86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. The Members will please be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Louis Barnes with St. Anne Woods Community Chapel in Hopkins Park. Reverend Barnes is the guest of Representative Dugan."

Reverend Barnes: "Let us all bow our heads. Father God, in the name of Jesus, we come today, we stand before You, because we know that You are the Creator of heaven and Earth. And we thank You for allowing us the opportunity to assemble ourselves here together and we pray that You will let Your spirit be in our midst today. And whatever the choices to be made for humanity, we pray, that You'll be there and guide our minds, our spirits, that we might be able to do what You have to do for Your people. We thank You for all the Representatives here. Thank You for everyone that's under the sound of Your voice. And we're countin' on You, Dear God, to look on this Assembly, touch every heart that's here today, every mind, every spirit. Give them to know that You are the only true God, that You sit high, You look low, Your eyes is in every place. Beholdin' the evil and the good and we come now to say thank You. We thank You for this opportunity just to say... just to say thank You. And we pray that You'll continue to bless our service here today, bless whatever we undertake to do, and we'll be careful to give You the glory. We'll honor You and we'll praise You.

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

- In Jesus name we pray and all of God's people said, amen. Thank You, Lord."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin, will you lead us in the Pledge today?"
- Dunkin 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 Molaro and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Durkin is excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 113

 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr.

 Clerk, read your Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Referred to the House Committee on Rules are House Resolution 864, offered by Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 866, offered by Representative Tryon. House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 91, offered by Richard Bradley. House Joint Resolution 92, offered by Representative Moffitt."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading... we'll go right down the list. House Bill 1295, Representative Froehlich. Out of the record. House Bill 2414, Representative Acevedo. Out of the record. Representative Flowers on House Bill 4125. Out

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

of the record. Representative Fritchey, you have House Bill 4173. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Schmitz on 4197. Out of the record. Representative Franks, 4205. Out of the record. Representative Rose on House Bill 4300. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Flowers on 4306. Out of the record. Representative Pritchard, you have House Bill 4322. Out of the record. Representative Reis on House Bill... Okay. Out of the record. Representative Burke. Representative Burke. Okay. Out of the Representative Lang. Out of the record. Representative Wait, you have House Bill 4398. Representative Ron Wait. Out of the record. Representative Bost, House Bill 4444. Out of the record. Representative Sacia, House Bill 4521's out of the record. Representative Phelps on House Bill 4525. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4525 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. However, a fiscal note and a state debt impact note have been requested and not yet filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Oh... okay. So, that'll stay on Second Reading.

 Representative Phelps, you have House Bill 4532. Mr. Clerk,
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4532, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 4561. Out of the record. Representative Mendoza on 4607. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4607, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Okay. So, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."
- Black: "This seems like an... an opportune time to ask the Chair, since we're on Second Reading, there are a couple of things, perhaps, you could illuminate my concern about. I filed a Bill on the 29th of December that would eliminate for 90 days the sales tax on natural gas. And that was one of my priority Bills that, unfortunately, will not get out of Rules. But then I see House Bill 4764, filed on January 18, with Speaker Madigan and all Democrats as cosponsors, not only out of Rules but assigned to the Revenue Committee. Could you enlighten me as to what was wrong with my Bill when an identical Bill, filed a month later, is going through the... the process. I... I don't understand that. Maybe you could tell me what happened."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the Speaker, I'm sure, would be happy to have you as a cosponsor on his Bill."
- Black: "That's very nice, but ya know, if we're gonna go back to the th... way things were in the late '80s, when hijacking of Bills become commonplace, just let us know. I mean, I... ya know, first of all, since my Bill has been stolen, one I've worked on off and on for about 6 years, imitation is the

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

most sincere form of flattery. I'm glad that you found my idea worthwhile, but I... I just don't understand. I mean, what... what benefit is there to hijack Member Bills that have lower numbers, filed before yours... I... I don't understand this. So, ya know, I... I appreciate your opportunity to let me be a cosponsor on a Bill that I sponsored, filed long before the Democrat Bill was sponsored. And now your Bill, the Democrat Bill, moves through the process, my Bill stays in the Rules Committee. I understand the Rule of 60. I understand you have the Majority, but I don't think this is the right way to do business. If we're going back to the really hard partisan days of the late '80s, sobeit, but just give me a little warning, will ya, so I can be prepared."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes."

Stephens: "Ya know, sometimes Representative Black stands up and talks about issues that are only... only affect him in a personal manner or maybe theoretically, maybe public policywise and some of the rest of us may not have as much interest in it as Representative Black does. But Members of both sides of the aisle should have a great deal of interest in the subject matter that he just brought up. Yes, when we file a Bill and you copy it and you decide that, ya know what, we're gonna cooperate with you. We're gonna steal your idea, but the Speaker says, ya know what, you can cosponsor the Bill with us. It reminds me of the late '80s, when this place was run with a hammer and Members on both

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

sides of the aisle, who happened to disagree with the Speaker or with the general policy of the House Democrats, you were toast. Your ideas will be bottled up in the Rules If it was a worthy idea, somebody's name, Committee. probably one of the targets on your side of the aisle, someone who was facing a difficult election, be he a senior Member or a new one, would get that idea. Democrat ideas can be stolen just like Republican ideas. It is a shame that this Speaker has decided to hold Bills in Rules Committee while Bills that have been copied, almost verbatim, are introduced by Members later and then you take credit for it. Bill called it a... Representative Black said it was a sincere... that it was a form of flattery, imitating our legislation. I'm not... I don't... I'm not so kind. think it's thievery and I think it's only for the worst just for short-term political gain. reasons, few of the issues that we know that you have hijacked from Members on our side of the aisle: senior citizens asetment... assessment freeze proposal, additional funding for LIHEAP, a needed relief from the high natural gas costs this winter. These are all initiatives that Members on my side of the aisle have been working on, in some cases for years, but stayed bottled up in the Rules Committee. And we can only assume at the time that when they were filed that you didn't like the proposals. When the Speaker keeps something in Rules, we think that that's probably not political. We, in... in good faith, think that the Speaker must not like the idea. He's using his ability as the... as the... the Chair of the entire House to hold the Bill in Rules. Well, that's

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

his prerogative. He doesn't like our idea, but lo and behold, just months later, sometimes only a day later, a Democrat on... files the legislation, no reference to the Bill that the Speaker held up in Rules Committee. Let me just give you a couple of more examples. All the way back in October, October of 2005, Representative Schmitz filed legislation to devote a portion of the unanticipated mor... motor vehicle sales tax windfall to our LIHEAP program. Thinking ahead of the curve, Representative Schmitz, as he often does, filed great legislation that the Speaker held in Rules Committee. This would have helped senior citizens and low-income families with... with the high cost of staying warm this winter, but it's still in the Rules Committee. Except, until last week, Representative Colvin had a Bill, it was... where Representative Schmitz's language was attached to his Bill, Representative Colvin's Bill, and lo and behold that Bill passed the General Assembly. Representative Schmitz's Bill is still in Rules Committee. On November 3 of last year, Representative Moffitt, another forward-thinking Legislator, introduced House Bill 4185 to offer consumers a tax credit for purchasing an ethanol-powered vehicle. Nearly two months later on January 18, the Governor proposed a \$500 tax credit in his... in his state and the state of the very nex... and the very next day Representative Washington filed similar legislation. Mr. Speaker, again, we may be flattered by your imitation, but we'd rather see you get ... let our ideas get a fair treatment. We don't believe that the Speaker of the House of Representatives should use his pulpit to badger Republicans who are just trying to further

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

ideas that we think are important to the people of Illinois. Shame on the Speaker for holding tax relief Bills, tax credit Bills, LIHEAP Bills, and others hostage. Bills that could have been passed as much as four months ago, but now are just being held... and just guess what. Whether you... your candidate has a primary or whether they face a tough General Election, we all see and the press is aware that these Bills are being directed for political gain, not for the good of the people of Illinois. We object strongly."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And while I understand that we're not actually engaging in debate over any particular piece of legislation, I would like to inquire of the Chair why we indulge in such political mumbo jumbo and are tolerating and allowing people to use words like 'hijacking' and 'thievery' when we talk about legislation, particularly when the facts are skewed. And I'd like to straighten out a couple points that were just made where my name was mentioned in a particular piece of legislation that I passed last week. I assume that the Representative is talking about House Bill 1744 with regard to LIHEAP legislation. Well, I would beg to differ in terms of hijacking legislation. Unlike the Bills that Representative Schock and Representative Schmitz filed in October of 2005, the original LIHEAP Bill that I filed in January of 2005, House Bill 644... 466, excuse me, House Bill 466, clearly highlights the same piece of legislation that I passed last week. think it's reckless and all this political mumbo jumbo that's being bantered about by certain Members of the

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Republican side crying about Bills not being called. This is a piece of legislation that I passed over a year ago and I would appreciate, political grandstanding notwithstanding, that if you make such claims that you at least check and verify your facts before you start pontificating about when a Bill was filed, before whose Bill was filed, and in... to all that regard. So, Mr. Speaker, if it indulges the Chair that I would simply ask that some of our colleagues practice just a little bit more discretion when they're using words, very strong words, like 'thievery' and 'hijacking'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address the same issue."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've only had the Sacia: privilege of being a State Representative for 3 years, and in that same 3-year time frame I have had the privilege of writing a weekly newspaper article of which 14 of my venues publish. I think the reason they do publish it is I stay very, very nonpartisan. I will say with the information that came to light this morning... and I'm not gonna use any of the terms that the previous speaker just utilized, but when you go down through and you look, what immediately comes to mind is a wonderful book that's out there known as Speaker, and it's written by Dennis Hastert, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. And he talks of his many years in the Illinois House of Representatives and the camaraderie he shared on both sides of the aisle. have echoed that ever since I have been here and I have applauded that working relationship which works so well

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

across the aisle. I will say, with what this appears to have happened in the past several months, the past month perhaps, has really been a disappointment to so many people to see Bills from one side of the aisle move when identical legislation filed earlier from the other side of the aisle has not moved. I think Speaker Hastert would be embarrassed. I personally am very disappointed. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

"Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Not to... to belay what it is that we're talking about here, but from the other side of the aisle they chose that we shouldn't use the term 'hijacking'. All right. maybe we should use the term 'Bill borrowing for bettering their political chances'. Well, that is true. speaker... one person on the other side of the aisle said you're gonna give it back, so obviously you're not giving it back. Now, if someone wants us to give facts, how about on December 14 of last year Representative Hassert filed a Bill, 4249, to reenact the senior assessment freezes that were thrown out after violat... they were ruled by the courts to violate the same... single subject rules. He filed a follow-up piece of legislation on December 21. In fact, at that time, Representative Bill Black had even legislation addressing the issue during the 93rd General Assembly. All of these Bills have been stalled in Rules. But just last week, fact, January 18, Representative Flider filed nearly identical legislation under his name and that measure has already passed out of Rules and has been passed

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

to the Revenue Committee. Amazing, isn't it? On a Bill that Bill Mitchell has, House Bill 5371, which I'm a cosponsor... because that's what we normally do. If someone comes up with an idea, the idea is that... that if you agree with that idea, you wanna support that idea and you wanna work with that idea, you've got all the spots for hyphenated cosponsor or Sponsor. The whole Legislature can sign on and say, 'Okay, I agree with that', and then become a Sponsor of that legislation. But no, no, no. We want... we wanna go ahead and... and turn a Bill like that over and... and let Representative... at this time, let me see, on that Bill we had several Members of the Democrat side of the aisle form a similar Bill. And not only that, the Governor's touting that now, giving no recognition to the Sponsor who had the Bill first. On another issue, the woodland issue that we're trying to deal with that is so important to us in the south: myself, Roger Eddy, Representative Stephens, David Reis, all of these people were working on this issue. Again, however, the legislation that was filed by our Members laid in Rules and then, all of a sudden, Representative Granberg's Bill moves forward. Ya know, I came into this General Assembly in 1995 and the Republicans took charge. They... and we got a lot of complaints that said, 'Oh, you're... you're treating us so terrible.' But the reality is that prior to that, the Speaker had treated this side of the aisle in a fashion that would not allow them to ad... advance things for their district, to take credit for their own ideas, and we had got away from that because it was the new Speaker, everything was gonna be straightened out. Well, now after this many

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

years, guess what, we're sliding right back into the same thing. Ladies and Gentlemen, from your side of the aisle, you need to pay attention to what's happening because it needs to be... if it's gonna work in a bipartisan effort, it can't be done this way. You've got to work with us. You've gotta allow us to carry our Bills. You need to speak up to your Leadership and tell them. And everybody smiles and go, 'Oh, oh, this is politics. Ha, ha.' Folks, me working for my constituents is just as hard... just as important as you working for yours. And you oughta be ashamed of what's going on. And ya oughta stand up with us on this side of the aisle and say to your Members and to your Leadership that if it's the idea of a particular Legislator, it shouldn't matter what Party he's from. And that person should be able to carry that Bill, united with both Parties, to advance a cause that's better for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "A point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."

Dugan: "Yes. I just wanted to say, of course, that all the Members gave Reverend Barnes such a nice welcome and he did such a wonderful invocation, but I also wanted to introduce with Reverend Barnes is a very special person, his wife, Juanita Barnes. So, if everyone could welcome Juanita. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise as a point of personal privilege. I've been here for quite a while, and in the old days this was a... taking Members' Bills by the

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Majority Party was a... not uncommon. And for quite a few years, the Speaker had decided that there was certain etiquette of allowing a Member that came up with a good idea to proceed with that good idea on behalf of the people of Illinois to bring it to fruition and then be voting on it up or down. To go back to the old days of simply taking a Member's good idea, killing it in some committee or in Rules, and then allowing, a brief time later, to have a Member of the Majority Party reintroduce the Bill just doesn't seem to be right. It... it... there's something almost morally wrong with that approach and I would ask that the Majority side and the Leader reconsider this approach that really makes it so it's inappropriate in terms of what's just fair and right. So, I would ask that though we are all standing on our side of the aisle to protest this... because it's just sort of repugnant to us that that... this would happen and we would hope that... that when we become in the Majority, whenever that is, that we, ourselves, do not revert to this kind of procedure. If it was inappropriate for the Democratic side, it certainly would be inappropriate on the Republican side. And when we controlled the General Assembly for 2 years, I think we may have done something like this, but that does not make... two wrongs do not make a And I would ask that the Leadership of the Democratic Majority in the House reconsider this approach. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of order. I know you've decided to sit here and just take it because

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

what do we have but to make a few little statements about the Bills we've lost, some of which are important to us. But the fact that nobody listens and nobody in the Body really cares, I think, is much more important. What goes on in this chamber under the guise of noise is a lot of stuff that the people of Illinois oughta pay attention to. If you have no one on your side of the aisle that has better authorship than to take Bills, I'd be surprised. You have a lot of very clever, good Legislators and probably many more staff members that come up with many good ideas. fact of the matter is, you take the Bills, then ya sit there and you'll put up with it for 20 minutes while we harangue. You call no order in this Body to ever hear what anybody says because you know it'll go away under the din. that unconscionable. The fact of the matter is, a lot of stuff is covered up by noise, no one paying attention, and who cares."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could I... could I just have your attention? Geez. Ya know, if... I... I don't be rude to other people; I'd appreciate it if you wouldn't be rude to me. I've got a right to say something and... and folks, please listen. Last... last week... last week, there were several of us from our side of the aisle and several from your side of the aisle that sat down and had a dinner together as impromptu; it wasn't planned. And we said how nice it would be if we could start to get along better. This malaise that is happening at the federal level where the two Parties don't talk to one another is

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

sifting down to this state. It doesn't do anybody any good. I guess nobody really cares, huh? I don't care if you like me for what I'm saying, folks, all I care is that ya try and have some empathy. You're the ruling Party in this state; we don't have the votes to stop ya. But we do have ideas, and when we put our ideas forward we would like to have 'em That's all that we're asking is some fair treatment, some fairness in this. And if you wanna sit down and have dinner with me and say, 'Let's get together', then don't sit here in the House Floor and thumb your nose at me when I have somethin' to say to ya. I'll listen to you. I can go back to when I was first elected here in 1993, it was common practice for Bills to be stolen. I didn't think it was right then; I don't think it's right now. If we allow it... if the people in this Body allow this to happen, then shame on us. And let me tell ya, folks, at some point that pendulum is going to swing back, whether it's this year, whether it's 10 years from now, whether it's 20 years from now. And some of you aren't gonna be here. I know I won't be here in 20 years. But somebody from your side of the aisle will be here and at that time I hope that they're treated with partim with bipartisanship, with fairness, that their ideas are able to be heard. Even last year I had Bills that were let out and they were killed, but I had a chance to bring 'em to a committee. In this case, we have Bills that aren't being let out and then the other side of the aisle is taking that very same Bill and running with it. That's not right. That's not why anybody in this Body came down here. Well, for those of you that listened, thank you.

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

I appreciate it. And I'll try and give you the same courtesy some day when you have something to say that maybe

I don't really wanna hear. But thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."

Rose: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this... this is all about the Golden Rule. Do unto others as you'd have done unto you. When I was a freshman here, I had a methamphetamine Bill that passed out of this chamber and dealt with restitution over in the Senate and, lo and behold, my idea came back here and... and it was then lodged under the name of a Democrat Legislator on the other side of the aisle. difference between then and now is that that... Legislator had the decency to come to me and tell me what was goin' on. I'm a firm believer that you can get a lot done here if you don't care about who gets the credit. But that person came to me and said, 'Hey, this is what's gonna happen.' I said, 'Ya know what, I appreciate you coming to me. Just put me on as a cosponsor.' And I thought that was a nice thing to do. That's a stark, stark contrast to what's goin' on right now. And why is it goin' on? It's pretty simple. The pension systems have been stolen from, the state's fiscal picture's never been bleaker, and unfortunately, the Majority Party is spending all their time trying to look good for next fall. That's all I have, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading... Representative Jefferson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table House Bill 4643."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman would like to table House Bill 2643 (sic-4643). All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Bill is tabled. Representative Feigenholtz, do you wish us to read House Bill 4134? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4134, a Bill for an Act concerning civil liabilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4134 amends the Crime Victims Compensation Act. What it does is expand the definition of 'violent crime' to include hate crimes. It actually is a slight modification based on some cases that have been coming before the Crime Victims Compensation Board. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of 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 is a... this is a good idea."
- Feigenholtz: "Thanks."
- Black: "And it's your idea. It's your idea. Let me just ask you. The only question... Excuse me. The only question that

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

I have, as we add more categories to the Crime Victims Compensation Act, historically, the General Revenue appropriation is not increased, and so one could argue that by adding more categories the amount of money awarded to each claimant would go down. And in case some of us get... I know I have a couple of constituents who are still... who have been waiting for some time for the award from the Crime Victims Compensation Act. So, if they call, what... what will your response be that we've increased the pool of applicants that... claimants that could be eligible for money, but we haven't increased the amount of money. And so, each... each claimant might get less money."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, that is a great question."

Black: "That was my idea, thank you."

Feigenholtz: "That was a great question. It's important for you to realize that, as you said, we're not increasing the... the cap on what we're awarding people. Most of the situations that this bell... Bill addresses are people who are already applying for compensation. And as you know, from the experience that you've had with your constituents who have been victims of crime, there is a relatively high burden of demonstrating loss for these claims and it is, sadly, a long, arduous process. I wish we didn't even have to have this Act, but unfortunately, each of us has constituents who are victims of crime. Some of them are... But what this Bill does is essentially it tweaks the law a little bit so that people who are already filing claims, if they're victims of hate crimes, they are compensated for loss under that."

Black: "So..."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Feigenholtz: "And... and your theory is right. Ya know, essentially, it could cost more and perhaps it does... and theoretically, it could reduce an award to one person, and perhaps we need to take a look at this fund a little more closely. I've been assured by the Attorney General's Office, who informed me this fund is 60 percent federally funded, 40 percent GRF, that they're able to pla... pay all of the claims that come before them."

Black: "Right."

Feigenholtz: "Although, I think it's gettin' pretty tight."

Black: "Representative, I... I thank you for that answer because I, as I said, I do have two constituents of mine that are waiting for an award and I think your answer was... was right on target. And in a spirit of... of trying to be more honest and open with each other, let me say that that question really wasn't my idea, it was our staff's idea from the lovely and talented Kyle Kirts, standing right here, Ladies and Gentlemen. An excellent question."

Feigenholtz: "It was fabulous, simply fabulous."

Black: "We... we both enjoy excellent staff members. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Maybe I failed to make the point earlier. Ideas are good things and they come from both sides of the aisle and many of them come from the people that we represent. And that's what we're all about down here, trying to do the best job of representing people who bring ideas and concerns to us and want them addressed by this Body. And I think in this case, Representative Feigenholtz has done an

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

outstanding job. She's worked up a good Bill, a Bill that's worthy of passage. And I certainly intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, and thank you, Representative Black. I would encourage an 'aye' vote and appreciate it."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jakobsson, do you wish us to read House Bill 4135. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4135, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This House Bill amends the Children and Family Services Act and the Child Care Act of 1969 concerning licensure of direct child welfare service employees of DCFS. It provides that if a direct child welfare service employee licensee is expected to transport a child or children with a motor vehicle in the course of performing his or her duties, that DCFS must verify that the licensee holds a valid driver's license and meets certain other requirements. It requires verification every 2 years and it provides that transporting a child or children with a motor without having a violet... a valid driver's license is

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

grounds for revoking an individual's direct child welfare service employee license."

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

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

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

Black: "Representative, I'm sure I've read this somewhere. Does the Bill also require that they show proof of insurance as well as a valid driver's license?"

Jakobsson: "I'm thinking that that's some of the further requirements. And it meets other… certain other requirements. I can find that out for you."

Black: "The reason I ask it, I didn't see it in the analysis.

And I apologize, I haven't read your Bill. If that is not in there, I would suggest that you see... perhaps seek an Amendment in the Senate that would make sure that they not only have a valid driver's license, but obviously, if they're transporting children, they need to have adequate insurance, for reasons I think you and I both could understand. Would... would you be willing to look into that matter, that they not only hold a valid license but a valid insurance certificate?"

Jakobsson: "I'll look into that. I'm thinking that it is, but I don't wanna guarantee it..."

Black: "All right."

Jakobsson: "...without checking."

Black: "All right. And... and it may be, but I think it should be. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

the Bill. Again, a good idea brought to us by a Member of the Democrat Party. Representative Jakobsson and I share a Senate District. This Bill originated from an investigative article with the <u>Chicago Tribune</u>, and I commend my colleague for putting that investigative report into good legislation, legislation that makes good sense, legislation that we probably should have done some time ago, and another example of how the process can work when we are allowed to move ideas brought to us by either the media or constituents in our district. This is a good Bill and a good Sponsor, and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. As I... as I said, this requires that DCFS workers who are transporting our children should have licenses. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Boland. Out of the record. Representative Flider on House Bill 4147. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4147, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flider."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speakers, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4147 creates the Central Illinois

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Economic Development Authority. And this is legislation that is very similar to the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority legislation that was passed last year, House Bill 690. I was proud to be a cosponsor of that. And the purpose of the Authority is to encourage economic development through the issuance of bonds for economic development purposes, i.e., retaining jobs and bringing good-paying jobs to our area. The Authority would have the opportunity to issue up to \$250 million in bonds, has no taxation power. And this is a... a Bill that is designed to help counties work together for the purposes of economic development. It includes Macon, Sangamon, Menard, Logan, Christian, Bond, DeWitt, and Montgomery Counties. And I would ask for the Body's support."

- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, Representative Eddy is recognized."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Eddy: "Representative, your comments were that the Bill was very similar to the Bill… the legislation that set up the eastern area. Ca… what are the differences between this Bill and that legislation? Are there discernible differences? You used the term 'very similar'."
- Flider: "Well, the only differences are the names of the… the counties in which would be in the Authority… in the name of the Authority. Other than that, it's identical."
- Eddy: "Okay, so the bonding Authority, the fact that at the end of the day, whenever bonds, for example, may not be paid, in

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority the State of Illinois is not on the hook for any of the General Obligation Bonds. You're saying that this is set up the same way and that the state is not responsible for those bonds?"

Flider: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Yeah, Representative Flider, who was the Sponsor of the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Council (sic-Authority)?"

Flider: "Representative Eddy."

Black: "Representative Eddy. Mr. Speaker, I... I rest my case on what I said earlier. Isn't it amazing? Good ideas, when allowed to come to fruition, originate on both sides of the aisle. Representative Eddy had this Bill last year and it's working, now Representative Flider thought it was a good idea and it's gonna work in his area. Remarkable what we can do when we're allowed to work together. A wonderful idea, Representative Flider. And Representative Eddy, congratulations to you. Imitation is indeed the most sincere form of flattery."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flider to close."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Bill from the standpoint of economic development. With regard to the speaker's last comments, I would have to tell you that when I first saw this piece of

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

legislation, the Eastern Illinois Economic Development Authority on the board last year being discussed, I couldn't wait to get over to the Representative who was sponsoring it to get onboard as a cosponsor. I thought it was that good of an idea. I think this is a... also a good idea. And this is an example of how we can continue to work together in a par... in a bipartisan manner. And I would encourage your support. 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 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 this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, do you wish us to read 4202? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4202, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I didn't steal this Bill from anyone, but I have been working very closely with Representative Bellock on your side of the aisle on this legislation. Ladies and Gentlemen, for some years, as you know, I've been working along with many of you in the area of mental health. And after many years of effort, a few years ago we passed a mental health parity law for Illinois. It was a pretty weak law. It didn't do everything it should have done, but we did pass it. And last year we did away with the sunset on that law, so now

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

it's the permanent law of our state. Because the Bill was weak, in one of the areas it only allowed 35 visits to a provider of mental health services, and for many of you who have a family member or a friend or a relative that may need mental health services, I think you know that that may not be enough in some cases. Accordingly, thi... all this Bill does is change the number that must be allowed from 35 to Now, some will say, 'Well, that's a pretty big jump. Who can afford it?' But remember a few things. First, while the insurance carriers and some of the employers had some issues with the mental health parity law when we first passed it, the fact is that the experience of this has been it's not been a huma... a tremendous burden to either. fact, when we eliminated the sunset on this last year, nobody came to us to complain. This Bill passed unanimously last year. And so, we must also remember that insurance carriers still have the option of deciding what's medically necessary. If the carrier doesn't think the extra visits are medically necessary, they can refuse payment and refuse the coverage. So, this is a good and reasonable piece of legislation. If mental health parity is to mean anything, we must pass this legislation. And I ask for your help."

Speaker Hannig: "And in response, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman said it merely increases from 35 to 60 visits and makes it sort of like... it sounds like it's just something that happens and it's... doesn't bother anybody. Well, there may be some... some need out there that I think we would all agree that there are people that have special

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

needs that this Bill would help. But let's talk about what it really means in the real world. What it means is that it's gonna cost a whole lot more. Who does it cost to? Well, it happens to cost the businesses of the State of Illinois. The people who, for the most part, are in small business because if ERISA was there, this wouldn't apply. So, the big dogs... the big companies probably are not gonna be affected by this legislation. Who will be affected are the small to medium-size businesses that this will cost literally thousands of dollars in increased health insurance premiums. Now, there's a lot of new Members here on the floor. Let me tell ya what happens when you have increasing costs to health insurance that employers must pay. cases, especially with the tough times that we have in Illinois with the strong antibusiness arena that has developed in this state, that they have to make a decision whether to keep the doors open or to provide health care. We keep putting these kinds of Bills, though they're... almost every one that I've heard, these mandates, the additional cost mandates, it costs... ultimately falls on the backs of the business community. And might I remind the Body, who creates the majority of the new employees in this state? It's the small business community who provides those new employees. And where will the growth come in the future years? It's gonna come from the small business community. But if we continue to put these kinds of Bills out, Bill after Bill after Bill, to increase the cost through increased mandates and increased costs to health care, we're gonna find small businesses not coming out and expanding in

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Illinois. We'll find that small businesses will be stymied from growing in Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to take a good, hard look at this legislation. intended, can be justified to some degree, but the cost in the long run will cost us in another way. The unintended consequences of this legislation is that many people in this state that are hired by small business are gonna lose their They're gonna lose it. And the very health insurance. people that this Bill wants to affect, people who have mental illness and have problems with coping and relating in our society will lose their health care altogether. everybody seems to be talking; everybody seems to be doing something else. But I want you to know that this is a Bill that further exacerbates the problem of uninsured in this state. And oh, yeah, you can stand up at your community meetings and you can stand up at your functions in your community and say, 'Woe is us. Holy cow, I can't believe so many people are uninsured.' But, Ladies and Gentlemen, look in the mirror tonight. When you vote for this... and you're the person that if you vote for this kind of legislation... and there are plenty of Bills just like this one, is gonna come down the pipe this Spring Session where this kind of stuff is gonna cost the Illinois business community not only jobs, but health care benefits to the very people that the Sponsor of this Bill and the other good-intended people who are sponsoring this Bill. I, unfortunately, must rise in opposition to this Bill and only because of cost to the business community that they cannot afford mandate after

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

mandate that be forced upon them. And for that reason, I will not be supporting the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "There are a number of Members who wish to speak on the Bill, so we're gonna move this to the Order of Standard Debate. Next to speak is Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the legislation before us, a couple of things that I wanted to point out because this has been an issue which wi... has been before the General Assembly for about the last 10 years. Some of the things that the previous Representative said are correct. When we passed the original parity, it was for the CHIP Program. From that, the business groups and the mental health groups got together. I believe the Bill was Bellock and Radogno that had set it up in order to provide some coverage out there and increased coverage. One of the caveats and stipulations was that the Department of Insurance would provide a cost study to see what the impact was going to be. Now, af... and for that reason, a sunset was set on the Act. At the time that the sunset came up and was closing... was closing up, the department had still not done their cost studies for it. And so to allow the law not to sunset under its current form, we went ahead and removed that. But it does have a definite impact, although we don't know what that number is going to be yet. And as we increase the mandates that we have to do, we do not hit most of the people who are insured out there. They bargained for it and collectively bargained through the ERISA, the exempt groups that the state can't make laws on. So, please understand when you vote on this Bill that we are impacting

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

the small employer groups and that makes it more and more difficult as you stack up not only mental health, but a myriad of other items. Though they may be worthy, they do increase the cost. So, please, keep that in mind when you're looking at the Bills that we vote on, look at the impact on employers who are trying to provide insurance for their people. We keep on making it more difficult."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock. Representative Bellock, your turn."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Bellock: General Assembly. I speak to support this Bill and I'm probably one of the most probusiness Legislators there are in the Assembly. But I see this as a Bill that, by spending money on the front end, by covering these visits, that you're saving money on the other end by keeping people from suicide, keeping people out of emergency rooms, keeping people out of state institutions at the cost of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. When we passed the Bill 5 years ago for mental health parity in Illinois, people were frightened. The business community, insurance, they all took a step and they said, 'We'll see what happens.' Five years later, when we voted... when that Bill went to sunset last year, nobody mentioned anything happening in Illinois, except I think it really saved money because it helped keep people out of institutions and what I've just mentioned. I think that all of us took a chance 5 years ago when we supported mental health parity. Only 11 states in the United States do it and they have looked to Illinois to see what has happened in that last 5 years. And they have

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

seen that people's lives have been saved and the business community did not see any ill effects from that Bill. This is the identical Bill, but it allows 35 visits to 60 visits which helps those that are seriously mentally ill. That is people that have schizophrenia, bipolar, and the diseases are outlined in the Bill. I think that this is something that's before us today that requires all of us to take a second look at. We know the Surgeon General has said that one out of every eight people in the United States suffers from some form of mental illness, but this Bill particular to those that are seriously mentally ill and suffering from bipolar and schizophrenia. I ask you to take a look at it and to see that the people who have mental illness can restore their quality of life by just taking their medication and going to an outpatient visit and not having to be hospitalized. Thank you. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer. Representative Meyer."

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

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

Meyer: "Representative, I'll be honest with ya, I'm not sure what I'm gonna do on this Bill. I... I am looking for some answers though to a couple questions, if you'd be so kind. The... this addresses outpatient only?"

Lang: "That's correct."

Meyer: "So, what happens to the inpatient days that are currently provided for? Does that increase, decrease, stay the same?"

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Lang: "Well, the whole notion of mental... the whole notion of mental health parity was to deal... was to allow people to visit mental health providers as an outpatient. Inpatient therapy is covered in other places in the policy."

Meyer: "And it does nothing with those, then?"

Lang: "No."

Meyer: "Okay. Prior to this Bill, it has been 35 days. Now, if I recall, back when that accord was reached between the insurance companies and... and those representing the people that had some of these afflictions, 35 days was thought, at that point, to be adequate. Do you recall that?"

Lang: "No, that is not correct. Thirty-five days was a... the amount of... Ya know, that Bill had lots of provisions. It had the number of days, which we settled on at 35. There were a whole range of different mental illnesses that were covered under that Bill we passed, but a whole range of mental illnesses that were not covered under that Bill. That Bill represented a negotiated Bill that we could pass at that time. None of the mental health providers, none of the mental health advocates, and none of the Legislators who were interested in passing a mental health parity Bill were satisfied with that Bill. And they were certainly not satisfied with a limit of 35."

Meyer: "So, you're then... just to paraphrase your point to make sure I've understood correctly what you're saying. The 35 was not something that the providers came up with. It was something that you... you could pass... and we do that with legislation, I realize... but it wasn't an end-all in terms of their thinking of the total treatment, then..."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Lang: "Well..."

Meyer: "...on an annual basis?"

Lang: "That's correct. Representative, my guess is that everyone on this floor knows somebody that... who's getting mental health services, and virtually all of those folks... Well, let me rephrase this. Virt... virtually all of those folks might have need for more than 35 visits."

Meyer: "Okay. Could I just cut you off?"

Lang: "The people I know who are getting help from mental health providers are going at least once a week."

Meyer: "Sir, could I cut you off right there because I wanna get at a point here that's concerning me. We're going from 35 to 60. Now, where did the 60 come from?"

Lang: "That was a number that the providers thought fairly and accurately represented what they believed was fair. Ya know, we all know people who are going twice a week for many more than 1 year to a mental health provider, but certainly 35 isn't gonna cut it. If in committee somebody said to me, 'Well, why don't you make it 52? Why don't you make it one a week?', I would have said, 'Okay', but nobody proposed that."

Meyer: "Well, again, my point is, do the providers think that 60 is the number that they need to have and that they can live with so that we're not back here next year looking at 75?"

Lang: "The... the advocates wrote this Bill, but I don't think they could stand anywhere as experts and say to you that 60 visits a year is gonna work for everybody. Some people might only need 5 visits, some people might need 3 a week."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Meyer: "But... but Representative, here's my point. At some point, we need to reach a consensus on this is the benefit. This is what you have to charge a rate at in order to make up the payment to the provider by the insurance company. At some point, if this is not gonna just be an open-ended question year after year after year, we have to settle on something. And my... my concern is 60, is that it?"

Lang: "Well, if it were up to me, but it isn't, I would have everybody get all the coverage they need for every illness they have, mental or physical."

Meyer: "Well..."

Lang: "But that isn't up to me. That's up the insurers of Illinois and it's up to the rest of this General Assembly."

Meyer: "Now, you're..."

Lang: "But as far as I am concerned, I would have no interest in expanding it..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Meyer, your 5 minutes have expired. Could you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Meyer: "Certainly. If you'd just finish at your point, I... I need to understand where you're coming from, Representative, in order to reach a decision as to what I'm gonna do here."

Lang: "And... and again, 35 visits isn't enough for many people that use these services. Now, please remember that the insurer still has the option of rejecting a claim when they think it's not medically necessary. And they have the option of rejecting a claim where it's over and above the customary charge and each cu... each insurance company has their own. And let's also remember that this doesn't apply to any employer that has more than 50 employees."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Meyer: "Say that again?"

Lang: "This does not apply to any employer with more than 50 employees."

Meyer: "No, wait. You said that has more than 50 employees. I thought this was for the bigger ones, and it doesn't apply to anyone that has 50 or fewer."

Lang: "I... I don't think I misstated it. I think I stated it correctly."

Meyer: "Would you state it again so I can hear it? Could we have some quiet so we can hear?"

Lang: "The largest employees are covered by ERISA. Those employers are not covered by this Bill, nor were they covered by the original mental health parity law that we passed."

Meyer: "So, this... well, what about those that are 50 or fewer?"

Lang: "Correct."

Meyer: "This would cover 50 or fewer, then?"

Lang: "Correct."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I appreciate the debate and I do recognize that there are those who are concerned about mandates and insurers and employers. I'm concerned about those things as well. But if we're to stand for anything in this General Assembly, it's to stand for the health care of Illinois. This is a reasonable approach to deal with a reasonable problem. Ya know, I heard someone mention cost reports. We did get those cost studies and those cost studies weren't... did not indicate any strong

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

upward trend in costs for businesses or insurers. In fact, they indicated more of a flat response. When we went, last year, to eliminate the sunset on the mental health parity laws, which you all voted for, there was no evidence at that time that any employer or any insurer was coming to us with that 35 problems those first visits Accordingly, we came to this year and no one came to committee with any of that evidence this year as well. Certainly some business groups came and they were concerned about mandates, certainly there were some insurers that were opposed to the Bill, but there is no evidence whatsoever over the last 5 years, no evidence in committee this year that this Bill will cause any substantial increase in costs to our employers or to our insurers. That being the case, I think we... if we're gonna err, we'd better err on the side of those with mental illness. And we know that those with mental illness certainly are not getting, in every case, what they need to get properly treated with only 35 visits a There are other Bills that may come forth; there's one in the Senate which will add more different diseases, more mental illnesses to the mental health parity law. don't propose that today. Representative Bellock and I don't propose that today. We simply propose that we allow people to get the treatment they need. And so... and so, let just urge you in the strongest possible terms to represent your constituents, to deal with their health care, and to pass this Bill. Thank you."

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

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Winters, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes' and 31 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, you're next with House Bill 4302. Out of the record. Representative Brosnahan on 4315. Out of the record. Representative Tenhouse, would you like us to read House Bill 4425? Out of the record. Representative Holbrook, you have House Bill 4449. We're now on the top of the page on page 4 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4449, a Bill for an Act concerning consumer fraud. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Speaker, I wish to bring this back to Second for an Amendment that's just come up today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, this will be returned to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative McKeon, you have House Bill 4453. Out of the record. Representative Currie, we have House Bill 4462. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4462, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure would make it illegal for Internet suppliers of restricted pesticides to sell them to people in Illinois

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

without the assurance that the people they sell to are people who legitimately are allowed to buy and to apply these quite toxic substances. There are five or six other states that already do this. We have been very effective and successful at stopping illegal sales of restrictive pesticides when there is a paper trail, but as you know, over the Internet there is not. I know of no opposition and I would appreciate your support for this measure that can help us protect our pets, our children, and the air we breathe."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, this is on the Order of Short Debate.

And Representative Black is recognized in response."

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

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

Black: "Yes. Majority Leader Currie, how many farmers do you have in your district?"

Currie: "I think the number is sixteen and a half."

Black: "That's... that's more, I think, than the former Majority Leader McPike ever claimed. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "I... I just wanna commend the Majority Leader for a good Bill for rural Illinois and all of Illinois. The only... the only thing bothering me is I don't know why I didn't think of it. And I have to honest, I didn't think of it. But had I thought of it, I probably wouldn't have gotten it out of Rules anyway. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very good Bill. The Farm Bureau, the fertilizer and chemical dealers are in full support of this Bill. And if

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

you'll stop and think of what this Bill attempts to eliminate, there are some very dangerous chemicals that you can purchase over the Internet. And some people get carried away with their yards or their flower gardens and they could really do a unintentionally or intentionally, whatever the case may be, some tremendous damage because they don't know anything about how to apply them, they don't know what the proper usage is, and to think that people have access to some of these very dangerous pesticides without any training whatsoever. This is an excellent Bill. I would like to be added as a cosponsor, if that's permissible, and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. This is a good Bill for ... no matter where you live in the state, whether you make your living in agriculture or whether you just lived next to somebody who thinks they can cure termites or garden pests or whatever. This is truly, and I'm not being facetious, this is an excellent Bill and should get a... all 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

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

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

Winters: "Yes, I... I really wanted to also commend you, in fact, that the original Bill was flawed and you did see the... the Amendment that came through was very useful. I am a certified applicator. I take a test every 2 years from the Department of Agriculture. This Bill continues to allow me access to restricted use pesticides, not only from my retail outlet, but also from the Internet sales. The original Bill was flawed in allowing operators who don't go through the same testing as the applicator. So, again, I think we

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

finally have a good product here and it is useful. Urge its adoption. Thanks."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie, shall we read 4526? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4526, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that would ask the Department of Children and Family Services to offer social services and legal help to grandparents who are bringing up their children. And the idea here is to help make sure there is some permanency planning in the event the grandparent may not survive 'til the majority... the child reaches majority age and if there is some particular problem confronting the grandparents, the department should be available to help them resolve it. It is a measure that I think would help keep children out of the clutches of the Department of Children and Family Services and I know there are many grandparents who would welcome help as they... as they bring up their grandchildren."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any... The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 4526. This is on the Order of Short Debate.

And in response, Representative Mulligan."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, what form of oversight? Is it mainly because of the aged caregivers that would have them and so you're worried about what would happen ultimately if they were too old to take care of the wards?"

Currie: "That's exactly why. So, we talk about disabled caregivers as well as grandparents. And I..."

Mulligan: "I..."

- Currie: "This is... this is thoroughly voluntary. It is only if a parent... a grandparent thinks that maybe it would be helpful to do permanency planning before the grandparent disappears from the scene would this kick in."
- Mulligan: "So, that would be the only people that would be impacted, people that are younger, where they've moved out of DCFS care, would not have..."
- Currie: "People... a grandpar... caretakers age 60 and above and disabled caretakers as well. Again, it's totally voluntary, Representative. It's only if the grandparent asks for this help that the help would be provided. But it seems important that the child be in a... be... be in a situation where permanency planning is a goal, and that's the point of this Bill."
- Mulligan: "In our analysis it says there is a potential \$500 thousand fiscal impact. Now, I don't know if that's what you..."
- Currie: "We... we have not yet found out from the department how they arrived at that figure. I think the figure is way larger than the reality. I suspect that they were

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

anticipating that everybody would want these services and I think that's probably inaccurate. But I'm prepared to continue talking to the department, finding out how they arrived at that figure. And if there is a way that we need to narrow the measure, we will work with the department to do so when this Bill is in the Senate."

- Mulligan: "Would that money be spent on legal fees or through somebody like Guardianship and Advocacy to take care of the children or would that money be considered to go to the caregivers or how... how do they envision that money being spent?"
- Currie: "I... I think the idea is to help the caregiver find out the legal avenues to establish a standby guardianship, for example, or to go to court to identify the next person that would be in line to become the adoptive parent."
- Mulligan: "All right. I think you and I worked on standby guardianship for AIDS moms years ago. So, you envision this to be similar to that?"
- Currie: "And... and the idea here is to help the people understand that that may be the right avenue for them. We don't want kids lost in the system; we don't want them falling through the cracks; we don't want their subsidies to disappear while people quarrel or fuss over who will be the next caregiver. So, the point of this Bill is to try to keep the child in a continuum of care and keep the child out of DCFS foster system."
- Mulligan: "Okay, I understand. Some grandparents over 60 have 20 years yet and others don't. So..."

Currie: "Right."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Mulligan: "...the object is to make sure the child doesn't fall through the cracks a second or third time."

Currie: "Right."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill. I know that Representative Currie has worked long and hard on it with the Chicago Bar Association. I know that the former speaker, my colleague in the... on the Appropriations Committee, knows that the Department of Children and Family Services, 2 years ago, their budget was cut \$80 million. And one of the things that I think we are going to have to start facing are the parents of these children or the guardians of these children who are aging out and will no longer be able to take care of these children. All this Bill is doing is trying to set a system in place to make sure that they stay out of the foster care system and stay in the care of family members where they belong. So, I... I just wanna thank Representative Currie for her hard work and encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner. 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 Coulson, do you wish us to read 4696? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4696, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4696 is really a technical cleanup Bill. As you all know, we passed the safe haven Bill in 2001 and we've been trying to get public information to people for many years. This, essentially, requires the schools to pro... cover the Safe Haven Newborn Infant Abandon Protection Act (sic-Abandoned Newborn Infant Protection Act) in health education classes. And I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schock, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're gonna return to page 3 for a moment to House Bill 4425. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4425, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4425 is an agreement between the Illinois Automobile Dealers Association and the new car

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

manufacturers. It is an issue that deals with warranty basically in terms of how their reimbursement is received. And this has been a contentious issue and they've reached agreement between the two parties. I would simply ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- 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? 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. We're gonna go now to page 4 of the Calendar. Under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading, we have House Bill 4453. 4453.
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4453, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McKeon."
- McKeon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4453 deals with a workforce development issue. A couple of years ago, I carried a Bill that established benchmarks for reporting the progress of workforce development, and in those benchmarks we had 12 criteria that were to be used as indicators of program success and annual reports to the General Assembly. What we found is that several of those criteria, three of 'em in fact, were based on decennial census data and were not available on an annual basis. This Bill amends the

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Illinois Workforce Investment Board Act to address those issues of benchmark indicators. It requires the board to report annually, as the underlying Bill does, on the progress of... of each of these bentmarks... benchmarks and how they apply to the 10 workforce development regions established by the Governor. It's an agreed Bill developed by the department, by representatives of the 10 workforce development regions, and stakeholders involved. And I urge your support and will gladly answer any questions of the Members."

Speaker Hannig: "This is... this is on the Order of Short Debate.

Does anyone speak 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 Soto, do you wish to be recorded? Mr... Mr. Clerk... 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. On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Resolutions, we have House Joint Resolution 75. Representative Colvin. House Joint Resolution 75."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. House Joint Resolution 75 is a very simple provision that deals with the growing and vexing problem of children being separated from their parents as a result of incarceration. The Resolution simply asks the Department of Children and Family Services and the Illinois Department of Corrections to study the feasibility and

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

accessibility of using video conferencing for children to visit with their parents in a... in a... in a video conferencing environment. It is not meant to replace personal visits. It is meant to supplement personal visits when it's just not feasible for a child to visit their parents physically at a state institution. Both the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services and the Illinois Department of Corrections have indicated their support for such study. There was no opposition when we presented the Bill in committee. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 75. 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 May, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Mendoza on House Resolution 732."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 732 recognizes the achievements of Emanuel Ofosu Yeboah as an athlete and champion for the rights of the disabled. Yeboah of Ghana was born without a tibia in his right leg but proved that a disability is not an insurmountable challenge. He made a symbolic ride of 379 miles across his home country to champion the rights of the disabled, help provide free wheatch... free wheelchairs to disabled persons around the world, and he started a cycling team, a wheelchair basketball team, and a running team for

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

physically challenged athletes. He's currently working on starting a sports academy for disabled athletes as well. And I wanted to bring special attention to this particular Resolution because these things, in and of themselves, are admirable... admirable accomplishments. However, Ofosu Yeboah, like I mentioned, was born in Ghana and with a serious disability in a country which, at the time of his birth, treated the disabled worse than trash. Many of the disabled were either killed or hidden to live in the shadows of a culture that thought that they were taboos punishments for bad behavior or prior sins to a higher power. So, it's really an amazing accomplishment that this young man was able to not only achieve these amazing importantly, accomplishments, but more energize revitalize and inspire an entire nation, and I would ultimately say, the world. So, for the first time ever in the history of Ghana, Parliament is considering a Bill that would provide rights to the disabled. And what we're trying to do today is simply honor Emanuel Yeboah... oh, Ofosu Yeboah for his accomplishments and try to give him a little bit of an injection of energy to carry on his great work in Ghana and ask that the Parliament consider this Bill of... for the disabled and also honor Mr. Yeboah with this Resolution. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 732. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Giles, for what reason do you rise?"

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to... on behalf of Representative Chavez that represents the 24th District and Representative Dan Burke that represents the 23rd District and myself, Calvin Giles, representing the 8th District, we have the City of Berwyn delegation here. First of all, we have the Mayor of Berwyn, Michael O'Connor. If we could give him a hand in the gallery. Accompanying the mayor, we have Mr. Scott Wagnet... Waguespack, the assistant to the mayor. We have Nona Chapman, the First Ward Alderman. We have Santiago Ramos, the Second Ward Alderman. Michele Skryd, the Fourth Ward Alderman. And Jeanmarie Hajer, the director of community outreach. We'd like to give them a warm welcome.

Welcome to Springfield. Thank you very much for coming."

Speaker Hannig: "On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Motions in writing, the Chair is just gonna go through all those on the Calendar real quickly. We have Motions to Table on House Bill 4253 by Representative Holbrook, 4364 by Representative Holbrook, House Bill 4402 by Representative Mautino, House Resolution 729 by Representative McKeon, House Resolution 833 by Representative Chapa LaVia. And also filed in writing, Motions to Table by Representative Mendoza for House Bill 4608 and Representative Jefferson has made a Motion to Table House Bill 4643. You've heard the Motions. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motions

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

are adopted and the Bills and Resolutions are tabled. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Resolution 808 by Representative Black. 808. House Resolution 808. Mr. Clerk, could you read the Resolution."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 808, offered by Representative Black.
 - WHEREAS, By the middle of January of 2006, a familiar face in the Statehouse will take a long-deserved break and his voice will be missing from the airwaves; Ben Kiningham, Springfield Bureau Chief for the Illinois Radio Network, has announced his retirement; and
 - WHEREAS, Mr. Kiningham was born in Fort Riley, Kansas, in 1942; he graduated from Springfield High School in 1960 and attended Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, where he studied radio-TV and started his broadcasting career as a volunteer at WSIU; and
 - WHEREAS, He enlisted in the military in late 1964, serving in the Illinois Air National Guard; some years later, he served as public affairs staff officer for the 183rd Tactical Fighter Group; he retired from the 183rd with the rank of lieutenant colonel after 22 years in the military; and
 - WHEREAS, He began his broadcast career in Springfield at WTAX, where he was hired on January 24, 1966; since 1974, when he succeeded Bill Miller as Statehouse Bureau Chief for the Capital Information Bureau, he has kept radio listeners apprised of developments in Illinois government and politics; and
 - WHEREAS, He is past president of the Illinois News Broadcasters
 Association (INBA) and the Illinois Legislative

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

- Correspondents Association; he received a lifetime achievement award from the INBA and has received several news awards from media organizations, including the AP, UPI, and the National Association of State Radio Networks; in 2004, he was named alumnus of the year by the radio-televsion department at SIU-C; and
- WHEREAS, His affiliations stretch to the private sector, and he is a past chair of the American Lung Association Christmas Seal campaign downstate and a former elder in Central Presbyterian Church in Petersburg; and
- WHEREAS, Mr. Kiningham has spent more than 10 years hosting "CapitolView with Ben Kiningham", a public affairs program, with a panel of reporters discussing the latest political events in the State; and
- WHEREAS, During his retirement, he plans to stay active in his hobbies of amateur radio and photography, and he and his wife, Beth, hope to travel, including visits to their children in Wisconsin and Arizona; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that on the occasion of his retirement, we congratulate Mr. Ben Kiningham, who has exemplified the highest ideals of journalism and community responsibility and whose voice will truly be missed; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Mr. Kiningham with our sincerest best wishes for his future."
- Speaker Hannig: "And on the Resolution, Representative Black is recognized."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and thank those of you who were standing who thought this was a Death Resolution. Let me assure you, it's premature. Majority Leader Currie and I are proud to cosponsor House Resolution 808 in honor of a long and distinguished career by someone most of you had an opportunity... if you haven't, my sympathy goes to you because he's simply one of the great reporters that has covered the Statehouse here for a long, long time and that is a good friend to all of us, Mr. Ben Kiningham, who is the bureau chief of the Illinois Radio Network. Ben is... for those of you, again, who were standing, I assure you Ben has not departed. He's over here in the press bench. just... Ben, with that wave of the tie, that makes me know you were here during the late Myron Olson's tenure because that was Myron Olson's greeting to everyone when he came or left the floor. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you're lucky in this business you get to deal with reporters who do their homework, who ask insightful questions of your legislation and who are extremely fair, whose integrity's never been questioned and just does an excellent job. because he does his homework, when he interviews you, you'd better hope you've read your Bill, or at the very least the analysis, because he generally knows more about legislation you're proposing than you do. But it has been a privilege and pleasure for me to work with him, to do a number of interviews with him. And it's always delightful driving home when you're listening to the radio and you hear Mr. Kiningham's lovely, golden-toned orator voice announce that he is speaking to Representative Bill Black on a piece

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

of legislation and at the end, ya know, he might throw in an editorial comment that the Bill needs a great deal of work but the young man is certainly trying. There is simply nothing that can be added to the tributes that Mr. Kiningham has received in the print media and from all of his colleagues. He has spent many years covering this and he's a wealth of information and stories about some of the things that have gone on here: who is accessible, who isn't, who's direct, who isn't. And some of those tales, thank goodness, he only tells in private and off the record. you've done an excellent job. It's been a privilege for me to have worked with you. I wish you the very best in retirement. And unfortunately, when people like you retire, you take so much institutional memory with you and so much passion for your job, integrity and credibility, that it's going to be very difficult. I know you have some excellent people that you've trained over the years, but I... I'm really sorry to see you go because you do such an excellent job of trying to tell the people who hire us what we are doing, good or bad, and the people need to hear more of that. Thank you very much for the opportunity to have worked with you over these past 20 years. I wish you and your family the very best as you enter in a new phase of your life, that being retirement. I do feel sorry when you go through the next drive-in ordering, whether it's from a fast food or whatever, when that voice comes back to you on the speaker, you're immediately going to hold something out the window and say, 'Can I quote you on that?' luck. It's been a privilege to work with you."

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I'm delighted to join Representative Black in this tribute to Ben Kiningham. I do think the title up there is perhaps a little misleading. I think it should say, 'Congratulates long-time Statehouse reporter Ben Kiningham on the occasion of his early retirement.' I don't know that you had to leave us quite this soon, Ben, and I, with... with Bill, will miss you for many of the same reasons. You are a journalist of the highest integrity and your standards, in terms of knowing your subject, knowing the questions, are absolutely without equal. We will miss your mellifluous voice as we drive about in our cars on the way home or to Springfield, but we appreciate the... the vision and the wisdom you've brought to your tasks. We're knocked out by the number of awards you've received, so many I can't begin to mention them. I did discover one thing, however, during this occasion, and that is that you're well-known in the ham radio circles and everybody knows you as 'K9IDQ'. Now, there is a moniker. So, I wish you and your wife the very best in your retirement years, playin' with your ham radio, working on your photography, and having the time and the energy to visit your grandchildren in Wisconsin and Arizona. Best to you, Ben. We'll miss you, but we appreciate all you've done for us. Many thanks."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ya know, it's a privilege to sit up here today and talk about Ben because I not only know Ben as a Statehouse reporter, but I know him as a friend and

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

as a neighbor. And when I look at Ben... and he should have as much white hair as I have before he retires and he's not even close. But when you see Ben's family and when you know how nice his wife is... his wife was my daughter's teacher in grade school, his sister-in-laws were classmates of mine, there's a lot of history there. So, it's... I wish Ben all the best and a long and happy retirement."

- Speaker Hannig: "So, the Clerk advises me that we've adopted this Resolution, previously. So, we did want to, though, have Ben on the floor and congratulate him. Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, though it may not be reflected on the Resolution, without objection, I would like all Members added as cosponsors of this Resolution. And I hope all of you get a chance to congratulate Ben before he leaves the Statehouse. I have a hunch he'll come back from time to time. Ben, good luck. Thank you. Best wishes."
- Speaker Hannig: "And so, Mr. Clerk, would you please add all Members to the Resolution. Just a note to Members of the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee, Representative Giles informs us that that committee will meet tomorrow at 9 a.m., 9 a.m. And now, Representative Lou Jones is recognized for a moment of silence. Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I will ask that you rise and bow your head in silent prayer for Coretta Scott King. I had the privilege of being in her company twice, once when she... when her husband was alive and once since he has been gone. This is one of the most... was one of the most warmest people I have ever, ever met in my

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

entire life. Monique Davis reminded me today of... when she was in her company, of something that she said. She said, 'Fighting the Civil Rights Movement and fighting for discrimination breathed a lot of hatred.' But she would hope that people would not have that hatred in their hearts and they would keep love in their hearts while they fought for the right thing to do. And I ask that we have a moment of silence prayer for this beautiful, wonderful woman. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Are there any announcements? Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just like to remind those people of the subcommittee on Elementary & Secondary Ed. We will meet for the first organizational meeting at 8:30. That's at 8:30 in Room 114. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 861, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 862, offered by Representative Winters. House Resolution 863, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 865, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 867, offered by Representative Acevedo. And House Resolution 868, offered by Representative Daniels."
- 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. Representative Currie now moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, at

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

the hour of 2 p.m and allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 838, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act concerning local First Reading of this government. Senate Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 5567, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 5568, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act appropriations and reappropriations. First Reading of these House Bills. Committee Reports. Representative Colvin, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4719; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4370; 'recommends be adopted' House Resolution 812, House Resolution 813, and Senate Joint Resolution 57. Representative Yarbrough, Chairperson from the Committee on Housing & Urban Development, to which the measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31,

86th Legislative Day

1/31/2006

2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 4342. Representative Mautino, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Standard Debate' House Bill 4293. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4529. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 31, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 4727. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."