Lake. In fact, no additional judges anywhere. So, I'd appreciate your 'yes' vote for Senate Bill 1681."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1681. And 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? Representative

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Ramey and Soto, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Okay, there's been a request for a verification. I'd ask that the staff... I'd ask that the staff retire to the rear of the chamber and that the Members please be in their seats. Representative Tryon has requested a verification. So, Mr. Clerk, would you please read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Tryon, do you have any challenges to those voting in the affirmative?"

Tryon: "No challenge."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, is House Bill 4173. Representative Fritchey, do you wish to have this called on Third? Okay. Out of the record. Representative Cross on House Bill 4217? Okay.

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Representative Hassert will handle this Bill. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4217, a Bill for an Act concerning libraries. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hassert."

Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 4217 clarifies the library district annexation ability and validates all previous annexations in response to a public court case. I'll be happy to try 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. Mr. Clerk, 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 91 voting 'yes' and 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rep... Representative Beaubien on 4317? Do you wish us to call that Bill on Third? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4317, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Wauconda Fire District who wishes to create a local firefighter pension. It'll be their pension administered by them, it'll be under the downstate pension sam rules. This

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Bill had no opposition and is supported by all Members of the Fire Caucus. There's absolutely no cost to the State of Illinois. This is their money, their credits. Will not affect the state budget one… one iota. I urge its passage. Thank you very much."

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 who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 'no'. And this Bill, having voting received a Majority, is Constitutional hereby declared passed. Representative Watson, do you wish us to call... Okay. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 4349."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4349, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4349 makes a change to the Illinois Municipal Gas Agency Code and allows out-of-state communities which purchase gas from an IMGA member to have a voice in the operation of that agency. I'd be more than happy to take any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 4349. 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

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

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 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jakobsson. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 4359."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4359, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4359 requires Jakobsson: that any payments currently being made from the General Revenue Fund from... to the Champaign Park District for museum purposes be transferred to the Urbana Park District. Currently, the Illinois Ra... Horse Racing Act allows a percentage of pari-mutuel handle taxes paid by off-track betting facilities to go to park districts if the park district has a museum. The Champaign Park District currently receives money from the local OTB in accordance with this Act. However, the OTB, currently located in Champaign, is moving to Urbana and the Urbana Park District believes that this statute will not allow for a transfer of the payments even though the park district does have a So, the Urbana Park District feels that special museum. legislation is needed, which it is, to allow them to receive the distributions that the Champaign Park District has been getting. The proposed legislation is modeled on a previous Bill that was passed for the Peoria Park District, which was

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

in a similar situation when an OTB closed there and then later reopened. I urge an 'aye' vote, please."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 4359. This is on Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, this... this cannot or will not be construed as an expansion of gambling, will it?"

Jakobsson: "Absolutely not."

Black: "All right. Rather than delay the time of the Body, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. As one of the original Sponsors of this kind of shared revenue legislation, I stand in support of the Bill. The Sponsor has been very honest and straightforward. The law is very clear. The... the proceeds of the OTB... a portion of the proceeds go to the park district or a conservation district, in my case in Vermilion County, in which the OTB is located. And since the OTB in the Sponsor's district changed locations, the park district is no longer the same. And so, she simply has to bring State Law into compliance. That money generated by the OTB now located in Urbana should, in fact, go to the Urbana Park District. It's a rather straightforward Bill. I commend the Sponsor on her dil... due diligence and I expect all of us to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you."

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is simply... the OTB location in question simply moved about a mile and a half to the east and across city boundary line from Champaign into Urbana. This is consistent with the original underlying intent of the Bill and I thank the Sponsor for bringing this before us. So, I would urge everyone to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

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... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes' and 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie. Representative Currie, you're recognized on House Resolution 824."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House... Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. In 2003 and 2005, the Legislature adopted strong standards to protect individuals and communities from the blight of predatory lending. We prohibited certain kinds of illicit practices and we're trying to continue to protect individuals who through no fault of their own find themselves on the brink of losing their homes and then we find whole communities that are blighted because homes are boarded up and people are in trouble. Unfortunately in the Federal Congress, legislation is pending that would take away our right to protect our citizens in this arena. House Resolution 1295

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

would overrule, would preempt this Legislature's ability to do a job for our people. This Resolution calls upon the Members of our delegation to resist any legislation in Congress that would undercut the laws that we have passed and undercut our ability further to protect the vulnerable, the elderly, the non-English speaking individuals who have become victims of predatory practices. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I hope you will join me in standing up for our rights as Legislators and our... our vulnerable populations to protect against these practices."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 824. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Thank you. Representative, I'm... all of us here are... are in support of the concept of... anything that... that smacks of predatory lending to our citizens. But what is the catalyst for this? Is there... had somebody told you that there is a Bill in Congress right now that... to water down the good Bill that we passed here?"

Currie: "Indeed... yeah, indeed, House Resolution 1295, as we read it, should the Federal Legislature adopt this measure, we would not be able to act further in this arena and some of the protections we have already established in statute would be overridden by the federal action. For example, our prohibitions against equity stripping, we have a variety of rights and remedies that are available under our statutes.

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

If the Federal Government were to pass HR 1295, that would preempt our existing legislation and our further efforts to protect these vulnerable populations."

- Parke: "Okay. Well, I think the legislation we passed here in Illinois is a... is a good model for the rest of the nation.

 And I rise in support of the Lady's Resolution."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, is House Joint Resolution 73, Representative Brauer."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution recognizes January as the Blood Donor Month. Once every 3 seconds people need blood in this country. The thing a lot of people don't realize is that every 42 days that's the length of the shelf life of blood. So, it's important that we give blood. Only 5 percent of the population does it now. There's no reason to wait 'til a tragedy like 9/11. This is to encourage people to... to go ahead and give blood. mind. Good information. This is the Pearl Harbor Highway Memorial. And... and you need to give the blood back. This recognizes a spot of... of Route 66 between Lincoln and Springfield for the people that fought in Pearl Harbor, for the people that gave the ultimate sacrifice at Pearl Harbor. This recognizes what they've done for us. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Joint Resolution 73. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open.

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

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 Resolution is adopted. Representative Bellock on House Joint Resolution 83. Representative Bellock, would you like us to adopt this House..."

- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the Rural Health Care
 Task Force is a very important initiative that we started
 last year. And what this does is it... it extends the
 reporting dates since the Resolution that we originally
 filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 83. Is there any discussion? Then 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 Tryon, do you wish to be recorded on your seatmate's important Resolution? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Brauer, we have House Resolution 796. The Members are clamoring for you to call it. So, please, please..."
- Brauer: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think enough said on this Resolution already. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 796 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 5 of the Calendar, we have... we have several Motions in writing to table Bills. Representative Black, you have a Motion to

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Table House Bill 4113. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to Table House Bill 4113 say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the Bill is tabled. Representative Moffitt, you have a Motion to Table House Bill 4424 and 4459. Is that correct? Okay. you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted and the Bills are tabled. Representative Monique Davis has filed a Motion in writing to table House Bill 4409, 4723, 4140, 4142. You heard the Lady's Motion. there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the Bills are tabled. And Representative Ramey, you have a Motion in writing to table House Bill 4318. You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the Bill is tabled. The Chair is prepared to adjourn. Are there any announcements? Representative Schock."

Schock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a moment of personal privilege. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, up in the gallery with us today, if you'll stand up guests in the gallery. I have 30 residents from my district who are down here today visiting the Capitol and taking a tour of the Lincoln Presidential Museum. So, if you'd give them a hearty welcome to the State Capitol, I'd appreciate it. Welcome."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 846, offered by Representative Krause. House Resolution 847,

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

offered by Representative Krause. House Resolution 848, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 850, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 853, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there any announcements, any further announcements? So, Representative Currie moves that allowing for... for perfunctory time, that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, January 26 at the hour of 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Mahoney: "House... House Perfunctory will come to order. Referred to House Committee on Rules is Senate Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative Madigan. Committee Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Reports. Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4197, House Bill 4334; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4449; 'recommends be adopted' House Joint Resolution 74, House Joint Resolution 76, House Resolution 711, House Resolution 722, House Resolution 765, and House Resolution 806. Representative Mendoza, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25,

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

back with 2006, reported the same the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4147. Representative McKeon, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 25, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4453, and House Bill 4525. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 5255, offered by Representative Joyce, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5256, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5257, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5258, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5259, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning organ House Bill 5260, offered by Representative donation. Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 5261, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 5262, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning 5263, offered by Representative House Bill revenue. Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5264, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5265, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 5266, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5267, offered by Representative

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 5268, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. Bill 5269, offered House Representative Coulson, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5270, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Bill 5271, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5272, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 5273, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal history records checks. House Bill 5274, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5275, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5276, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 5277, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning public safety. House Bill 5278, offered by Representative Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5279, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5280, offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act House Bill 5281, offered by concerning elections. Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5282, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 5283, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning municipalities. House Bill 5284, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning safety.

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

House Bill 5285, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5286, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5287, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 5288, offered by Representative Mendoza, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 5289, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 5290, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 5291, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5292, offered by Representative Hamos, a Bill for an concerning State Government. House Bill 5293, offered by Representative Ramey, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 5294, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 5295, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 5296, offered by Representative finance. Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5297, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 5298, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5299, offered by Representative John Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning businesses. House Bill 5300, offered by Representative Mulligan, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 5301, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 5302, offered by Representative Mendoza, a Bill

82nd Legislative Day

1/25/2006

for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 5303, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. House Bill 5304, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 5305, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for House Bill 5306, an Act concerning local government. offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 5307, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5308, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5309, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 5310, offered by Representative Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 5311, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 5312, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 5313, offered by Representative Daniels, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5314, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."