125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 5786, offered by Representative... Representative Osmond. First Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 5786, a Bill for an Act concerning finance, offered by Representative Osmond. Referred to House Committee on Rules is House Joint Resolution 127, offered by Representative Madigan."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off their laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers. And we ask the guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Jeff Chitwood of the South Side Christian Church in Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Chitwood is the guest of Representative Ray Poe."
- Pastor Chitwood: "Let us pray. Lord, I wanna thank You for this day that You've given us, this time to come together. Lord, I pray that You'll be with these men and women today as they make decisions which affect the lives of others. I pray, Lord, that You'll grant them wisdom and guidance in their hearts and their minds. I pray that You'll protect their families and watch over them as many of them are away from their families at this time. Just watch over them. Lord, we thank You for our country and our state. I pray, Lord, that You will be with our nation, our leaders, that You'll grant them wisdom and guidance. Lord, for our soldiers that are serving abroad, I pray that You will protect them and that You will watch over them during this time. Lord, we

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- thank You for our country, we thank You for our freedom and we give You glory for all of these things. In Jesus' name we pray, amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Poe."
- Poe 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 Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Representative Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Will Davis, Representative Giles. Oh and... and Representative Hamos, Representative Jones, and Representative Patterson, and Representative Kelly are excused."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Representative Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Churchill, Coulson, Dunn, Jenisch, Mathias, Pihos, and Wait are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 105 people responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for House Bill 4572 which is referred to

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Second Reading; House Joint Resolution 119 referred to the Order of Resolutions; Senate Bill 1497 'approved for consideration' referred to Second Reading. Senate Bill 2277 Floor Amendment #2 'approved for consideration' and Senate Bill 2762 Floor Amendment #3 'approved for consideration'. Representative Jefferson, Chairperson from the Committee on Campaign Reform, to which the & measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1445. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 627 and Senate Bill 929; 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 1216. Representative Richard Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 t.o Senate Bill Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

following recommendation/s: the back with the same 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate 630; and adopted' House Resolution 1197, House 'recommends be Resolution 1223 and House Resolution 1210. Introduction of Resolution 1244, Resolutions. House offered Representative Franks. This Resolution is referred to the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank... thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, if I might. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the... the pathetic blow-hard conference will meet immediately after Session in my office. And while I'm saying that, Mr. Speaker, I've been in this business 30 years. I've held elective office since 1976. I've been called worse. But I wanna say one thing about the old... the old theme and song that we heard in our grade school years. Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me. don't hurt me, but my spouse was unhappy about that and my children should not be subjected to that and I don't think it's appropriate that your spokesperson refers to any Member of this Body as a pathetic blow-hard or any other name. And I would say this for the record. I think that's out of character for Mr. Brown. I like Mr. Brown. I consider him a friend, but I think that went beyond the pale and I think

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

it's out of character for him to do that. And my wife would be very mad at me if I didn't say she did not in any way, shape or form, appreciate that remark."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mitchell, proceed."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is regarding our Deputy Leader. And I don't know, I read the Chicago paper and I see a comment whether it's attributable whether it's an accurate comment or not, I don't know. However, I just have to say in terms a... defense of our ... our Deputy Leader is that, you know, we're in the last week or two of the Session and the Republicans haven't been part of the process; we certainly would like to be part of the process, but one of the things we really... really appreciate about ... about Mr. Black is how hard he works and he studies every Bill. As our Deputy Leader, I'm very proud of him and I don't always agree with Mr. Black, but I appreciate what he brings to the table. And one of the things, and if you've been around here a certain amount of time, you appreciate when Black speaks he's pretty original and sometimes in this process all we get is scripted sock puppets mouthing certain lines without an original thought in their life. Mr. Black doesn't have that. He certainly never can be talked about as a sock puppet for a line of reasoning. Now, what we would like to do, Mr. Speaker, on the Republican side of the aisle, is work in a bipartisan fashion to address worker

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

retirement security and we wanna talk about the debt. We wanna work in the bipartisan fashion that people send us here and wanna sit down with the Majority and stop the name-calling and get on with the business of the people. We'd appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, thanks. I'll keep this relatively short. I was here on Wednesday afternoon and saw and listened to the debate on the horseracing Bill. And it was somewhat contentious. And Mr... Representative Black made comments that maybe made some people uncomfortable. know, Mr... Mr. Speaker, this place has gotten out of control where no one listens to the debate, no one listens to what's said and on our side of the aisle, as this week goes on, we're gonna go to caucus if people don't wanna attention. 'Cause we're gonna have some debate on the budget that's very serious and we're gonna have some debate about a variety of issues over the last... next few days that have been put off. So, Mr. Speaker, could we have a little order in the House, just a little and I'll be done. Black does a very, very good job for us. It's not always a popular job; it's not a job that everybody enjoys. He has to point out things that go on on this floor and makes observations that sometimes we don't like. And on that horseracing Bill the other day, there were some things that went on and he made... he pointed out those observations. I was here. He referred to a Member of your side of the aisle that got a call from the Governor's Office. This person left, she came back and she... her vote was different from the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

time before and he pointed that out. And he questioned whether or not the process was working in the way it should work and that's his job. And you may not like it sometimes, on the other side of the aisle, when he points out some things that are maybe a little tougher and rougher than you'd liked to hear, but that's the job he's asked to perform. Mr. Speaker, we have throughout this Session, we have for the last couple years, attempted to work with you in a very civil manner. We've had some disagreements on policy; we will continue to have some disagreements on policy, but we have tried to conduct ourselves in a very, very civil way. We have attempted not to play games; we've tried to keep our yelling and screaming down to a minimum, but when we see and heard what happened the other day that was directed at Representative Black to resorting to namecalling, not even to talk about the facts, not even to have a substantive disagreement with Representative Black in the press, but to start calling him names, I think inappropriate. I would like to think that you share my feeling that that was inappropriate. Representative Black has spent a number of years in this Body doing an incredible job; he's very effective and I think I'm joined by the Members on our side and I would hope by Members on your side that we don't resort to name-calling and personal shots when we don't like what he says. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you would share my sentiments and feelings that what was said the other day and in the Chicago Tribune was highly inappropriate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. Mr. Brown, if... if we are in error and you were quoted incorrectly, we... we, on behalf of all of the Members on our side of the aisle, I apologize, but Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we suspend the appropriate rule and give Mr. Brown a... a moment to... to make a public apology."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Realizing there is a lot of hot air around here, right now it's a little bit too much cold air coming out of those vents up there. And it's really very unhealthy, it's unpleasant and I am very uncomfortable. I've spoken to some other Members and they, too, feel that the air coming from those vents is just very unacceptable. Please do something about that, please, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Would it help if we finished our work and went home? On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 585. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flider."

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 585 is very similar to a Bill which passed out of here last year about this time, House Bill 1038, passed out of here 113 to 0 and had been in the Senate over the summer and we had worked on it and recently came back in the form of Senate Bill 585. What this legislation does is it updates the Open Meetings Act and specifies rules

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

with regard to electronic communications. It expands the definition of a 'meeting' to include the presence whether by telephone calls, video or audio conference, or electronic means. And it also specifies that a quorum of members of a public body must be physically present at an open meeting in the case of electronic communications. physical quorum requirement may be met by a public body with jurisdiction limited to a specific geographic area less than statewide when it meets simultaneously at one of its offices and on one or more locations in a public building, which may include its other offices. And that meeting would then be conducted by interactive video conference. And it provides that there would a public notice of the meetings and provides public access to all locations. Legislation also establishes guidelines for attendance by means other than physical presence, allows local governments and other governmental bodies to determine what those rules would be for members to attend on the basis of telecommunications. The bottom line of this is that it updates the Open Meetings Act to deal with electronic communications. It does not change whatsoever the quorum requirements of the Open Meetings Act. And I would ask for your support of this important piece of legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Durkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, as I... as you mentioned that you want to include certain type of text messaging, other type of

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

electronic messaging as a means to be present at a meeting. Is that what this is... you're attempting to do with this legislation?"

Flider: "Well, that would be... one of the thing... and I'm sorry,
Representative Durkin, I couldn't entirely hear your
question. But the intent of the legislation, as I
understand your question, is that we want to update it so
that it reflects those kinds of communications. So..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Flider: "...you know, what we want to happen is when the public attends a meeting that they are getting a sense for what is being discussed in that meeting and that if there are any kinds of... say sidebar types of communications that are going on by electronic communications then those communications should be made public or available."

Durkin: "All right. I just wanted to make sure it's perfectly clear what we're voting on is language that's gonna state that whether a person... that meeting means 'any gathering whether in person by video or audio conference, telephone call, electronic means, such as without limitation electronic mail, electronic chat, instant messaging'. That is what you're... that's in this Bill, correct?"

Flider: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't hear the question."

Durkin: "All right. Let me repeat the question. I wanna make sure that... see if first of all this is in the legislation. Now, you've expanded the definition of 'meeting' under the Open Meetings Act to state that meeting for any gathering whether in person or by video or audio conference, telephone call, electronic means and in parentheses (such as, without

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

limitation, electronic mail, electronic chat, instant messaging) would constitute... that would constitute one's presence at a meeting. Correct?"

Flider: "Correct."

Durkin: "Now, I understand that. I can understand that certainly that there is an issue when someone needs to call in, you can identify the voice of a member who's... member of an elected body and you can verify that that is the individual or through the video conferencing, you can tell through the person's image. But when you are saying that someone can participate in a public meeting through instant messaging is... how do you verify that person's identity through the instant messaging?"

Flider: "Well, I think that's a very good question. I think the bottom line and the premise for the legislation that we all have to understand is that, you know, when a meeting is conducted just... without this legislation or with this legislation, a quorum must be present. So, the public notice provisions apply. All the information the public needs to know that a meeting is occurring applies. However, with regard to the electronic communications, the... let's say a local village board or city or county board, what they can do is they would adopt rules under which a person would be meeting whether to attend a it's able telecommunications, say the telephone, audio conference, and so on. And so, based on the provisions of this law, which there's certain quidelines in which they could attend meetings outside of that chamber, they would... their board then would adopt rules that say, here are... here we agree

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

with those rules and you... under those rules, you can attend under these guidelines. Now, with regard to say e-mails or chats or instant messaging or so on, you know, there's always the challenge, I think, of making sure that if you're an elected official, you just understand by this... by virtue of this law that those kinds of communications which would occur or would be designed to occur outside the view of the public while a meeting's occurring that that would be considered to be a violation. And I would hope that with this legislation, we'd be minimizing those kinds of situations."

"Well, it'd be in violation, certainly. But I think Durkin: what we're doing is that we've opened a door individuals... I'm not saying that all boards and local government or the school boards and park districts are going to operate in a way which would be inconsistent with the Act, but I think it... what it does it creates, I think, sets a bad precedent. We're saying that someone who is gonna participate through electronic means such as chat or through the electronic mail, as I said earlier, there's no way to prove that those are the individuals are actually at the other end are members of the board. And that is why I said yes, it's fine if you have teleconferencing, you can recognize the voice, if... telephone or by teleconferencing you can recognize their image, but I think we're making a mistake by including these members participate through the messaging part and through the electronic means which we had just discussed. So, I hope you people take that into consideration, but I think it sets a bad precedent."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flider has moved for the... Mr. Flider has moved for the passage of the Bill. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Has Mr. Ramey voted? Mr. Turner. Has Mr. Turner voted? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 101 people voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1089. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1089, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1089 is identical to House Bill 4521 which many of you helped me pass out of this chamber earlier this year. It is basically a squad car funding Bill that started off with an effort to create funding for squad cars for the Illinois State Police. The way the legislation currently reads is anyone who receives a traffic violation who asks for and receives... that asks for and receives supervision would pay an additional \$25 for that privilege. As I noted when I discussed 4521, many in this chamber cannot get supervision because they have CDLs. It is a tremendous privilege to receive that and what this Bill does is it adds the \$25 of which 25 (sic-20) goes to the arresting agency for the law enforcement agency, \$4.50 goes to the Clerk of the Circuit Court and 50 cents goes to the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Prisoner Review Board. That is the only difference in this legislation compared to House Bill 4521. Senator Jones himself carried this Bill in the Senate. It's a good piece of legislation and I ask for your support. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Washington."

Washington: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Washington: "Thank you. To the Bill and to my colleagues. I'm hoping that we all see that we should definitely go ahead and support this legislation. This is a good piece of legislation. Would do a lot of good across the state. And I, too, rise to the occasion to support my colleague on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 106 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2328. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2328, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Delgado."

Delgado: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill was proposed on behalf of HEARTLAND ALLIANCE for Human Needs & Human Rights. It amends the… it amends a merit… a Public Aid Code in relations to eligibility for medical

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

assistance and adds to classes of eligible persons or any individuals that has a pending application for asylum with federal Department of Homeland Security and represented by counsel or are receiving services through a federally funded torture treatment center or can demonstrate under the rules adopted by the Department of Family Services and Health Care after seeking treatment for trauma resulting from the torture in their country of origin or previous country of residence. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote." Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 100 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 2330. Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2330, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2330 is a blind vendors Bill that would create a new Act known as a Blind Vendor Act. It would also add new things for the blind vendors as far as defining buildings which would specify that they would only... specify that only the portion leased or owned by the state would be subject to this law. Would also give preference to the blind vendors in operating vendoring facilities on state

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

property and direct funding earned from the vending operations who have... into a newly created Blind Vendors Trust Fund. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for 'yes' votes on Senate Bill 2330."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no discussion... The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in reluctant opposition to a fellow Republican's Bill. I happen to have a prison in my district and I've talked to many of the workers in that correctional facility and they have made it very clear that they have serious concerns about this Bill. The way it's drafted and the way the Governor is interpreting it there is simply no way that a blind vendor can operate a cafeteria or a commissary in a prison. The security concerns; the shenanigans that can be pulled, it's just simply not ... it does not lend itself to this Bill. Having said that, if you were to take the Department of Corrections out of the Bill, I think you would probably have an agreed Bill although DHS has some concerns about it as well. And one can say that, well, that won't happen and that isn't our intent, but it's my understanding that the Department of Corrections has been told, I don't know if by Executive Order or by verbal communication, that they have to use whatever vendor the Governor says they're gonna use and that's certainly within the power of the Governor to do so. But to operate a commissary in a prison that houses murderers, rapists, people who are in for life or two or three life terms, it's

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

not the same as operating a concession stand in the rotunda of the Capitol or at a tourist stop at a rest area on an interstate highway. I'd certainly take no satisfaction in opposing a good friend's Bill, but at the same time, I think all of us are sent down here to listen to people in our district, particularly those that have a difficult job to do and after talking with several of the union members in the Danville Correctional Center who just have some real concerns about the way this Bill is written and they asked me to vote 'no' and that is what I will do."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor... Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Okay. Representative, just to, ya know, just asking simple questions for you with this right here. I'm just curious as why they presented this to you this time of the... Where's the origination of this Bill? Who are the people that... that's really pushin' for this right here?"

McAuliffe: "Representative, there's a committee called the Committee on Blind Vendors that's run by John Gordon and he happens to be a constituent of mine. He presented the Bill in the Senate and they passed it. And I picked it up in the Senate and I'm trying to move this Bill forward. So, that's where it originated from; that's where I picked it up from."

Dunkin: "Okay. Have they run a program similar to this elsewhere in State Government on this scale?"

McAuliffe: "There is something that's at this scale but not at the scale that we're gonna do. This is gonna allow more

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- blind vendors to be able to make more money and earn an income here in the State of Illinois. And also, there's a provision that if something would happen to them, it would go to their spouses and any extra money that would be made or profit would go into a Blind Vendors Trust Fund."
- Dunkin: "So, you're... so, you're saying that they are running programs of this scale of \$2 million elsewhere in State Government or in other aspects of government? Are they running a similar program elsewhere in State Government at this... at this... at this scale?"
- McAuliffe: "There is... Yes, there is something, but it expands and the Federal Government also supports this too, I think, with 90 percent funding."
- Dunkin: "Do you know what... what they are here in the State Government?"
- McAuliffe: "Yeah. It's all administrated through the Department of Human Services."
- Dunkin: "Okay. It's through... but you don't know what specific programs, I mean, administered by this particular group?"
- McAuliffe: "It's just the blind vendors program and this would just be building on it, Representative."
- Dunkin: "All right. But nothing of this scale, nothing of this magnitude at DOC, et cetera?"
- McAuliffe: "I believe... I'm sorry, Representative."
- Dunkin: "I'm trying to figure out if there's a similar program that they're running of what's being requested here."

McAuliffe: "No."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Dunkin: "We know they run, ya know, certain programs, but of this magnitude, are there additional programs in State Government that you're aware of?"

McAuliffe: "No."

Dunkin: "There isn't any?"

McAuliffe: "No."

Dunkin: "There aren't any?"

McAuliffe: "No."

Dunkin: "Okay. Why is the Department of Human Services against this Bill?"

McAuliffe: "From what I'm told, DHS doesn't like the DD facilities being told that the blind vendors would have to...

The Department of Human Services does not like the... or the DDS, they just don't like the Bill that the blind vendors would have to operate in their facilities."

Dunkin: "They just don't like it?"

McAuliffe: "Okay. They would prefer that the DD individuals would do that and there was like questions of definitions in here and from what I was understanding, that some of the things that the blind vendors are gonna do, aren't gonna impact some of the things that the DD facilities already do."

Dunkin: "What about the Department of Revenue? Why would they be opposed to such a... such a measure?"

McAuliffe: "Just some loss of money."

Dunkin: "How would they lose money?"

McAuliffe: "Some of the vending machines in the Department of Corrections won't go to the Illinois State Department of Revenue, it'll go to the Blind Vendors Trust Fund."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Dunkin: "Okay. So, some of the money or all of the money will go to a Blind Vendors Trust Fund?"
- McAuliffe: "Well, I mean, the profits of it. The profits would go into the Blind Trust Fund and the rest would go to, ya know, to the blind vendors."
- Dunkin: "So, where would they get the money to purchase the goods and materials to sell to the various inmates?"
- McAuliffe: "Can you repeat that, Sir?"
- Dunkin: "Do you know where or who would pay for the products to be sold to the inmates that the vendors would be sellin'?"
- McAuliffe: "That would be the blind vendors. The State of Illinois's not giving them any additional dollars to do that. The State of Illinois isn't giving them any additional money, that would come from the blind vendors. They would start that themselves."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So, we would create, in essence, an agency or a program that a special group would administer, but... and all of the proceeds would go directly to them. Am I understanding that correctly?"
- McAuliffe: "Yeah. It's just like the Federal Law does that too.

 I'd be the same as the Federal Law."
- Dunkin: "Okay. I'm just curious as to why they're not administering that... this type of program here in the state already on top of why the Department of Human Services, the Department of Revenue, would be opposed to such a program?"
- McAuliffe: "Because it's not done all over and now it would be done all over the state."

Dunkin: "Okay."

McAuliffe: "So, I assume that... that would be their opposition."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Dunkin: "All right. Ya know, this is... I'm a little confused because you have two major agencies that are opposed to this... Will... will the Department of Human Services have any control over their activities of this specific program, Representative?"
- McAuliffe: "Yes, I believe they would administer the program as long as... as long as... as well as CMS too."
- Dunkin: "Well, I'm confused 'cause according to my analy... my analysis that... that's a bit... I'm confused. Where is that in the law that says they would adhere or administer this program if another special group is administering it?"
- McAuliffe: "It's in... Representative, it's in the Bill. If you look at the Bill in there it says that the Department of..."
- Dunkin: "What line in the Bill is it, Sir, what Section?"
- McAuliffe: "Okay. It's... well, it's right through the bear... the
 Bill here on page 3. It says secretary... it means the
 secretary of Human Services."
- Dunkin: "But will they... Would they have any control and I'd like to read that in the law where the secretary or the state would have to... some level of leverage or control over this group with this... with \$2 million that I'm not sure if we have or not."
- McAuliffe: "Yeah. I'm looking through the Bill too,

 Representative, here on page 5. They keep referring back to

 the secretary through the director, so…"
- Dunkin: "What does it say, Representative, on page 5? It... And can you... I wanna get on the same page as you are."
- McAuliffe: "Okay. It says, 'the secretary, through the director, shall continue, maintain and promote the business

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- enterprise program for the blind. Some or all of the functions that a program need be provided by the Department of Human Services.' And then it goes on listing different venues."
- Dunkin: "So, if that's the case, again, I'm very confused as to why they're opposing this Bill that's gonna cost an additional \$2 million that it seems that they won't have control over."
- McAuliffe: "Okay. From what I'm told, they're not... they're not opposed from the administrative standpoint, just from the DDS facilities."
- Dunkin: "Then it... Well, according to my analysis they are opposed to this measure for a number of reasons and I... Can you elaborate on at least two or three of those reasons why they would be opposed to such a legislation?"
- McAuliffe: "From... from what I believe, Representative, they want the DD peo... the DDD people to go in there, do what the blind vendors are gonna do and just administrate it that way. So, I guess that's their only opposition, just from... from the DDD people."
- Dunkin: "Okay. Representative... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's a great deal of confusion here with this Bill. The Department of Human Services and the Department of Revenue has been actively lobbying against this Bill because one, they will have very little or no control over this special group the fact that the \$2 million to go into the Department of Corrections and as the previous speaker before me elaborated on, it's a very awkward or very different type of position to have... to have

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

get this here, this particular group to be administering given the population that they'll be serving in. And I'm trying to get a sense of where we are legally with the Department of Human Services, Revenue, and how it is that they would administer or work with this group, but I'm not able to find that. And it seems as if, ya know, this is a... this is a very, very special interest approach to something that we will not have the complete or ultimate control over. Unless that question can be answered on this here, I would encourage a 'present' or a 'no' vote on this particular legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a few questions?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking at our analysis, specifically Section 10, the business enterprise program for the blind... I'll let you get there. Our analysis indicates that blind vendors would have a priority in the operation of all vending facilities on state property. Is that your understanding of how the Bill's written?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, it is, Representative."

Franks: "And it also indicates that the state... that state agencies may not allow competition with the blind vendor. Correct?"

McAuliffe: "For vending, yes, that's correct, Representative."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Franks: "Okay. Let me ask how that would happen here in the State Capitol. And you're on the first floor, when you walk in, there's a little vending kiosk there."

McAuliffe: "Um hmm."

Franks: "There's some people that have been running that for years. You get your ice cream and your sundries and things."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "If a blind vendor would make a proposal to have that vending, would the people who have been there need to be dispossessed because your Bill says there can be no competition?"

McAuliffe: "They would have until the end of their contract, I believe."

Franks: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you."

McAuliffe: "Yes, but they would have until the end of their contract, whenever their contract would have expired."

Franks: "Is there something in the Bill that would grandfather folks who already... Many people make a large investment when they're buying machines or buying the freezers or buying what they need to buy and I'm wondering if there's people who are already doing this job for the state and the way this is written, it seems to me that those peoples' contracts would be terminated."

McAuliffe: "Yes. Yes, there's no grandfathering in that. Now, there is definitions of a blind person. They may not be totally blind, but their eyesight may be dead, but I see what you're saying, Representative."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Franks: "Let's assume they meet all the criteria and they are blind and then they say, ya know, I'd really like to get the vending concession in the State Capitol. Would the people who have it there now... Under this Bill, it seems to me that they would be dispossessed and they'd move someone in... someone else in there who happens to be blind. Wouldn't you agree?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. Now, Representative, you've probably seen the gentleman there, the tall gentleman, I don't know what his condition is, he may fall under this criteria, I don't know. I'm not gonna say that..."

Franks: "Well, let's not..."

McAuliffe: "...but he may. But if he's not..."

Franks: "We can go to the State of Illinois Building..."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "...and how would that work as well. We... in the State of Illinois Building, for instance, and they have the food court in the basement."

McAuliffe: "The food... No. Rep... the food court, that private food court down in the basement of the J. R. Thompson Center, that would not affect this at all."

Franks: "Okay. But if you go on to the first floor where they have some vending machines, again, the people who have spent the money for those vending machines or have rented them or have purchased them they would be dispossessed and new... and new folks would come in. Correct?"

McAuliffe: "Yes. Yes, if they're not blind."

Franks: "Okay. We also in the Bill indicate that you won't charge any utility charges for someone who happens to be

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

blind, but you would charge utility for someone who isn't.

Can I understand the thought process you had where the state wouldn't even be able to recover their fixed costs?"

McAuliffe: "Can you ask me where you're reading that from, Representative, please?"

Franks: "I'm looking under Section 10. I'm looking... I'm not looking at the text, I'm looking at the analysis. What we have is that no state agency may impose any commission, service charge, rent or utility charge on blind vendors operating on state property."

McAuliffe: "Yeah. Yes, Representative, that's correct."

Franks: "Aren't we entitled to at least to cover our fixed costs?"

McAuliffe: "Representative, I mean, I see what you're saying. I mean, there are some concessions, I think, and negotiations that went on with this Bill to try and help people out... out that are blind. So, I mean..."

Franks: "We all wanna do that."

McAuliffe: "...we have to get... So, I think, ya know, I..."

Franks: "You were a cosponsor of the Bill I had 2 years ago where we wouldn't charge any more for information if you call the phone company, if you happen to be blind. Everyone here voted for it. I know you sponsored it."

McAuliffe: "Right."

Franks: "I'm just concerned here and I know that you wanna do well, we all wanna help, and there might be ways to do it with just tax breaks or things, but it just seems here it's so heavy-handed because if there's an existing business someone could walk in and take that business because they

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

happen to be blind. I also wonder... Let me as... Have you thought about any of the safety issues, because if you're dealing with a vending machine and you have a blind vendor and that individual... if it's a coin-operated machine or it's a dollar-operated machine, are we gonna have to provide additional security now when they... when those individuals are emptying out the machines?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah. I... Yeah. Representative, I don't know.

There's nothing that addresses that in the Bill, so."

Franks: "Now, this has already passed the Senate."

McAuliffe: "It passed. Well, we put Amendments on when we negotiated, both sides of the aisle, we put an Amendment on. It's gonna go back to the Senate and they would have to either... If the Bill would pass, then they would have to adopt our Amendments and then the Bill would go forth."

Franks: "Would you be... be willing to move this back to Second and do a little bit more work on it because I'm worried the way it's written that people who have invested a lot and spent a lot of time with their life, ya know, their life savings in these jobs could lose everything with the stroke of a Governor's pen."

McAuliffe: "I think with this then being as it is I don't even know if we're gonna get this Bill out, if we pass it today, if it'll even get out of the Senate depending on when we adjourn. So, I'm gonna try and move the Bill forward, Representative, but I appreciate your comments, though."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Will Davis."

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

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

- Davis, W.: "Representative, just a... just a... if you could answer a couple of questions for me. And particularly regarding the... the trust fund. I understand that DHS is opposed to this piece of legislation and it's my understanding that they're opposed because the monies that I... I believe will be put into the trust fund will take away from specific programs, particularly a job training program that they sponsor particularly in their mental health and developing... and developmental disa... disabled facilities. Is that correct?"
- McAuliffe: "Yes. From what I understand, Representative, it said that this Act would not affect those facilities because the Bill's would... is intended and designed to be a training facilities rather than profit generating facilities and in this Bill it'd be specific criteria to determine whether a facility is a suitable site and these snack bars don't meet... do not meet the criteria. So, I don't think that would happen."
- Davis, W.: "So, then why are they still opposed to it, because that was a specific objection that I was told that they had and you're saying that they will no... that they will be exempt or those facilities or those dollars will not be affected by this Bill, but yet they're still opposed."
- McAuliffe: "It would... Okay. Central Management Services they would say... they would say what the criteria is, of what is exempt and what is not. It may be for that reason, ya know, they may have opposition 'cause they're not sure where... where, ya know, what definition a site would be."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Davis, W.: "Okay. One other thing, Representative. A previous speaker asked about the Department of Corrections and that they'd be taken out of this Bill. Were you willing to agree to that?"
- McAuliffe: "Representative, this Bill has started negotiating for almost three weeks with both sides of the aisle cooperation from all the, ya know, from both staffs and from different state agencies. The Department of Corrections was in the… in the negotiations and, ya know, we're just tried to negotiate in good faith."
- Davis, W.: "So... I'm sorry. Was that a 'yes' or a 'no' with the Department of Corrections? I'm sorry."
- McAuliffe: "Like in your case with the Department of Corrections, the commissaries aren't included, just the vending machines. So, I think that's the part where they have, ya know, where they have their opposition."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I just understand that was a request that was made earlier and I was just curious to know whether you're willing to negotiate on that request or not. That was my... that was what I was asking, that's all. And if so, just let me say for the record that if you're willing to negotiate with the Department of Corrections, I'm sure the Department of Human Services would like to also be included in that in terms of those things that could possibly be exempted out of this Bill and not affected by it."

McAuliffe: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "I... You don't have to answer that."

McAuliffe: "Well, okay."

Davis, W.: "I'm just letting you know..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

McAuliffe: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "...that if you're gonna negotiate with one agency, there is a second agency that would like to be a part of that negotiation on their own behalf. Okay?"

McAuliffe: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Representative."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig in the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative, is there any percentage of blind people that a blind vendor must employ in order to comply with this?"

McAuliffe: "You wouldn't... There's... You'd get incentive for you to... to employ a blind person."

Mulligan: "So, you only have to be a blind owner you don't necessarily have to have blind employees?"

McAuliffe: "Correct, correct."

Mulligan: "So..."

McAuliffe: "You could hire the DD guys if you wanted to. It's just that the blind..."

Mulligan: "So, why... If someone has a lot of money and they're blind or they're blind and they're a veteran, we've kind of given them carte blanche and there's no competition here any longer for other people to bid and they're not necessarily employing blind people. Is that correct?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

McAuliffe: "Yes, Representative. And then part of that, their salaries or money they would make would go into the Blind Vendors Trust Fund too."

Mulligan: "So, they don't have to meet an income standard and they don't have to hire blind people, so someone that is wealthy and is blind and has this kind of company can come in, get an edge on the bid ... I understand what the concept was originally for this. It just seems to me that this really gives them carte blanche a little bit overboard, so I'm not quite sure where you're going with this or why you would not put some regulation on the type of employment or how many people they'd have to employ because all we're doing is giving an edge to a blind business owner who may be quite wealthy and own other businesses and I understand some of the reasoning behind it but I would think that part of it would be that they have to employ so many people that are blind or disabled or they would still be on an even footing to compete to some extent. If they have no competition, what keeps them from overcharging the state and the people that they're selling things to? I... I'm not quite sure how to... I understand that."

McAuliffe: "There's a... Representative, there's a provision in here that would clear up what you just asked me."

Mulligan: "There is... there..."

McAuliffe: "Yeah."

Mulligan: "...there is something there that would keep them from overcharging or being noncompetitive?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Mulligan: "Okay. Do they have to promulgate rules for this or is all of it encompassed in the Bill? It looks to me like it's quite extensive."

McAuliffe: "I think it's pretty much spoken for in the Bill. I mean, that could always happen, ya know."

Mulligan: "The Bill has everything in it."

McAuliffe: "I think so, yes."

Mulligan: "Yeah. It looked like it had a lot. How come DHS is opposed to this? It says, DHS, Department of Revenue, Department of Corrections, Department of Agriculture, Department of Central Management Services and AFSCME are all opposed to the Bill even as it is amended."

McAuliffe: "Again, Representative, because the DHS opposes it because of the training that they do with the DDD facilities."

Mulligan: "Ya know, I work a lot on the General Assembly with the disabled or people that are disadvantaged, but and I certainly respect where you're going with this Bill. I just think it's... eliminates competition and certainly could allow someone that's quite wealthy to come in and get an edge over other bidders in a contract and that bothers me just a little bit about this. I... I wish it wasn't quite as extensive in giving them every edge that ever was and that's what it appears to be. So, thank you."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Graham."

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

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

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Graham: "Representative, what is the... where does this Bill come from?"

McAuliffe: "Representative, this Bill came from the Senate. I picked it up April 3. The chairman of the Illinois Committee on Blind Vendors lives in my district. I talked with him, both sides of the aisle in this chamber, negotiated with this Bill with different state agencies. Towards the end of these talks and towards the end of our Session, there are some people that are still not completely happy with the Bill. We tried to make as many people happy as we could, but again, to your original question, this is from a constituent of mine, John Gordon, who's the chairman of the Illinois Committee on Blind Vendors."

Graham: "Thank you, Representative. I also have some vendors who reside in my district as well. Would you say that this Bill was drafted... based on some of the comments from some previous speakers... would you say that this Bill was drafted because the vendors somehow felt that they were being excluded when it came down to being considered for the contracts to begin with. Would you say that that's why the Bill came about?"

McAuliffe: "That could be, Representative, I don't know."

Graham: "Okay."

McAuliffe: "I'm not sure."

Graham: "So you haven't... you weren't involved with some of the prior conversations. I've had a number of meetings with them in terms of them talking to me about whether or not they should have had first right of refusal to some of the state contracts that were coming down the line and they felt

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

that they were being excluded. So, you're not sure if this is why this Bill was drafted?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah. From hearing your remarks, Representative,

I'd probably say 'yes' I did... agree with you."

Graham: "Yeah. Okay. Would you say that... A question has just come up that by doing this piece of legislation that the price of the items in the vending machine would go up?"

McAuliffe: "There's protections in the Bill. Another Representative asked me that question and there's provisions in the Bill so they couldn't do that."

Graham: "Oh. It couldn't... it wouldn't go up?"

McAuliffe: "No, they couldn't go up."

Graham: "It couldn't?"

McAuliffe: "Right."

Graham: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Graham: "I stand in support. Sometimes we draft legislation that doesn't quite fit right and sometimes we do things and we have to see them play out to see the real impact. I've been here maybe just a short period of time, maybe just 4 years and I've heard a lot of different arguments and pro and cons... pro and cons on various subjects and sometimes we put a little more yeast where the yeast we think it may benefit us. But sometimes we have to make these tough votes and this is one of 'em. The blind vendors in my district talked to me quite often on this measure and they felt like they were being excluded when it came down to being considered for the contract and when I talked to the Department of Human Services or the various people who were

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

in charge with distributing or awarding the contracts, they didn't have a clear explanation as to why the blind vendors weren't being first... given first refusal to it. So, if this is a measure to help put some... set some of that straight and reinforce what we thought we had done in the past, I fully support it and I do know that this would be a tough vote for... tough vote for some folks but I think it's worth... worth the opportunity. Thanks."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I enjoyed answering the questions. Again, this is for a constituent of mine, John Gordon, who's chairman of the Illinois Blind Vendors. I'd like to thank the staff for the negotiations and for the Sponsors. I have over 40 Sponsors on this legislation. I just hope that... 38 and just hope I have a 'yes' vote. 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... Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes' and 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie. Representative Currie, you're recognized for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 626 can be heard in State Government, Senate Bill 830 in Executive, Senate Bill 1028 in Environment & Energy, Senate Bill 1268

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

in Executive, Senate Bill 2333 in Executive, House Resolution 1230 in International Trade & Commerce, House Resolution 1235 in Agriculture, and House Joint Resolution 127 in the Committee on the Executive. I know of no opposition. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted and the posting requirements are suspended. Representative Delgado, you have Senate Bill 2339. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2339, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Delgado."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Delgado: Senate Bill 2339 as amended makes several changes to the Minimum Wage law. The Bill adds minimum liability companies to the definition of an 'employer required to pay minimum wage'. In addition, the Bill adds subpoena powers to the director of the Department of Labor which is consistent with the powers of the director under other labor laws. additionally, it makes two clarifications. The first change is in response to a court decision that an employee was only able to collect the 2 percent penalty of unpaid wages by going through the Department of Labor. And Senate Bill 2339 allows the court to directly award the 2 percent penalty to an employee when they have not been paid the minimum wage. And the second clarification reduces the standard for punitive penalties of 20 percent, the old standard for triggering these punitive penalties was willful and wanton.

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Senate Bill 2339 as amended changes this to repeated and intentional. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2339. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

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

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

Durkin: "Representative Delgado, can you explain to me the subpoena power of which we are giving the director of the Department of Labor under this legislation?"

Delgado: "Yes. Thank you, Representative Durkin. The subpoena power that this creates for the director puts him in line and consistent with other directors under other labor laws. It also assists the department in expediting in collections and it saddens me, I had a note that I wanted to read from and I still may have it here. It will allow us to be able to give the director subpoena authority regarding all books, records, and other evidence relative to a matter under investigation or hearing by the department. The department cannot effectively enforce the law... laws without such subpoena authority which it's had for most of the other laws it enforces."

Durkin: "So, the director of the Department of Labor could be investigating an employer who is under investigation for not complying with this Act which is 820 ILCS 115/14 which is a Class C misdemeanor..."

Delgado: "That's correct."

Durkin: "...it's a criminal offense which even though it's the lowest in the chain... in the food chain of criminal offenses,

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

it is still a jailable offense. Now, the question I have here, the way it's written it states that if a person fails to comply with any subpoena lawfully issued under this Section or a witness refuses to produce evidence or testify to any matter regarding which... which he or she may be lawfully interrogated, the court shall, upon application of the director, compel obedience by proceedings for contempt. Now, the question I have, if someone's being investigated for a Class C misdemeanor, a criminal offense, how can the director compel their attendance or their testimony if they're asserting the Fifth Amendment privilege, when they are subject to a criminal offense at the same time? That is... flies in the face of all laws and I think you understand that."

Delgado: "Yes, I do, Representative Durkin. I can only suggest that this was reviewed by the Law Department on both the Labor Department and our staff and with that said and done, I would intelligently assume that the discretion's gotten:

a) is the director can have his subpoena power, but to bring him in, that's a question I really can't answer other than the fact that there have to be some discretion in the court... under... during the due process."

Durkin: "Well, I would... I would ask this, if you could... I mean, we're still not that late in the Session. You can make this a better Bill. You can get this issue over with if you had the inclusion that the... that the person, this enforcement power, this... which the director has, it's lawful unless that party has a reasonable Fifth Amendment privilege against

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- self-incrimination because they are being investigated for a criminal offense."
- Delgado: "Yes. I'm willin' to discuss that with you,

 Representative. I think that obviously we will like them to

 keep this legislation moving."
- Durkin: "Well, we could keep it moving. I... All I'm asking is that we just make it perfectly clear that if someone does have their Fifth Amendment privilege, that... and they assert a privilege of Fifth Amendment and it's reasonable that the court cannot compel any type of contempt proceedings against them 'cause you can't penalize someone... you can't penalize somebody for..."
- Delgado: "No, I understand your reasoning, but I'm having a hard time hearing. I'm hav..."
- Durkin: "...you can't penalize somebody for exerting their constitutional privilege which is their Fifth Amendment..."
- Delgado: "Absolutely."
- Durkin: "...when the ultimate penalty is... which is a jailable offense. So that's..."
- Delgado: "Have you... Do you recommend..."
- Durkin: "Can you change this? Can you take it out? Can you just... I can help ya. It'll take me two minutes to write it for you, if you want."
- Delgado: "Absolutely. I think that's a good way to go and to solidify it. I agree with your legal reasoning on it and at this point, I'd pull it from the record so we can go ahead, 'cause this is gonna require a technical Amendment, Jim."

Durkin: "That's..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Delgado: "And with that I have no problem in doing that. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I do believe that the next few days I'm packed here through the..."

Speaker Hannig: "So, we'll take it out of the record. Okay. So, we'll take that Bill out of the record. On page 4 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 2654. Mr. Clerk, would you return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 2664, Representative Scully. Representative Scully, do you wish us to read this Bill on Third? Out of the record. Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish us to read Senate Bill 3018? Representative Chapa LaVia, should we read this Bill on Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3018, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank... thank you, Speaker and Members of the Assembly. This Bill went through a couple changes with the help of Representative Rose and Durkin. And it's just like I said the other day about the Amendment, it cleans up the language to ensure that the Bill does not apply to people with only physical or no mental disabilities. And it also ensures that it only applies to people in supervisory... supervised residential living situations. What the actual Bill does is it puts in a couple definitions on sexual conduct where a person with disability occurs and the capacity to consent to the... to the act of. So, I would appreciate your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 3018. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. question, there are 106 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Delgado, on the Bill that you took from the record, did you wish to return that to Second? Yeah. So, Mr. Clerk, Representative Delgado wishes to return Senate Bill 2339 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 17. Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish us to read this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 17, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's two parts to Senate Bill 17, the first dealing with the Southern Illinois Economic Development Authority. It creates authority that covers counties: Franklin, Perry, Randolph, Jackson, Wilson, Saline, Gallatin, Union, Johnson, Pope, Hardin, Alexander, Pulaski and Massac. The Authority Board will consist of six members

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

appointed by the Governor, 14 members appointed by their respective county board chairs and the director of DCEO with the ex officio member. The Authority will be permitted to issue up to 250 million in bonds and the Authority has no impact on existing regional development authorities. second part of this Bill creates what's known as the River's Edge Redevelopment Initiative. The program is a joint initiative by DE... DCEO and the IEPA and will design a two pilot... two pilot areas: one in Aurora and one in East St. These communities will act as prototypes as DCEO hopes to expand the program in the future to other riverfront communities such as the Quad Cities, Chicago, LaSalle, Peru, Danville, Elgin, Joliet, Rockford, Peoria and Quincy. Environmentally contaminated riverfront areas will be redeveloped so they can be used for commercial, retail and other uses. Developers and business located in the zones are eligible for tax exemptions similar to those that exist in enterprise zones currently, including a sales tax exemption on building material and investment in jobs tax credits and various other deductions. A unique feature of the... the River's Edge Redevelopment Initiative environmental remediation tax credit for cleanup costs. And I would... I would take any questions or request 'aye' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, on the Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Representative, this is \$20 million every year?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "Well, the program is gonna be a 5-year pilot program and it's supposed to be divvied in between East St. Louis and Aurora. The... A capital budget would need to be passed to equip this with the dollars needed. For right now, in the two areas and speaking more so for Aurora area, the city has already come up with a commitment..."

Parke: "I asked..."

Chapa LaVia: "...of 90 million to start..."

Parke: "I only asked is this 20..."

Chapa LaVia: "...those areas."

Parke: "I asked is this 20 million per year for 5 years? Yes or no."

Chapa LaVia: "Up to 20 million a year."

Parke: "For 5 years it's 20 million, so it's a... The pilot project's a hundred million dollar pilot project."

Chapa LaVia: "I... I don't think that's correct, Representative Parke."

Parke: "You just told me."

Chapa LaVia: "I really do think... I really do think it's only 20 for the... Let me through..."

Parke: "Well, is it 20 per year or is it 20 over the 5 years?"

Chapa LaVia: "It's... The way I... I understand the Bill, it's

20 for the 5 years for the two pilot programs between the

two... the two areas."

Parke: "Okay. Is this is this a... is this part of a capital budget or is this General Revenue Fund?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, it stands alone. It is part... it's part of an initiative through the capital budget but..."

Parke: "It's a capital budget. It's no General Revenue Funds."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "No."

Parke: "And how's the money gonna be spent?"

Chapa LaVia: "The money will be spent in a couple different areas, different programs. The sales tax exemption, there's about one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine... nine areas tale... sales tax exemption, investment income tax credit, job income tax credit, River's Edge site remediation income tax credit, dividend income tax deductions, interest income tax deductions, charitable contribution income tax reductions, property tax abatement and probably the largest component of this is the IEPA's Municipal Brownfields Redevelopment Grant Program. Presently, right now, the majority of cities that already have an enterprise zone could already go after these grants, as they... they stand alone. The interesting part of the Bill is when it comes to riverfronts and helping developers remediate all the contaminated area and that's what's added into it. The Bill itself it just puts it into a nice bundle. Prior to this, anybody can go after most of these."

Parke: "Well, it just seems strange... Do all of these have riverboats? Are all of these towns have riverboats or..."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, the pilot program itself, it's starting in East St. Louis and Aurora."

Parke: "Okay. If other communities wanted to go into this pilot project, do you have to have a enaling... enabling..."

Chapa LaVia: "An enterprise..."

Parke: "Do you have additional legislation to do so? Will we need additional legislation?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "After we create this program and we learn from the failures of both areas, right now DCEO's looking for areas to put this into after this one or during this one because we're already... I know Aurora and like I said, I can't speak for East St. Louis and I know Ms. Younge has been working really hard on a program like this, but I'm thinking the turnaround rate is gonna be more like 3 years and once it's done, then we go on to a different area. And I'd be more than happy to help other people with different areas."

Parke: "Do you... Have you negotiated with the Governor's budgeteers that there, in fact, is this \$20 million in the budget?"

Chapa LaVia: "We... we have and we've been in negotiation and like I said, the Bill itself does stand alone and it does need capital budget to be proved."

Parke: "So, you've said 'yes', the Governor's agreed to fund this. It's in the budget."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative, where's this money coming from?"

Chapa LaVia: "It would be coming from the capital budget."

Mulligan: "So, if there's no capital budget, it won't be there?"

Chapa LaVia: "However, some of the set ups we'll still be able to get because of the enterprise zone."

Mulligan: "So, any river... any community on a river at some point might be able to go for this?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, Ma'am."

Mulligan: "Don't you think this is a little bit of money to be going for something like this when we are having a hard time sweeping funds like the LUST Fund was swept which would take care of underground storage tanks. Money... money that I don't understand, money that was community project money for us 4 years ago which went to flooding, economic development is still sitting in a fund and the Governor has used... my understanding is most of the authority for the Illinois FIRST bonds which were covered by revenue sources that we voted for but now all of a sudden you're looking at a capital budget that has no revenue sources and you're proposing a Bill that would put a lot of money into something without paying off previous commitments communities in similar areas and you have complete, good feeling about going ahead and... and doing this without worrying about having ever passed or paid for past obligations?"

Chapa LaVia: "That's a very good question, Representative Mulligan, but the... the fact is that Aurora has already started the program in the sense that we've already dedicated 90 million into the redevelopment of both sides of the rivers. So, I understand your concern and I've spoken to quite a few Members about their concern and..."

Mulligan: "If there was a program for riverboats, which you all in that community and some of those communities had that was supposed to put additional money into the communities, why isn't that taking care of these issues?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "I wasn't here when that piece of legislation was written, Representative Mulligan, but I have..."

Mulligan: "I'm sorry, what?"

Chapa LaVia: "I wasn't here initially when the piece of legislation was written for the riverboats, as far as how the money is dedicated, but I would think that we need to re..."

"Well, you live in a community that gets money. Mulligan: sure you know what the financial arrangement is for your community to get money back from that riverboat. I would be surprised that any Legislator that lived in one of those communities didn't know pretty much to the dollar what was happening there. It's kinda like the Governor's ad, I suppose, on if you're there you know what it is. Is that... is that where we're going with this? So, I live in a community that has a river's edge and it has great flooding and I had money in the budget 4 years ago for money that went to my community on flooding, which this Governor has said he's going to pay or give the check to the local communities maybe four times and then the check is in the mail. We don't believe that anymore because the check never shows up and so now you're passing a Bill and you're gonna pass a budget without any of us and you'll have perks once again in this budget. Isn't this just a \$20 million perk for your community on who knows what's going to happen with something when you already have a riverboat that pays part of your community?"

Chapa LaVia: "I... I don't think that's a fair assessment. I respect your... your assessment, but I don't think it's a fair

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

assessment. Aurora is the second-largest city in Illinois and we have never had the ability to come to the table to finish a program. We've been trying to do this for 25 years on the riverfront with the support of the Speaker of the House, Hastert and other people in the area. So, ya know, we all are here and represented by our communities to come down here and fight what we can get for our districts. So, I respectfully disagree."

Mulligan: "Well, I don't disagree. If you're looking at a capital Bill with no kind of revenue to pay for it and yet you're willing to move forward with this Bill and you have no idea of what kind of revenue would pay for it or no kind of vote to put on it except maybe raiding a pension fund once again for a budget and yet you come forth with a Bill that's gonna put \$20 million in one community that already has a riverboat. Don't you think that's a little bit..."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's not just one community, it's both pilots and it could be up to that. I'm not assuming that we're gonna be using all that money 'cause, like I said earlier, the City of Aurora currently budget 30 million are allocated for infrastructure improvements of the two loca... the locations there in Aurora. Aurora's dedicated 15 million this year alone to land acquisition environmental rema... redimi... redimi... remediation of brownfields. Aurora's already created two TIF districts for both sides of the river as we... One developer, well respected in Kane County, has already received approval for 20 million in the TIF district the other one has received approval for 25 million. And then, like I said earlier, the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

total that Aurora is willing to come to the table and belly-up with is already 90 million for the brownfield redevelopment. And ya know, we're... like I said, we're all... we're all here in our respective districts not only represent the whole state but also to represent our constituency. And I've been asked to do this. It was the mayor's idea as far as putting a program like this together. He's the president of the Illinois chapter of National Brownfield Association for this state."

Mulligan: "Representative, I respect your right to go after whatever you can for your community, but I... you also have to respect my right to point out that the... this government, the State Government, has had obligations to many communities, particularly on this side of the aisle for 4 years that they have not paid off. You also are doing things that are putting in the way you're presenting a budget and the way you're trying to present a capital budget to put the people that I represent in jeopardy. So, I feel that it's perfectly all right for you to go for things that are gonna benefit your community, but it's within my right to point out that it's fiscally irresponsible."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Chapa LaVia: "I just wanna thank everybody for the interesting debate and hopefully I'll get a 'yes' votes. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, we're gonna have a Roll Call vote on the Amendment. So, all in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'; all in... opposed to the Amendment vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes' and 24 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise? Okay. Rep... Mr. Clerk, why don't you read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 17, a Bill for an Act in relation to economic development. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I think that we heard enough debate earlier. If you'd have anymore questions, please... please go ahead and rise. Otherwise I really would appreciate your support on this Bill. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentle... the Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 17. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your inquiry."
- Black: "What is the debate status of the Bill?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Speaker Hannig: "The Calendar says Short Debate, but the Chair typically just uses Standard Debate when a number of people wish to speak. So, we're on Standard Debate."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is a hundred and... almost a hundred and thirty pages. I would ask that you give this unlimited debate without allowing someone to cut it off because they're hungry. This Bill is a very complicated Bill and I'm not about to vote or stand up and do headstands on a Bill that is extremely complicated. We weren't allowed to debate the Bill unlimited on the... while it was... on the Amendment. I would prefer that we have unlimited debate on a hundred and thirty page Bill that most of us have seen for the last 15 minutes."
- Speaker Hannig: "I... I think it was adopted in the Revenue Committee on the 18th, but nevertheless, Representative Black, we'll have unlimited debate and if you wish to speak, please proceed."
- Black: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, on page 11 of the Amendment, line 23, it appears... Well, first of all, let me back up. It was my understanding that the Southwest... what is it, the Southwest Illinois Economic Development Authority Act was not in Amendment 3, but I find that it is. Correct?"
- Chapa LaVia: "The... the Southern Illinois Economic Development Authority was created... It was a Bill that was mere... married in the mine and Representative Bradley is running it down the south. I think there was some Members... I know, speaking to Representative Bost that were cut out of an authority in a earlier time."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Black: "All right. So. so, that that still that is in the Bill, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Black: "All right. Now, on page 11 it talks about that Authority being able to issue \$250 million in bonds. And then down on line 23 it says, 'all such bonds, notes, or other evidence of indebtedness may be payable solely and only from the revenues or income to be derived from loans made', ta da, ta da, ta da. I... I don't find anywhere in this Amendment that that \$250 million that the Southern Illinois Economic Development Corporation is allowed to issue is, in fact, not a moral obligation of the state. Where is that language that specifically states the state is not responsible for the \$250 million that the Southern Illinois Economic Development Commission can issue?"

Chapa LaVia: "I'll be right with you, Representative. A Representative from this side asked the same question when we married the two together, Representative Black, and it is not... the state is not on the hook for the payment of those bonds."

Black: "That... that's my understanding."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Black: "And I thought... I thought Speaker Madigan had made it clear earlier in the Session that these Authorities should not be able to issue bonds that become the full faith and credit of the State of Illinois, but I didn't find that exclusion anywhere in the Amendment."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Chapa LaVia: "Correct. That's why I'm getting the full language so we can reverify that, but you are correct. That was one of the concerns that Representative Jack Franks had."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Black, your... your time has expired. Would you like to bring your remarks to a close."

Black: "Well..."

- Speaker Hannig: "Perhaps one of your... your cohorts would like to yield some time. Representative Myers is gonna yield ya 5 minutes of his time."
- Black: "All right. And thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Representative Myers. On page 17 of the Amendment, Article 10 starts out, the River Edge Redevelopment Zone Act, line 27. Can you point out in any subsequent pages of that Amendment where is... where is there reference to \$20 million from bonds that are the full faith and credit of the State of Illinois?"
- Chapa LaVia: "There... there is no reference. It's subject to approval."
- Black: "So, that... there's no mention of where the \$20 million comes from?"
- Chapa LaVia: "No, there isn't."
- Black: "Well, Representative, if there's no mention in the enabling Act, how in the world can we spend \$20 million of capital dollars that we don't have on a... on a Bill that doesn't say anything about... I can't even find where it says \$20 million, period."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's the ability to bond up to."

Black: "Well..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Chapa LaVia: "Are you talking about River's Edge, Representative Black, or are you talking about the Southern..."
- Black: "Yes."
- Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Because... No. River Edge you can't bond.

 It's a totally different program. The Southern Illinois

 Economic Development Authority is totally separate from the
 River's Edge."
- Black: "No. I'm... I'm out of that. I'm in Article 10 where it starts to talk about the River Edge Act. It's on page..."
- Chapa LaVia: "There is no bonding in the River's Edge Redevelopment Act."
- Black: "Well, that's... I guess that's my concern. If there's no enabling legislation where... how do you get the money? Some... somewhere... I... what... All right. Is it gonna be in a 'bimp' Bill?"
- Chapa LaVia: "It... it's in the budget."
- Black: "All right. So, the money's gonna be in a budget implementation Bill, but there's no language in here that talks about how much money..."
- Chapa LaVia: "But it's... I'm sorry."
- Black: "There's no language in the Bill that says how much money. I mean, that there's... it could be 2 billion for all I know 'cause... Ya know when I'll get the 'bimp' Bill, don't ya, about 15 minutes before we're asked to vote on it."
- Chapa LaVia: "It will not be in the budget implementation Bill.

 It'll be in the actual budget. It's an... These are all... the majority of these are all EPA grants."
- Black: "So, this was in the Governor's budget."
- Chapa LaVia: "These... the majority, they're EPA."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Black: "And you... you assured me... you're assuring me that what the Governor requested for this is gonna be passed in the budget. It may be the only thing he requested that's adopted point and counterpoint in the budget. I'm still waitin' for my Book of the Month Club. I've got little grandkids just cryin' their heart out they didn't get those five books a month they were supposed to get."
- Chapa LaVia: "I haven't see the… the budget. I don't think anybody's seen the budget, so I don't know actually what's in there. You have?"
- Black: "You haven't seen the budget, either? Now, I don't feel so bad. All right. This is a strange way to do business. But let me ask you one more question. You said earlier that other cities along the river... that have a river and a brownfields... could perhaps apply for a cleanup."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Black: "Do you know how that application process will work?"

Chapa LaVia: "The applications will be available through DCEO..."

Black: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...and the EPA, so both organizations."

Black: "I think that's... I think that's very important because many of us have brownfields areas. I have an old General Motors plant with a landfill that goes right up to the river's edge and obviously, at some point, we'd like to get it cleaned up. So, you're saying, in effect, the City of Tilton could at some point apply for a grant, perhaps receive the grant."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. Correct, Representative Black. And what I did is initially when Members came to me and asked to be on the Bill originally, 'cause it was gonna be a great..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Chapa LaVia: "...great deal of cities, I ask... I reached out to DCEO and EPA and asked them to contact those Representatives and start them on the process. 'Cause there's a lot of things that you could put in place right now, like the enterprise zone and just building a relationship with... so your cities start saving up the money..."

Black: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...for the program."

Black: "All right. I... I appreciate that, particularly since I do have a city that may qualify. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "I favor the concept of the Bill. I think it's a good idea. I just... At the risk of being a pathetic blow-hard, this is a strange way to do business. There is nothing in the Bill that says how much money is going to be involved, how the appropriation will be handled, or how the application procedure will be handled. Allegedly, it's in the budget. I will take the Sponsor's word for it, it must be in the budget. It's a good idea, but it's presented in a way that we did not use to do here..."

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

Black: "Yeah, I will, Mr. Speaker and thank you for your indulgence. All I'm saying, and I'm not being critical, there's some good ideas in this Bill. But it's awfully hard

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

sometimes to vote on a Bill that says we're gonna spend 20 million, but there's nothing in the Bill that says that. We could spend 20 million; we could spend 40 million; we could spend a hundred million. It doesn't give a funding source, which is unusual to say the least, and I think violates what the Governor said in his budget address. If you send me something without a revenue source, I'm going to veto it. I'm going to hold the Governor at his word. I hope he has a revenue source because I think there are many cities who would like to get their riverfronts developed and their brownfields, certainly along the river, cleaned up. And it's for that reason, I'll vote 'yes', but this is a strange way to create what I think is probably a good idea but with not enough details to really give us anything to put our teeth in. Having said that, I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

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

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

Eddy: "Representative, I just have a couple questions to make sure I'm clear on issues related to the Southern Illinois Economic Development Authority portion of this. My understanding is that, from the previous questions, that the state is not on the hook for the moral obligation... for any moral obligation bonds associated with this?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, correct."

Eddy: "So, it's... it's consistent with the types of economic development authorities that we've been handling this year?" Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Eddy: "Can you tell me what specific differences there are between the... the portions of this Bill that constitute the Economic Development Authority Act from other Economic Development Authority Acts, specifically related to the naming of the members of this? When members are named to the authority in this Bill, how does that take place?"

Chapa LaVia: "There's a portion that are appointed by DCEO and then the other portion is appointed by county board chairs of the counties within the Southern Illinois Economic Development Authority."

Eddy: "So, it's consistent that the Governor..."

Chapa LaVia: "So..."

Eddy: "...does not have sole authority to name the members of this board?"

Chapa LaVia: "No."

Eddy: "And that's also consistent. There is a provision to my understanding in Senate Bill 17 that... that allows an executive director of this authority to be paid a salary. Is that... is that your understanding that the executive director would receive a salary?"

Chapa LaVia: "Let me check the Bill real quick."

Eddy: "Representative, while you're lookin' I'll ask a couple of other questions as my time slowly winds down here."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm not finding it yet that's why I haven't gotten back to you..."

Eddy: "I understand..."

Chapa LaVia: "...and if it was, it would have to be appropriated through the budget."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Eddy: "...and as mentioned earlier, this is a... it's a long Bill.

 I guess my point is that in some of the other economic development authorities that are set up... I'm not being critical, maybe this is something... for example, in the authority that I set up on the southeastern part of the state, we need to revisit because obviously it would be easier for the authority to run if it had an executive director working it rather than, ya know, multi-county efforts to try to put something together. But my understanding in this Bill is that there is a... an executive director that's paid by DCEO?"
- Chapa LaVia: "There is a paid executive director for the... the Southern Illinois Economic Development Authority and it's paid through DCEO, but it has to come through the budget as well."
- Eddy: "Would the board have the authority to hire that executive director then? Does that authority... or does that authority come from..."
- Chapa LaVia: "The board appoints the person."
- Eddy: "And then that person is paid a salary. The other thing. There's nothing that I find in the Bill that directs the Auditor General to audit the Authority in this particular setup wherein the others there seems to be an audit authority for the Auditor General. Is that a fair differential to note here? And I'm just askin' and I haven't had a chance to read, obviously, the whole Bill, but those are..."
- Chapa LaVia: "The Authority in the Bill itself on page 17. It says, 'the authority shall annually submit a report of its

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

finances to the Auditor General and the authority shall annually submit a report for its activities to the Governor and the General Assembly."

Eddy: "Okay. So, there is an Auditor General audit..."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Eddy: "...of that Authority? Okay. Thank you very much."

Chapa LaVia: "You're... you're welcome."

Eddy: "And Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to ask some questions to get some clarification on those issues. And I certainly intend to support this type of development. I just wanted to make sure that we're headed in a consistent direction as we establish these around the state. And based on the answers, I... I think I may come back and look for some things that... that I might try to improve in the Authority that I set up. But I also intend to vote for the legislation and hope this does the type of economic stimulation that... that you're looking for. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson."

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

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

Munson: "Representative, I've heard from one of my communities who's under the impression that they would be eligible to apply for these funds within a year. Is that outlined or specified in this legislation that other communities will be able to apply for these grants?"

Chapa LaVia: "Currently, right now, there is a mechanism for Elgin to apply but because this is a pilot program the... the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

completion of the two programs would have to happen before we'd take on a new city."

Munson: "How long is this pilot program for?"

Chapa LaVia: "The pilot program is in the Bill to run for 5 years. I'm not seeing... foreseeing that taking Aurora that long. I don't know about East St. Louis, but the quicker we get done the better off for everybody in the state 'cause it is a pretty outstanding program and I know your mayor has shown a lot of interest in making sure that Elgin does get on the ball."

Munson: "What... what are the outcomes that you're expecting in order to move this from being a pilot program into being a full-fledged state-funded program?"

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Munson: "What are the outcomes that are going to move this from a pilot program into a full-fledged program that all communities, who are river communities, could apply?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, by 2009 the General Assembly is supposed to re... have received a report from our failures, our successes, how it rolls out, who would be next in line. Currently, right now, you could start the process especially... I don't know, do you have an enterprise zone in Elgin? You qualify for seven of those grants presently, that you could contact DCEO and EPA and start that... the ball rolling. But it's not until the completion of the program and the General Assembly will receive a report on the completion of the two programs and then how to open up the gates for everyone else."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Munson: "So, there's nothing in the legislation that would provide that communities could apply for this grant before the pilot program is over?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, because it is a pilot program we wanna make sure that we get all the kinks out, if you will..."

Munson: "So, they're impr..."

Chapa LaVia: "...and I'm hoping by that time, too, that the cities will have put aside money to help because the cities are picking up a large portion of this. Like I said, we're in for 90 million and we're dedicated to the program working, period. So, I'd hope that the commitment would be there from other cities too."

Munson: "Okay. You know while I do represent Elgin I also represent another commun... all of my communities are along the river and I have one that has some water supply contamination, MTBE contamination in all of their public wells and we've been working with the EPA in trying to get some financial assistance for cleanup. Will this affect those funds that are available for brownfield cleanups for contaminated water supply cleanups?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, maybe we can work on, from this program, we can work on another program that has to do with cities that aren't on a river source. I'd be more than happy to, ya know, share all the information that I... we've been working on for nine months on this program with you, Representative Munson."

Munson: "Okay. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

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

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

Winters: "Representative, I talked to you last week about the possibility of the Rockford community being included in this language. Can you explain why it was not allowed in?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, first of all, it's... it's not cost prohibitive if we do receive the money for the program."

Winters: "It's... it's not..."

Chapa LaVia: "It's not... it's co... there... we don't have money. So, we're... what... what's happened is the initial program itself was developed... the genesis of this was Mayor Weisner. It wasn't DCEO, it wasn't the Governor, it wasn't EPA. My... my mayor came up with this idea. Initially, and I didn't see the whole program until last Monday. I've spoken with your mayor and we're looking at expanding his enterprise zone so he can... in the areas he's really concerned with is like 40 acres of brownfield... that he can start the process of starting to apply for at least seven of these grants in hoping that Rockford will be right there when the prototype is done."

Winters: "Well, I guess my major concern is we... we've selected two for a pilot project. Often we want to look for re... are our communities that lack resources and Aurora, as I understand the Bill, Aurora and East St. Louis are the two communities that are selected as the pilot projects. Both of them have access to something that the Rockford community doesn't, that Representative Mautino in LaSalle-Peru, another major downstate community, that would love to have

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

access. Neither of... none of those three communities have any access to the riverboats."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

"And those riverboats were initially approved for Winters: riverfront communities, not only because they had the river to float the boats, but because they were in need of economic development. How did we end up with communities that already have access to millions of dollars from the riverboats, now we're gonna start a new program and again, target those at communities that already have access to the riverboats? Wouldn't it be more fair to look at communities that don't have a riverboat, for some reason or other in their past, who are economically distressed, that In fact, Rockford is have higher than normal unemployment. the community with the highest unemployment rate in the state and yet you're not allowing us to even apply for the pilot program."

Chapa LaVia: "I've already spoken with your mayor on the issues and I'm working with him on any way I can assist to make sure that we start the ball rolling in your area."

Winters: "An Amendment to remove Aurora or remove East St. Louis might be helpful."

Chapa LaVia: "And the reason... one of the reasons... one of the reasons that we're starting in Aurora, like I said earlier, is that Mayor Weisner was the first one to develop this program and I... and he... it was his ability to come lobby in Springfield and get the rest of the departments together in putting this package together. We'd be more than happy to give you all of our failures and all our successes at the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

appropriate time, but Aurora also has over 200 acres of brownfields, we have a high unemployment rate, we are the second-largest area for people on probation and parole. We need to put people to work. We have the same issues, but being the second-largest city, we have mirror issues and I acknowledged that with your mayor. So, any way I can help out, I will."

Winters: "Well, again, I think it should have been targeted at communities that don't have the resources available to the two that were selected. So, I'd urge a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, I noticed in your fiscal note from the Department of Revenue that this legislation would result in approximately 11.3 million in income tax and personal property tax replacement or loss, is my way of looking at it, approximately 8.8 million in another area for calendar year 2008, the first one was 2007, 8.9 million in 2009 and 1.3 million. I don't understand how that's all that it would be. First of all, could you explain to me if the RERZ credit that a community can give is the same as a TIF district, so that local schools would lose that money if the local municipalities decide or local municipal governments decide not to require them to pay property tax? Part of this Bill is a property tax abatement."

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. A part of the program is to allow a tax abatement for the two properties on the river that are central in downtown Aurora."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Mulligan: "All right. There's also job tax credit, investment credit, dividend income deduction, individuals, corporations, trusts and estates are not taxed on divided dividend income from corporations income or substantially all of their business in a zone. Financial institutions are not taxed on the interest received on loans for development within a zone. Businesses may deduct from taxable income double the value of cash or in-kind contributions to an approved project of a designated zone organization. And it goes on. There's any number of different tax credits, so I don't know how the Department of Revenue could come up with 11.3 million and... in income tax and personal property tax replacement and that certainly isn't gonna help your schools if you're allowing that. what you're doing with this RERZ credit, which I'm sure stands for River... River's Edge ... "

Chapa LaVia: "River's Edge Redevelopment Program."

Mulligan: "Yeah. I could figure that out."

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. And the taxes... the tax abatements and things are judged off of other enterprise zones that are already in existence. And ya know, the amount of money we discussed earlier, Representative, it could be up to that amount and it could be a lot less than that amount that we discussed earlier. But seven of these programs, like I said earlier, anybody here in the General Assembly can apply for applications to get those tax credits as long as they have an enterprise zone currently."

Mulligan: "All right, I understand that. What I'm... what I'm suggesting is that the fiscal note is not correct on that

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

and... just to the Bill. You know, the Lady had a perfect right to go ahead and do a Bill that would help her area. I have no problem with that. What I do have a problem with and why I think this is really a bad Bill is the simple reason that we have a bunch of people here that are getting ready to pass a budget that's gonna raid the pension fund again. It's getting ready to do a capital plan when there is no... Ya know, they're putting out Bills that's saying there's gonna be for capital and saying that the money is already set aside in a budget when we have no capital Bill. The last capital Bill here a lot of us put our butts on the line and went home and voted for a revenue source and there issues in those bonds that helped our communities, some of which have never been paid off. is a really big issue here. So, we actually had the guts to put ourselves out on a line to vote for a revenue source on bonds, which this new Governor has seemed to used all the bonding authority from all the past, whether it's Build Illinois or Illinois FIRST. And so, now we have no money that pays off the obligations for things that were put in those budgets that a lot of us voted for in order to get those things to our home community. If you wanna introduce a Bill that is for your community that's gonna help 'em, then come up with the revenue source for the capital Bill and stop playing these games. Come up with revenue sources that are adequate for a budget and stop playing games. We're now gonna see all this stuff from now until the end with a bunch of baloney on stuff that is not paid for that will tax future members of our generation and the next

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

generation and our grandchildren because we went ahead to pass a budget which we won't pass. You may, but we won't."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you for all of the debate and I would request 'aye' votes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes' and 26 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rep... Representative Gordon, you have Senate Bill 49. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 49, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill's been read a second, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gordon, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this...
this Amendment makes some changes from the Bill that was
passed out of the Personnel... Pensions and Personnel
Committee from last week. Specifically, it deals with the
employees at a community college as well as the salaries
that are paid to a teacher during the time that are graded...
when they're 10 years from retirement eligibility. This is
an agreed Bill between all interested parties. And I would
ask for an 'aye' vote on the adoption of the Amendment."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'll wait 'til the Bill goes to Third and ask my questions. Thank you."

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

Black: "Just a quick inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Does Floor Amendment #1 become the Bill?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon, do you wanna answer the Gentleman's question?"

Gordon: "Yes, it does."

Black: "And can you tell me when the Amendment was filed?"

Gordon: "It was... the Amendment was filed today. I put it in front of the committee this afternoon."

Black: "Yeah. I mean, I'll tell ya, in all honesty, I'm just trying to figure out what the timeline is. My fax machine... we had to load the fax machine with paper four times in my district office Friday. And I think I heard from every teacher in my Legislative district urging me to vote against, not this Bill, the House Bill that they said was a sham. Is it 1813? Or it used to be 1815 or whatever it was, I don't remember the Bill number. So I'm trying to figure out, if they faxed my office on Thursday and Friday saying that the so called 6 percent solution was not a 6 percent solution, that they opposed it, then was this Amendment filed sometime after Friday, this being Monday?"

Gordon: "Yes, it was filed today."

Black: "It was filed today?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Gordon: "Yes."

Black: "Did... has it had a committee hearing?"

Gordon: "Yes, this afternoon at 4:15."

Black: "Okay. And did anyone... did any of the education organizations slip in opposition to this Bill? I'm trying to figure out what the difference is between all the faxes I've received and what this Amendment is. So, if it had a hearing, did any of the teacher groups or education groups file in opposition to the Bill?"

Gordon: "No, Sir. No."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 49, a Bill for Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 49 makes some changes to the reforms that were done to the pension system in Senate Bill 27 last year. I would be happy to answer any questions that anyone may have on this legislation."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 49. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

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

Eddy: "First of all, I want to make a point of clarification.

Staff tells me the IFT did not officially slip in favor, but it's your understanding that they are now in favor of the Bill?"

Gordon: "They are in favor. Actually, Representative, after we got to the floor today their representative gave me a card and I went out and talked to him. He said, 'I was missing in action and I tried to get there.' But they are in favor of the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. You know, some of the issues related to problems associated with Senate Bill 27 I want to kind of go through and I want to make sure they're in this. A lot of people haven't had a chance to read the Bill... or the Amendment because it's moving so quickly. But in a situation where someone who is in a district and moves from, say, a teacher to a principal or administrative position that requires a different type of certification, would they be exempt under this legislation? Would the 6 percent liability for school district be exempt under this?"

Gordon: "That would be an exemption. Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if someone is an assistant principal with a Type 75 certification and needs to receive a specialist degree Type 75, they're moving from principal to superintendent, they would also be exempt in this situation?"

Gordon: "Yes, Representative."

Eddy: "If a school district, as often is the case, decides that some of their most experienced teachers are perhaps the best

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

teachers to teach a summer school reading class and that assignment in the summer school reading class might cause their salary to be 6 percent more than the previous year, along with any other raise that may have been negotiated, in that case, this legislation would exempt the summer school portion of that salary from penalties related to the 6 percent cap?"

Gordon: "Yes, Representative."

Eddy: "Other types of situations that occur that have to do with grants, that the teacher's being paid from a state grant that really the district has not offered in the way of compensation directly from district funds, those would also would be exempt of this situation?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "And if a teacher happens to go back and do what we've been trying to incentivize here, and that's a National Board Certification, another good example. They receive automatically a stipend for National Board Certification. And in those cases, the stipend from National Board Certification would be exempt from the 6 percent?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "Teachers who may take an overload in a school district, teach during what might commonly referred to their planning period as an overload, that... that type of compensation would also be exempt?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "And I understand there's also a provision in here that if someone is 10 years or more from retirement, there's a

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

clarification that those members shall be excluded from the 6 percent rule?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Is there anything in the legislation that allows for an appeal process for school districts if they disagree with the TRS pension liability calculation? Can they..."

Gordon: "We didn't… I'm sorry, we didn't here the beginning of that, Representative."

Eddy: "Is there anything in the legislation that allows a school district to appeal the TRS pension liability calculation if they have a... is there a formal appeal process in the legislation?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay, good. And I... it also... does it also, this is my question, allow districts an additional period of time to pay the liability once the calculation is finalized and agreed upon?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "During the appeal process for the school district, are those days counted? For example, I think it's 90 days instead of 30 days."

Gordon: "Yes, they're counted but they get 90 days without interest."

Eddy: "Okay, good. And interest is charged from the ninetyfirst day. How long then do school districts have to pay the… the penalty with interest?"

Gordon: "Three... three years."

Eddy: "So, school districts would have up to 3 years. So some of the salary savings that a district might realize, because

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

replacing perhaps an experienced teacher with a younger teacher, less experienced teacher, they would actually begin to realize some of that during this."

Gordon: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you very much. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I commend the work that's been done on this. There were some serious issues related to this that were causing districts to be hamstrung and ultimately it was affecting who we could put in front of students. And I would urge all Members to support this legislation. It's a good fix and it's fairly done. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "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, what now under this so-called fix, what is... what provisions do you have to stop what was the most egregious abuse? And that is a superintendent of schools making \$185 thousand a year getting a \$200 thousand raise in his or her last year and then maxing out a pension at state expense. I don't see any language in there that would stop what created the backlash on this in the first place."

Gordon: "There's... there's nothing that... in this legislation that would allow that, Representative. But those type of abuses have been stopped. That... that's what was already there. These are just some changes that were made from last year. But that type of abuse can no longer take place and the state be held accountable for that type of money."

125th Legislative Day

"No."

Gordon:

- Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. It's extremely hard to hear in here and this is a very important Bill. If I heard you correctly, Representative, you said there's nothing that prevents the egregious abuse that was going on and documented by the Chicago media of superintendents getting..."
- Black: "...\$200 thousand a year raises in the last year of their contract, which all came at state expense. The district didn't pick up any of that."
- Gordon: "Representative, there... that's already been taken care of last year. This Bill doesn't have anything to do with that. That was something that was already dealt with."
- Black: "All right. So, the administrator cannot exceed the 6 percent cap other than what might be listed in the Bill. Correct?"
- Gordon: "That's correct."
- Black: "All right. If they exceed the 6 percent cap, does the district still pay for the excess in above 6 percent or does TRS, i.e., state dollars... state tax dollars, do they pick up the..."
- Gordon: "It would be the school district that would pay, Representative."
- Black: "All right. So you... the only thing that I didn't hear my good friend, Representative Eddy, mention. In my... one of my local districts, the basketball coach... head basketball coach resigned at the last board meeting. Now, what if you're less than 2 years from retirement and you're appointed at the May school board meeting and, therefore, you get a \$5 thousand stipend or a \$6 thousand stipend for becoming the

125th Legislative Day

- head men's basketball coach. I didn't hear anything about a coaching stipend. Is that taken care of?"
- Gordon: "No, Representative. The person can still get their stipend for the coaching, but it's something that the school district is gonna have to pay for."
- Black: "So, in other words, there's no real way to separate a coaching stipend in the Bill, and I assume that isn't... that's why it wasn't in here."
- Gordon: "Well, I don't know if it's a real way, but that provision is not in this Bill, Representative."
- "Well, Representative, thank you very much. appreciate your work on it and Representative Eddy's as But you know, again, and I don't want to risk somebody's wrath, but this is what happens when we do something hastily, as we did last year. Then we have to come back and fix it. And as much as I support the Bill as you have fixed it, it still doesn't do one thing to address the serious pension underfunding that's going on in the State of Illinois. And many of you on that side of the aisle are gonna go along again with another \$1.2 billion hit on the teachers' pensions. Now with this Bill you... you've, I think, taken care of some of the more egregious abuses that was... that were handed off to teachers because the Bill wasn't carefully thought out last year. But many of you sent out press releases saying, 'What we've done, we'll save enough money that actually the pension debt will disappear in 10 or 11 years.' I think we've all come to the conclusion that that wasn't true then and it isn't true now. And I do appreciate the reasonable accommodation you have

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

made for teachers, but in the end-run we've done nothing to address an ever-growing problem, and that's the chronic underfunding of the state pension systems. What we need to do is to go back to the '95 law and get on a schedule in 40 years and bring the pensions up to 90 percent. And if we don't do that... and you've all read the... you've all read the Fitch Report. They've downgraded our bonds because they don't think we have the fiscal discipline to meet the pension payment in 2010. I don't think we do either, but it remains to be seen. But I do appreciate the work you've done on this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative, who signed in at the... in committee on this Bill and who testified?"

Gordon: "The president of the IEA was there. TRS representatives were there. The School Board Alliance was there."

Mulligan: "All right. They were there, but did they testify and did they sign in 'for' or 'against'?"

Gordon: "They slipped as proponents but then the president of the IEA also made a statement to the committee."

Mulligan: "I'm sorry, repeat the last."

Gordon: "The president of the IEA did come and make a statement to the committee that they were in favor of the Bill."

Mulligan: "They were in favor of it. When did they see the Amendment?"

Gordon: "Pardon?"

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Mulligan: "When did they see the Amendment?"

Gordon: "I think they've been... they've been involved in the negotiations from the very beginning, Representative."

"The only reason I'm willing to vote for this is Mulligan: because Representative Eddy said that he'd worked on this you and he asked you the right questions. But I think there's a real problem with filing a 27-page Amendment in one day, taking it to committee, bringing it to the House Floor, moving it from Second, moving it to Third, and then putting it through. I think there's something really wrong because this is one of the major issues that's been on the plate of many teachers who have come here, and I think they should've had the ability to take a look at it, lobby us whether they were in favor of it or not, and do a little better process, particularly since this was a really big issue. And I still... I also agree with Representative Black as far as what the pensions go. But I think the ability to put an Amendment out that's 27 pages in the morning and bring it to a vote before the day is over speaks to a great problem here, particularly for the people who've been lobbying for something for this. I hope when this gets done with this vote that what's in this Bill is what they desire to have in the Bill to fix a problem that was created by the vote that you made last year. But I really do find it to be a bad way of doing business of the House."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mitchell, Jerry Mitchell."

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

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

125th Legislative Day

- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Gordon, are there any major issues that teachers felt were pretty egregious in the original Bill that have not been addressed in this one?"
- Gordon: "You'd have to define egregious, Representative. I mean, they came in... these were..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, there was an entire list that the teachers came out with."
- Gordon: "Right. And... and... I mean, the fact that someone who, ya know, gets more education and moves up and becomes a better teacher, they're no longer, ya know, going to lose out on the money, they're going to be rewarded for that. I thought that was a very big one, especially from a teacher to an administrator has been taken care. Those were some of the really major ones."
- Mitchell, J.: "It looks to me that... that most of the things that were on the teachers' list, their major concerns, have been addressed with this particular Amendment. How long have the teachers, and you may not know this, but how long have the teachers been working with the Speaker's staff to get this Amendment put together?"
- Gordon: "Representative, I've been working with the unions, staff's been working with the unions. Many people have been involved in negotiations. But I know... I mean, a very long time."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, I know the teachers certainly knew about this particular Amendment before our side of the aisle and probably most of your side of the aisle did. I happen to get an e-mail from one of the district IEA representatives to my wife, who's president of the IEA, yesterday outlining

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

everything in this Amendment and that they are in favor of it. So, I did have an opportunity to see what was in the Amendment prior to getting here today, but it was only because I happen to be married to the local president. They are certainly in favor of this Amendment. They're very happy with the results of it. Is there any retroactivity in this Bill at all? Will it go back and affect..."

Gordon: "I'm sorry, is there any what activity?"

Mitchell, J.: "Is there any retroactivity for last year? Anything that happened last year?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Mitchell, J.: "So, basically, this fills that gap or that void that happened from the beginning of the former Bill to now?" Gordon: "Yes, Sir."

Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good fix to some problems that came up with the original pension reform Bill, or so it was called. I know for a fact the IEA is certainly on board and the IFT is certainly on board. I think this is one that will satisfy much of the problems that... that our teachers saw in the original Bill and I certainly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon to close."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is the culmination of many hours of negotiations, lots of people asking questions. I thank the people who have spoken on this Bill, they are true experts and I thank them for their kind words. I would ask for your 'aye' vote. This is something that is truly needed and truly addresses a prob... some issues that had come up based

125th Legislative Day

- upon some previous actions by this Body and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 49 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 106 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And
 this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
 hereby declared passed. Representative Bassi, for what
 reason do you rise?"
- Bassi: "My button malfunctioned and I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will reflect your intentions, Representative."
- Bassi: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Molaro, you have Senate Bill 613. Representative Molaro, do you wish us to read this Bill? Representative Molaro, would you like us to read this Bill on Second? Out of the record. Representative Bradley, you have Senate Bill 619. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 619, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley, you wish to have it read? Mr. Clerk, read this on Third."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 619, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley, J.: "I don't know if this is a good omen or not, but I just broke my microphone. I got... I got one of the... I got a hand-held microphone now. This is simply a Bill that would allow us to extend the incentives to bring the FutureGen project to Illinois. As many of you know, unfortunately, my area's not going to be able to get this specifically, but I'm still willing to do my part for the team to try to bring it to Illinois. So it's gonna help somebody else's district, but this is something we need to do. I know of no opposition. I think everyone's in support of this. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 619. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, I don't understand this Bill. If you could help me, I'd appreciate it. I thought the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity... their task was to assist any body any place in the State of Illinois in attracting economic development investment in the State of Illinois. Now given what I thought that's what their task was, why do we need this Bill? I would think they would be there now already."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Bradley, J.: "My understanding is it gives them the ammunition they need to help try to bring this back to Illinois. So..."

Black: "Well... and I'm not about to vote against it."

Bradley, J.: "No."

Black: "But when we were... ya know, I had an opportunity in my district to get a million square foot distribution center and quite frankly, I don't think that DCCA (sic-DCEO) was very aggressive."

Bradley, J.: "Yeah."

Black: "And I would've never dreamed to come down here and put in a Bill. I mean, is this the way we're gonna do it from now on..."

Bradley, J.: "I don't... Repre..."

Black: "...on economic development project, we pass special legislation?"

Bradley, J.: "Representative, I don't have the institutional knowledge to respond to that. But to the extent that I could ever help you try to bring something to your district, you know that I would."

Black: "As near as I can tell, the Bill does not allocate any special moneys. Correct?"

Bradley, J.: "No, I think that's right."

Black: "All right. Well, thank you very much, Representative."

Bradley, J.: "Thank you. Thank you."

Black: "The... I... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "Obviously, this is a great project and I certainly hope it ends up somewhere in Illinois, and that is yet to be determined. But it appears to me that the bulk of this

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

money to develop this FutureGen project will be our tax money that goes to Washington and comes back to us in the form of some kind of federal grant or subsidy. I guess, ya know, maybe I can talk to Chris Meister or somebody in DCCA tomorrow or... excuse me, DECO (sic-DCEO) that... ya know, I don't know why we need the legislation. I'm not about to vote against it. I hope it ends up in Illinois and I'm sure the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity will do everything they can to do that, but I thought this was what they were tasked to do. And I'm just a little confused because I, like any of you from now on if there's a project in my district I won't know whether to bring a Bill urging DCCA (sic-DCEO) to get involved in a potential project or whether it's a... this is just simply different because it's so big in scope and primarily federally funded. So, I'll talk with to tomorrow. But for now, obviously, I hope the FutureGen project decides to locate in Illinois. good for all of us in Illinois and whatever it takes, fine, I'm willing to do. But I need to talk to someone in the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity 'cause I've never seen a Bill quite like this in all the years since Governor Thompson started an economic development arm. But I wish the communities involved the very best. I hope it ends up in Illinois."

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

Rose: "Thank you..."

Speaker Hannig: "Should be..."

Rose: "...Mr. Speaker. I'm from Champaign."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Champaign."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an extremely important Bill. I wanna commend Representative Bradley for working in a bipartisan fashion on this important legislation. FutuereGen is the future of electricity in this state. It'll allow us to use our Illinois coal and create jobs in the same time provide new Southern Illinois and at technologies that'll become the basis of the future. would urge everyone in this Body to adopt this Bill. It is that enjoys bipartisan support. It's extremely important to those of us in downstate Illinois from a jobs perspective, to the environmental community. Again, in the environmental community this will allow us to burn Illinois coal in a environmentally friendly way. This is absolutely wonderful. And the reason it's necessary is because the package that DCEO is putting forward as part of the bidding process as we compete against other states is this extension of the deadline allows them essentially to bid on that package. So, I am rising in strong support of this. incredibly important to the jobs in downstate Illinois. It's incredibly important to the future of the environment Illinois. And this FutureGen project, if we're fortunate enough to land it, will be a wonderful, wonderful thing for all areas of the State of Illinois. And I would urge every Member to support this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, support the Representative's Bill. Whether this facility would be located in my district or John's district, Representative Rose's district, Vermilion County, it does not matter. What matters is economic development for a region that desperately needs it. And for your information, Representative Bradley, years ago under Governor Thompson we had the similar issue with the superconducting super-collider. And they asked us to help them site that facility in Northern Illinois. And the whole... the whole Body, I think, was in support of that measure because it was important for the state. So, no matter what region, it's important that we do anything we can to secure business for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, you've spoken in debate.

For what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With your indulgence, I found out from staff why we need the Bill. And I'd just like to say that... put it on the record. The reason that the Bill is before us is that there was a timeline on the original enabling legislation of July 1, 2006. It appears that the Federal Government may not make up its mind before that. So, if I'm correct, Representative Bradley, this simply extends the deadline..."

Bradley, J.: "Yeah."

Black: "...so that DCCA (sic-DCEO) will have time to work with the feds up until July 1 of 2007. Right?"

Bradley, J.: "Yeah, that's... that's absolutely right,

Representative."

125th Legislative Day

- Black: "Okay. Now, that makes imminent good sense. I appreciate staff, I appreciate you, and I appreciate everything everybody has said on this Bill. It really is not a regional issue; it is a statewide economic development issue. And I would hope, given that fact, it gets an unanimous vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, we've had Representative Bradley, Rose, and Granberg speak in favor. Does anyone wish to speak in response? Representative Mulligan in response."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not speaking in response, I'm just would like to invite people to come up to my district. We have a four-story model of a gasification facility, which is really interesting, in my district at the Institute for Gas Technology. It certainly is an interesting concept and I would like to see Illinois get something like that. Although, I'd like to see the Federal Government pay for all of it. But if you're interested in coming up, they do do tours and it's a very interesting facility to visit. And I do think it's a good thing for Illinois, particularly for Southern Illinois where they need this economy."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy, do you wish to speak in response?"
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Very quickly, I will.

 I also want to thank the Sponsor regarding this Bill. This shows a true bipartisan effort on something that is very important to the state. I know that the Southern Illinois University Coal Center worked very, very hard on this concept and for awhile it looked as if perhaps some of the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

best areas were down in the deep southern part of Illinois. However, the fact that the seismic activity may have caused the need for this plant to move did not... did not cause Representative Bradley to lessen his support, and I appreciate that very much. This could be a tremendous economic boon for not just the four cities, but certainly for Illinois coal. And if we're going to gain real economic advantage in this state, it's gonna be by using corn and coal and those things that we have a natural economic advantage in. And I just wanna also add my support to this and ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley, J.: "I appreciate everybody's kind words. I ask for 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 107 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bradley, do you wish for us to read Senate Bill 835? Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 7 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1279. Would you read the Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1279, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

All notes that have been requested have been filed."

125th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on May 01, 2006, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor for consideration' for House Bill 1945, referred to Second Reading; House Bill 2013, referred to Second Reading; Senate Bill 1520, Floor Amendment #1 •approved for consideration'; Senate Bill 2554, House Amendment #1, Motion to Recede 'approved for consideration'; 'direct floor consideration' also for Senate Bill 2654 is House Amendment #2 'approved for consideration'."
- Speaker Hannig: "On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, is Senate Bill 1445. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill's been a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure comes to us primarily from clerks across the state and as far as I know there is no opposition. Much of it is technical in nature. There are several substantive issues. For example, this would provide that in elections there would be a central count for all forms of early and absentee

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

As you know, we've sorta separated out the absentee ballots that are counted at the precinct level; at the end of the day, others are today counted at the central This would provide for one single kind of location. It also would permit those people who are tabulation. voting ahead of time to be alerted if their signature is going to be rejected so they have an opportunity to challenge at that time. We will eliminate the in-person voting at municipal township and road district offices at the request of those en... those entities because the new systems that are being used for early voting would not permit, by virtue of the resources required, would not permit that to work if everyone wanted to participate. People who applied for an absentee ballot but didn't use it would still be allowed to participate on election day. And we're making sure that the local election authorities transmit the names and addresses of all the voters, including those who were voting under the grace period, to State Board of Education (sic-Election) so that the information can be made available. We're making sure that the vendor is the one who pays the costs of testing voting equipment and we're making some other technical changes in the way the State Board selects precincts for random retabulation after election day. And we're requi... we're making some other technical changes in when write-in candidates have to announce that in fact candidates. A substantive change used to say that if a political committee is making robo-calls mentioning a candidate's name without that candidate's permission, that

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

the entity that's paying for producing those robo-calls must be listed. We require that right now when people are distributing brochures, sending out mailings, all manner of other things. It seems only reasonable to apply the same disclosure requirement to robo-calls as we do to everything else. That's the sum and substance of the Bill. As I say, there are more technical changes. I would be happy to answer your questions about any of them and I'd appreciate your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I've explained all the provisions that are in the Bill. Again, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them. And I'd appreciate your support for this good government, clean elections program."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1445. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

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

Currie: "Yes."

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

125th Legislative Day

- Durkin: "Representative Currie, I think everybody in this Body believes in transparency in government and also good government as well. And I want to go over the issue, which I discussed at length at least with some extent with you in committee this yesterday, is this provision regarding the robo phone calls. Now, this has been talked about in cons... in the last two weeks of the media but also last week in committee. One of the questions I have, first of all, is what was the change that was made in the Bill, which we addressed in committee last week, to the one which we are arguing now on the floor?"
- Currie: "I believe the provision in this measure would apply to all candidates for all elections rather than a limited set."
- Durkin: "Would this prohibition apply to any group who is not a political committee to issue these types of phone calls, which... without identifying themselves? Even if... it could be a trade organization who is not organized under the Election Code."
- Currie: "And by definition it is only political committees that are affected by this provision."
- Durkin: "Okay. So, now as we... as I look at it, I would like ask one question. Under... what would be the penalty for any one individual or what group if they did violate this particular section that we are... that's in this..."
- Currie: "Representative, the same penalty that would apply today if a political committee that did a brochure or a radio ad failed to disclose who it was. So, it's exactly the same... the same penalties that apply for other failures to disclose

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

information in materials that are geared toward electing or defeating a candidate for public office."

Durkin: "Would that be a fine which is levied by the State Election Board..."

Currie: "It could be."

Durkin: "...or would that be a... or could it be a criminal offense?"

Currie: "It... it... both. And in fact, as I say, right now today if a political committee fails to put its name on a brochure, subject to precisely the same penalties. So, no difference."

Durkin: "I would like to know who would be... if there is a violation of this particular section and a complaint is filed with the State Board of Elections and this individual who believes that they've been hurt by this phone call, who would be the appropriate investigatory or prosecuting agency to proceed with an investigation?"

Currie: "If it were a complaint filed with the State Board, it would be the State Board that would do the investigation."

Durkin: "Correct, but there are..."

Currie: "If this were a criminal complaint..."

Durkin: "State Board does not have criminal enforcement powers. Who would be..."

Currie: "If it... Then that would be a state's attorney as I understand it."

Durkin: "Okay. What is he… who currently can enforce the state elect... violation under the State Election Code?"

Currie: "Precisely those two entities."

Durkin: "So, the Attorney General..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Currie: "The State Board of Elections and the State's Attorney."

Durkin: "So I wanna make it perfectly clear that the Attorney General has no current authority under the Election Code to investigate and prosecute any..."

Currie: "Yeah..."

Durkin: "...complaints under the Election Code. Correct?"

Currie: "The Attorney General does, as I understand it, have concurrent jurisdiction. More frequently, violations of this sort, if they reach a level of a criminal charge, are in fact handled by local state's attorneys. But under Article 9 there is concurrent jurisdiction for the Attorney General."

Durkin: "There is no current jurisdiction for the Attorney General, so this is... is that what you just stated?"

Currie: "There is. My understanding is that there is and there is for all of the other items I listed as well."

Durkin: "Well..."

Currie: "So a failure to disclose on a brochure, on a radio ad, that too would involve concurrent jurisdiction with the Attorney General."

Durkin: "Well, my understanding is that the jurisdiction of the Attorney General for prosecution is not as expansive as it is for a local state's attorney, that the Attorney General, basically, their role is to... unless they have exclusive jurisdiction over matters, which I discussed earlier which is under the tax violations, environmental violations. I do not see it in the code where the Attorney General or under the Attorney General Act where..."

Currie: "Well, it..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Durkin: "...where it gives them jurisdiction to initiate investigations and prosecutions under viola... for violations under this code."
- Currie: "My... first of all... first of all, if you had multiple counties, you might very well wanted... if there were multiple counties where the specific violation occurred, it didn't belong to a particular state's attorney, there might be Attorney General opportunities for that reason. Second, we will try to find you the cite, but it was our understanding that our... under Article 9, the AG already has concurrent jurisdiction in each of these other areas. But we will double check that."
- Durkin: "I believe that... I just... looking here briefly under the executive offers section... executive officers section that the Attorney General would..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your 5 minutes have expired.

 Could you bring your remarks to a close. Representative

 Parke wishes to yield you an additional 5 mintues."
- Durkin: "Thank you. Now, my reading under the Executive Officers' Act that the Attorney General could have election... authority to prosecute election matters if the local state's attorney has declined to investigate. It's only upon that portion, and I will refer you to 15 ILCS 205/4, which states that it is only upon the... the decline of the AG."
- Currie: "Well, I... I'm taking my information from the Attorney General's Office. It may be that that kicks in only if the local state's attorney refuses to investigate."

Durkin: "Okay. Okay."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Currie: "I don't have the answer but we will get answers o that question to you."

"Now, one of the question I had last week, which we Durkin: thought we were gonna close, but the ... under the Amendment it says... under this Bill, 'Nothing in this subsection that will require disclosure of any telephone communication unless a random sampling or other scientific survey methods to gauge public opinion for or against any candidate or question of public policy.' So, we're stating that someone who is... can question, which has ask the very same caused legislation to come into place, can ask that very same question but state that it's only being... it's being applied through a random sampling or a scientific survey. they'll get specific... and you don't have to disclose that. You don't have to disclose who has purchased the scientific survey or the random sampling."

Currie: "Right."

Durkin: "So, there is... Correct. So..."

Currie: "That's right. And... and we think that's important because we think that people ought to have the opportunity to find out how candidates and how ideas, public policy proposals are being received by the electorate. But you... there's such a huge difference between the robo-call that goes to all the voters and the scientific survey, the random sampling, that goes to a tiny percentage that there is no worry that the two in fact overlap."

Durkin: "Well, I see that, you know, as I mentioned earlier, that when we deal with the Election Code and the Campaign Code, when we try to close a loophole we seemingly open up a

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

bigger one. And that is what I see right now in this legislation by allowing an exemption for the same type of questions to be asked, but under the heading that it is being used in random sampling or other scientific survey methods, which there's really no definition for... for someone to proceed without having to disclose who has purchased the communication."

Currie: "Well, in fact, of course, this kind of activity is already covered in the Election Code and we're just clarifying that the prohibition against failure to disclose with robo-calls does not lean over into an area that we have already specifically exempted."

Durkin: "Is there anything in this Bill which will penalize a individual... a political committee for dispensing false information?"

Currie: "It... I'm sorry. Did..."

Durkin: "Is there anything in here which penalizes a political committee for transmitting inaccurate or false information?"

Currie: "For mis... campaign... A campaign of misinformation, disinformation, I don't know if that... that's not the subject of this Bill. But there may be other places in the Election Code where lying is..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Currie: "...somehow treated as at least a venial sin."

Durkin: "So, this..."

Currie: "And it would certainly be possible if somebody were telling lies about you to haul that person before the court with a civil charge, without respect to the Election Code."

125th Legislative Day

- Durkin: "So what has prompted this legislation is not the content of what the message that was sent out about a month ago but was rather the fact that nothing was disclosed.

 Correct?"
- Currie: "Disclosure is the whole of this measure."
- Durkin: "That's correct. So, the… the contents of that… absolutely. So, there's nothing factually inaccurate with that robo-call, which has caused this legislation to be brought to this chamber."
- Currie: "No. No, no, no. We're just saying that there ought to be disclosure just as there should be if there were a campaign brochure."
- Durkin: "All right. Now, I just wanna make... I also wanna get this very clear. We're also talking about... this only applies to candidates. Now, you're gonna have individuals who are current elected officials who at certain points during their term are not candidates. So when does a person... when does an elected official become a candidate and when do they not become a candidate?"
- Currie: "I think in other parts of the code it specifies that if somebody has made the announcement that he or she is a candidate for a particular office, certainly by the point of filing nominating petitions to run for a public office, that individual would clearly be a candidate. And it may be that one would stretch that to include people who are currently incumbents, but we haven't yet reached the point for filing for reelection to that office."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Durkin: "Okay. I just got one little… one last question. Now, we're getting back to this whole issue of the penalty, the criminal penaly against someone who does allow for this…"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your... Representative Parke's 5 minutes have expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close. Are you..."
- Durkin: "One question. Thank you. I just want to make it perfectly clear that if we are now saying that this is now a criminal offense; it's a Class A misdemeanor."
- Currie: "Just as... just as it is if you fail to disclose on the brochure, on the radio ad, on the billboard. Yes, you've got to disclose who you are. That's all this is about."
- Durkin: "So the parties who would have exposure under this possibly could be not only the individual or group who purchased the ad, but also the individual who was involved with..."
- Currie: "The product... No, no."
- Durkin: "...writing out the guestions and it also..."
- Currie: "No, it would be... it would be that the officers of the political committee, not the people who produced the robocalls."
- Durkin: "Well, that's not the way that I read this... this Amendment. And also..."
- Currie: "Well, let me ask you a question then. Do you think that if somebody violates the current disclosure requirements with respect to a brochure, that it's the printer that pays the penalty?"

Durkin: "Well, I..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Currie: "That it's the printer that is hauled before the State Board of Elections? I think not."

Durkin: "Well, I think what we're saying is that we're now...

staff are gonna be... they'll have exposure under this if
they're involved, whether it's through one of the campaign
committees, that they would be accountable under the law
as..."

Currie: "No. No. The same..."

Durkin: "...the same way that someone who drives an automobile and a window that someone shoots out the car, the driver's accountable."

Currie: "No, but... Yeah."

Durkin: "That is the accountable… accountability theory under our Criminal Code."

Currie: "That... miss..."

Durkin: "And that's what applies to all misdemeanors and felonies."

Currie: "You are misinformed unless, of course, you do believe that staffers and printers would today be eligible for federal... for misdemeanor convictions if they didn't disclose on a brochure or a radio ad. And I don't think that's right."

Durkin: "Well, I'm just saying that anyone who is involved with creating the message..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative..."

Durkin: "...and also was involved with knowingly printing the message and having or having it sent to a... some service who makes the robo phone. As far as I'm concerned, they're all at some point culpable and they are... would be subject to a

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Class A misdemeanor. So, I'll bring my questions to a closure. I appreciate the fact that we've had some good dialogue over this particular Amendment over the last few weeks. But as I said earlier, sometimes when we do work with the Election Code and the Campaign Code we try to close loopholes but we... we've created a bigger one, and that is the issue about the random sampling an also the scientific survey exemption. So, if we're trying to stop a problem, we've allowed for it to continue in which I believe some people, and hopefully it'd be nobody in this chamber, would take advantage of 'cause there are some serious penalties. So, because I believe that this does not address a problem, which we all agree at some point may happen in the future, I will... I'm gonna vote 'present' and I would ask my colleagues to vote 'present' as well."

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

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

Black: "Representative, is there anything... as I scrolled through the analysis, it seems to me... correct me if I'm wrong. Can election authorities now say that if I wanna vote early, I can only vote early at one place, the courthouse, the county clerk's office, or can I still go to a satellite office?"

Currie: "If this measure becomes law then the election authority will determine what sites will be for early voting, and the reason for that restriction is because they do not have the resources to make sites available everywhere. We have more complicated machinery, more expensive machinery, and it is

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

not as simple as saying to the township road commissioner, 'You'll run the election for us today.'"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I don't wanna interrupt her while she's talking to staff."

Currie: "In fact... I'm sorry, I did misspeak. Right now, the election authority has the authority to say, here's where... but under this the election authority would be more limited in where it... not that you can't do it here or you can't do it there, but they would not have to say 'yes' if somebody said they wanted to participate."

Black: "Okay. Well, I... I mean, obviously, in my county... and it's not comparable to Cook, but in my county someone could drive 80 miles round-trip, my home county, if they have to go to the courthouse. And in Cook County I would say it would be much more than that... a longer distance than that. I understand you can't staff every precinct, but I think it's a real burden, particularly on seniors, if the election authority says, 'Look, you come to the courthouse or you don't vote early.'"

Currie: "I'm sorry, I missed the last part of your comment."

Black: "Yeah, I mean, I just... I'm trying to get some semblance of an idea, and I know you can't staff every precinct or every location."

Currie: "Right."

Black: "But in Cook, not to mention some large rural downstate counties, a round trip could be a considerable amount of miles if you have to go to only the county clerk's office or the board of election commissioner's office..."

Currie: "Well..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Black: "...if you're not allowed to vote in your town hall or something like that."

Currie: "Yeah. My understanding is that in Cook, for example, the county clerk says there will be an opportunity for early voting in every township."

Black: "Okay. All right. And the only other question I have, nothing in this Bill precludes the election authority's... well, maybe requirement's not the right word. Let me rephrase it. I have to show ID to vote early. Do I not?"

Currie: "You do."

Black: "All right. And that would be an acceptable form of state identification, passport, driver's license?"

Currie: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons, J.: "Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Lyons, J.: "Barb, I have a question on point number one on our analysis here, at least on the Democratic analysis. It says, count for all forms of early..."

Currie: "Yes."

Lyons, J.: "So, what's the..."

Currie: "All of them... all of the votes will be counted at the central location."

Lyons, J.: "What's the point of that?"

Currie: "Part of the point of that is that it is difficult to transmit information that is voted on the DRE or the optical scan in the early vote back to the precinct judges. So..."

Lyons, J.: "The night of the election."

125th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Right now... right now..."
- Lyons, J.: "So the night of the election that information would come back?"
- Currie: "There being... they are being counted centrally and what's added here is that absent votes will now be counted at the central location as well."
- Lyons, J.: "But now, what about the tradition absentee ballots that usually come back to the precinct? This says that that will also be counted. Will that still come back to the precinct?"
- Currie: "They'll be... they'll go back to the central location so that all of those are counted together. That will relieve the election judges of some burdens and I think that would be a good thing."
- Lyons, J.: "And that'll be back election night so they're gonna be counted those during the day or something so it'll come back?"
- Currie: "Yes. Yep. They will not have to come to the precinct; they'll stay at the central location."
- Lyons, J.: "Well, I'm looking at this from a precincts captain's point of view, Barb. And if... you know, when you're working at a precinct and you're trying to get it as good a number as you can for a final result..."
- Currie: "Right."
- Lyons, J.: "...especially on a close election on a state rep race or aldermanic race or something that's very local, you wanna know darn well how close am I to an actual vote total. We always lose some of 'em downtown in Chicago that we don't get or are counted at large, which are always kid of

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

frustrating to good precincts. So I have an issue here unless I'm not understanding something. We're gonna actually be losing actual count of the traditional ballot but we'll be gaining the electrod... the scanner. All right. So, we have the two different systems now. We have the mark your card with a pencel..."

- Currie: "You have four. You've got absentee. You've got grace period. You've got optical scan. You've got DRE. You've got early. You've got..."
- Lyons, J.: "Right. And most people who use the optical scan this time at the… at the locations throughout the city use the optical scan, but in a lot of the polling places on election day people were using full system. So, I'm just… what my concern was here on the absentees. If somebody gets a traditional absentee mailed to their house and they're still going to making the, you know, making the 'x's' in their little circle now instead of punching the dots as we did for 30 years, we will not be getting any of those back to the polling places. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "You will, however, know who voted early and you will have those totals added to the precinct count once the central tabulation is made."
- Lyons, J.: "But that..."
- Currie: "So, you will know... the precinct people will be able to identify which people in that precinct applied for an absent ballot or voted early."
- Lyons, J.: "Well, we do get that list. I mean, the Board of Elections in Chicago was always cranking that list out, usually on a daily basis to let you know who's taking the

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

absentee or the early voting. The EV was the new designation this last primary. But I'm still concerned about the fact that we in the precincts will be losing our actual tallies. We will not..."

Currie: "No, no. You will get those tallies, but..."

Lyons, J.: "Yeah, but not the night of the election."

Currie: "They should be able to get the count the night of the election."

Lyons, J.: "All right. Well..."

Currie: "Yeah. I mean, they should be presumably..."

Lyons, J.: "I'm... I would... I wish I would've had time to talk to you about this."

Currie: "Yeah."

Lyons, J.: "I don't want to make... extend the debate any longer than it is."

Currie: "Yeah."

Lyons, J.: "Again, looking at this from precinct captain's..."

Currie: "Okay."

Lyons, J.: "...eyes, in the precinct, you like to have as good a reading as you can."

Currie: "But remem... remember that right now the DRE and optical scan early votes are counted centrally."

Lyons, J.: "Right."

Currie: "You're not counting those today. You did not count them on March 21."

Lyons, J.: "Okay."

Currie: "That's current law."

Lyons, J.: "I'll... I'll ride with you here, Leader. Thanks."

125th Legislative Day

- Speaker Hannig: "We've had two speak in favor and three in response. Does anyone else wish to speak in favor? Then Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is primarily a technical Bill but it closes one very important loophole in our current elections laws. And this is, if you are attaching or supporting a candidate and you do it by brochures or radio ads or what have you, you have to tell the world who you are. Under current law, you do not have to tell the world who you are when you make those attacks through robo-calls. This measure will close that loophole. I urge your support. This is for transparency and accountability, not just in government but in our elections as well. I'd appreciate your '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 61 voting 'yes' and 40 voting 'no'. And the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect of the Chair, if we have to move or ask every time for unlimited debate on some of these Bills, we'll do so. If you're gonna cut off debate then that's what we'll do every time. Now, we had two people's lights that were on that you would not recognize, Representative Bellock, Representative Krause. These people are not... do not have a reputation of just getting up to hear

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

themselves talk. They had questions that they wanted to ask. And knowing both of them, they would've been questions to the issue. And when you don't let that happen and you run some of these things through real quick... look, we hadn't been stalling. We would've liked to have gotten here on April 7. You don't a.m you don't ask us to be involved. You will not let us go to any budget meeting. Contrary to what you tell some of your Members, we haven't refused to attend any meeting. You will not invite us. You will not let us be part of the process. Now, at the very least... and I have great respect for your fairness, for crying out loud, don't shut off debate. We're not the ones that are keeping you here after April 7. You guys couldn't get your act You control every lever, every button, every together. piece of machinery in State Government. If you're here after April 7 put the blame where it belongs, on your side of the aisle, not on us. Let us have at least an opportunity to speak. That is a ridiculous and asinine way to run this place. And if you're gonna do that then every issue we will demand unlimited debate. We have a right to be heard. We have a right to participate in the process, but you won't let us, and that's wrong."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "Mr. Speaker, I did have my light on. It was a most significant Bill, particularly for my district, my county. I also was going to ask for a verification. And yet, the Bill was just called without recognizing. And I think that Representative Black is correct. On all Bills, particularly significant Bills such as this, those who had their lights

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

on should've been heard. This has a lot of consequences to my area. It has a lot of concern. I had questions that I had wanted to have addressed and yet did not have the opportunity and the Bill was called with no chance to speak and no chance to ask for a verification. That should not be done. That should not be permitted on... on key pieces of legislation and I should've been given that opportunity on a most significant Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Ya know, I think it's about... it's been said enough.

Representative Krause, Representative Black have made good points. But, Mr. Speaker, it's also been the custom of the Chair to announce when we're on Short Debate, unlimited debate. I don't think... it's my understanding that that was announced... was not announced tonight on this particular Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Rep... Representative, I just assume we're on Standard Debate, always."

Cross: "Well, it has been..."

Speaker Hannig: "And... and every time that Representative Black has asked, we have always gone to unlimited debate."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "It's not my intention..."

Cross: "Yeah, I'm not..."

Speaker Hannig: "...to be unfair."

Cross: "...accusing at this point, Representative... or Mr. Speaker, of anything. It has been your custom at times, many times, to do that. And when we've had lights on, like we did on this particular Bill, it seems to me that in a... from a

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

fairness standpoint that that issue ought to be raised. Now, in the interest of fairness on this issue, on an election Bill that affects every person in the State of Illinois... we've got, as we know, an election comin' up in the fall. You oughta dump that Roll Call and let's start over. There are people on this side of the aisle that wanna talk. There are people on this side of aisle... this aisle that have a right to ask for a verification. You may not like that, but we have a right, just like the people on your side have a right to enough debate on a Bill that affects every county in this state. There are clerks that are concerned about this Bill. And to do this, to ram this through when we had lights on, and to not ask us... or let us know that you're gonna cut off debate is highly improper."

Speaker Hannig: "All right. So, Representative Cross, we're going to do as you request."

Cross: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "And so, we're going to... Mr. Clerk, put House...

Senate Bill 1445 back on the board. We're gonna dump the

Roll Call..."

Cross: "All right."

Speaker Hannig: "...and we're gonna resume debate. Okay?"

Cross: "And now, what are you gonna do about... you're gonna let the people who have lights on speak?"

Speaker Hannig: "It... it will let everyone speak. How 'bout,

Representative Cross, if we just let everyone speak once
that would like to speak?"

Cross: "That's fine. I just wanna make sure that Representative Krause gets represented for..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Speaker Hannig: "My only point is..."

Cross: "...recognized."

Speaker Hannig: "My only point is sometimes people get limited because more than one person... one person maybe speaks more than once on your side."

Cross: "I just wanted the people that weren't able to speak the first time an opportunity to speak and an opportunity for Representative Krause to ask for a verification."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And also thank you for the courtesy that has been extended. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed, Representative."

Krause: "Okay, thank you. Representative, on the Bill itself it calls for all of the local canvassing boards to be eliminated. Is that right? So that canvassing of a local election as mayor or trustee will now be handled by the county?"

Currie: "Could you tell me where you're... what you're referring to? 'Cause I'm not..."

Krause: "Under the..."

Currie: "Did you say... you're talking about canvassing boards?"

Krause: "Yes."

Currie: "'Cause I don't... that's not in this Bill. That was in the Bill originally..."

Krause: "Okay."

Currie: "...but I do not believe it is in the Amendment that became the Bill."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

- Krause: "In the Amendment, therefore, it is out. Okay. So, has that Amendment been totally withdrawn? There's nothing in here on can..."
- Currie: "Amendment 2 replaced everything and... to the extent that canvassing boards were referenced in the Bill as it came from the Senate. That's not what's in the Bill now."
- Krause: "Okay, fine. Okay. On the... in the March primary we
 were able to do early voting, ya know, at the various
 municipalities. Does the Bill now precisely state where
 they will be? Will they be in the townships?"
- Currie: "The election authority will make that determination for the reason that we want to do more of the..."

Krause: "Okay."

Currie: "...optical scan and DRE voting."

Krause: "Well, here... has that been determined where it will be
 or will that be still in the discretion of the county clerk?
 Where... has that been determined like for the general
 election?"

Currie: "The election authority will make that determination."

Krause: "So at this point it will be totally up to them as to where it could be."

- Currie: "Right. But we have been told by the Cook County Clerk that there will be a site in every township, under his jurisdiction."
- Krause: "Okay. And as far as the absenteeism. Where will that be as far..."
- Currie: "People will vote absentee the way they do today.

 They'll send in an application, they'll get a ballot, they'll fill it out, and they'll send it back. The..."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Krause: "If... on the early voting, can that county clerk still provide for the early voting in the municipalities?"

Currie: "Yes. Yes."

Krause: "Or... or it could be in the townships?"

Currie: "Yes."

Krause: "We do not know. Okay."

Currie: "Yeah. And my... my own sense is this is uncharted territory. My sense is that we will see more and more people take advantage of the early voting opportunity and we will expand the resources that are available and the sites that are available for early voting the more experience we have with the new system."

Krause: "Okay. I... I have a number of concerns still. Coming out of that March primary there were a lot of problems. A number of the early voting did not get to the precincts. And has there been anything that has been done in order to secure that that total would get to the precincts as of election day?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand the... the last comment."

Krause: "As far as the early voting that is balloted, is there anything that has been done? Because in the March primary a number of the early voting ballots did not get to the primary on March 21, did not get to the precincts. The question is, is there something that has now been established to in fact guarantee... even though they say that it'll be there by 6 a.m., what can be done to get those ballots... those early voting ballots, in fact, counted to those precincts on that specific day? Has anything been done?"

125th Legislative Day

- Currie: "I think the central count will help that situation and I think that the bigger problems, at least in the jurisdiction in which I live, was that they were not able to do a count at the precinct level on election night."
- Krause: "Well, a lot of the precincts, the ballots... the count did not get there. It did not get there on March 21 at all... of the early voting did not get there. And the concern is that that could be addressed by November... by the November general election because they were not there. Mr. Speaker, if the vote on Senate Bill 1415 does get a majority, I would ask for a verification."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay, and you'll be granted one. Just to clarify the record, Representative Currie moves to reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed. Is there leave? Leave is granted. And so now, this is the Third Reading Roll Call on Senate Bill 1445. Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had two things.

 First was an inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."
- Bellock: "I wanted to know if the prior debate before we dropped that Roll Call was going to be included in the record."
- Speaker Hannig: "Yes, that will be part of the perma... permanent record."
- Bellock: "Oh, thank you very much. Second was, I just wanted to speak to the Bill, as I had had my light on before..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."
- Bellock: "...with regard to what Representative Lyons had said. I too have concerns that I think that in this Bill you are

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

taking away one of the rights that we have in voting, which we've always dealt with with absentee ballots. Votes have always been counted in the precincts where the voters live. And with regard to this Bill, that right is being taken away that those absentee ballots will no longer be counted in the precincts, so we will not be able that night... I can't even imagine that they will get that tally on time to know what those absentee ballots are. So, I do not support this Bill for that reason. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Molaro: "All right, thanks. Well, you sort of explained it...
'cause I had my light on, too. And I... I know you've always
been where someone asks to extend the debate you almost
always do it. And I know you asked 'anybody in response'
one a left... now you said... Just procedurally again, wanna
run this by me? You dumped the Roll Call?"

Speaker Hannig: "So what we did, Representative... so, we... we passed the Bill."

Molaro: "Right."

Speaker Hannig: "But in fairness to the other side, who wish to have some additional debate, with leave of the Body, we reconsidered the vote by which that Bill passed. Okay?"

Molaro: "How did... but how did... did you decide that or how does that happen?"

Speaker Hannig: "Well, with leave of the Body, Representative Currie moved, and with leave of the Body, we'd reconsidered that Roll."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Molaro: "But how'd she do that? Because I was looking at her, I didn't see her go up there and sign..."

Speaker Hannig: "She... she's very talented. That's why she's the Majority Leader, Representative."

Molaro: "Oh, okay. You've explained it now. So, I'm fine with that. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "A parliamentary question."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, state your point."

Franks: "Following up on the previous Speaker, would we need to have a Roll Call vote to re... to reexamine the previous vote?"

Speaker Hannig: "With leave of the House, we used the..."

Franks: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "...Attendance Roll Call as the... as the actual Roll Call vote, Representative Franks."

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

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

Franks: "Thank you. We'll talk... may I ask a question about the Bill? Looking at our analysis, they indicated going back to the issue that seemed so interesting to the other side of the aisle were the robo-calls. Now, is there anything in the Bill concerning the robo-calls and the use of caller ID?"

Currie: "There... there is a language also saying that someone making the robo-calls cannot block caller ID information.

We're not permitting people who make robo-calls to block caller ID, for example."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Franks: "Okay. Are there any other procedural safeguards in the Bill? Representative, if I can draw your attention to paragraph 13, which allows the State Board of Election to select precincts for random retabulation after election day. Could you please describe that more fully? I'm a little confused."

Currie: "Right now... right now, in fact, the State Board of Elections does exactly that. They establish the formula for the automatic 5 percent retabulation when voting is done by an optical scan or a DRE machine. And what we're doing here is clarifying that that is their responsibility. This is an... it requires them also to give the information to political parties within the jurisdiction of what that formula will be. The actual retabulation, of course, will be done as it is today, at the local level, following the formula established by the state board."

Franks: "So, all you're really doing is codifying existing practice."

Currie: "Exactly. Exactly. And clarifying that the state board will continue to make sure that the political parties know that they have established the formula, which then will be the subject of the retabulation."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, Republicans are willing to work late into the evening. We'll stay here all night if that's what it takes. But what's taking place here is an abomination. Just because this is a Democrat election Bill, those people in the gallery up there should not be kept in the dark.

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Now, I insist that we either have a flashlight or maybe even the Governor could get them a candle, but this... this has gone on too long. We're gonna be out of here... as the sun sets and they remain in the dark, we're going to be leaving."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?

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

Lang: "Representative, I heard someone on the other side of the aisle talk about the right to have absentee ballots counted in the precinct. There's no such right, is there?"

Currie: "I wouldn't imagine that there would be. And it seems to me that doing a central count will make things more efficient, will make information quicker... more quickly available at the precinct level and to the people at large."

Lang: "So the right we do have is to have our vote counted."

Currie: "Right. Exactly. Exactly."

Lang: "There's nothing in the law today that gives us... that tells us how that vote is to be counted."

Currie: "Exactly."

Lang: "It's up to this General Assembly to pass legislation to make it more efficient to count the votes."

Currie: "Exact... exactly. Faster."

Lang: "And your position is that this Bill will make that more efficient."

Currie: "Right now that central counting is being done for DRE...
for early voting. It makes sense to do it all in one place.
Information about who is an early voter, who is an absent
voter, that will continue to be made available to people at

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

the precinct level on a daily basis. And this only says that the count will happen at the central location. I think that we will find that those counts will happen more quickly over time because these... this machinery... the new machinery is more efficient."

- Lang: "Well, how... how will the ballots... how will the most... how will the latest ballots that are cast in the local township or village or wherever get downtown in time... or get to the counting place in time for them to be counted?"
- Currie: "Well, as you know, today if somebody gets the absent ballot in too late for them to go to the precinct level it's already counted downtown, and that would not change under this."
- Lang: "Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Currie is recognized to close."
- Currie: "Thank you. We've had a good discussion. This is about accountability and transparency in elections. Robo-calls should require a disclosure, just as brochures and radio ads do today. I appreciate your support for the passage of Senate Bill 1445."
- Speaker Hannig: "So 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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take
 the record. There has been a request for a verification by
 Representative Krause, so I would ask the staff from both
 sides of the aisle to retire to the rear of the chamber.
 I'd ask for all the Members to please be in their seats.

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

And Mr. Clerk, would you read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Acevedo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; Brosnahan; Burke; Chapa LaVia; Chavez; Collins; Colvin; Currie; D'Amico; Davis, M.; Davis, W.; Delgado; Dugan; Dunkin; Feigenholtz; Flider; Flowers; Franks; Fritchey; Golar; Gordon; Graham; Granberg; Hamos; Hannig; Hoffman; Holbrook; Howard; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Joyce; Lang; Lyons, J.; Mautino; May; McCarthy; McGuire; McKeon; Mendoza; Miller; Molaro; Osterman; Phelps; Reitz; Rita; Ryg; Scully; Smith; Soto; Turner; Verschoore; Washington; Yarbrough; Younge; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Krause, do you have a question of those voting in the affirmative?"

Krause: "Representative McKeon."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McKeon. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He's at the rear of the chamber. Representative Krause, could Representative Hoffman have leave?"

Krause: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Representative Hoffman has... Any further, Representative Krause?"

Krause: "Representative Fritchey."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey. He's on... on the Republican side of the aisle in the front."

Krause: "Representative Holbrook."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook is in his seat."

Krause: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Nothing else."

Speaker Hannig: "On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes' and 43 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a

125th Legislative Day

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 2185?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2185 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Nekritz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the last Bill, my... my switch did not work and I'd like to be... the record to reflect that I would've voted 'aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will reflect your intentions, Representative. Okay, on Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read Senate Bill 627."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Hold that on Second Reading. Read Senate Bill 630, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 630, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that on Second, Mr. Clerk, and read Senate Bill 929."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 929, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment

125th Legislative Day

- #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk, and read Senate Bill 1216."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1216, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Hold that on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1245, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1247, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1248, offered by Representative McGuire. House Resolution 1249, offered by Representative Churchill. House Resolution 1250, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 1251, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 1252, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 1253, offered by Representative Hassert. House Resolution 1254, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 1255, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1256, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 1256, offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there any announcements? Representative Colvin. Representative Colvin."

125th Legislative Day

- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois
 House Black Caucus will meet immediately after Session in
 Room 122B."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin, I'm advised that that room is... is not available."
- Colvin: "All right. Then I'm gonna take that out of the record for a moment."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, you wanna read the House Committee schedule."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m.: the Executive Committee in Room 118, the Labor Committee in Room D-1, the Revenue Committee in Room 114, and the State Government Administration Committee in Room C-1. The following committees will meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning: Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education in Room 118, Appropriations-General Services in Room 115, Appropriations-Higher Education in Room C-1, Appropriations-Human Services in Room 114, and Appropriations-Public Safety in Room D-1."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanna revise that statement.

 The House Black Caucus will meet in Room 115 immediately following adjournment today. Room 115."
- Speaker Hannig: "Are there any other announcements? Then allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, at the order of... at the hour of 12:30 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the House stands adjourned."

125th Legislative Day

5/1/2006

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 5787, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."