23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones and pagers and we ask our 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 Reverend Michael Tozer, the pastor of the Springfield Foursquare Church in Springfield, Illinois. Reverend Tozer is the guest of Representative Poe."

Reverend Tozer: "Let us bow our heads. Almighty God and eternal God, may we bow our heads as well as our hearts in honor and to Your divine presence. As we glorify You this day, heavenly Father, we give You thanks that Your holy word declares that we might enter into Your sacred presence. With confidence and boldness, by the very blood of the cross, let us always remember as we bow to You that Your scriptures declare yet a time is coming and now has come when the true worshipers will worship You and the Father and the spirit and in truth. For this is the kind of worshipers the Father seeks. Mighty high God, we call to You in remembrance of our leaders of this great state and its people. No one knows better than You, Almighty God, how fearfully the peace and the justice of this state depends upon these leaders. May Your name, Oh Lord, and by Your name, we pray for our leaders that they may not neglect their stewardship, neither mistake their very nature of their obligations. May Your anointing be upon these men and women. Let them never doubt Your love, that divine love and that power within their life. Compel them to use their full

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- passions and talents that You have bestowed upon them for their great state to accomplish great and mighty things in Your name, amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman 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. Can ya..."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Dunkin and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 115 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Hannig in the Chair."
- Speaker Hannig: "...Clerk, read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 173, offered by Representative Lang. House Resolution 174, offered by Representative Mautino. House Resolution 179, offered by Representative Howard. Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1729 and

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

House Bill 2781; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 913; 'recommends be adopted' is House Joint Resolution 27. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 679, House Bill 1041, House Bill 1058, House Bill 1059, House Bill 1084, House Bill 1696, House Bill 3633; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 678, House Bill 1100, and House Bill 1279. Representative Colvin, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' House Bill 1360. Representative Boland, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1288; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1657. Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Access, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1455; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 192, Representative Nekritz, Chairperson and House Bill 813. from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Bill 426. Committee on Agriculture & Conservation, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 918, House Bill 1499, House Bill 1635, House Bill 1768, House Bill 1779, House Bill 1864; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 297, House Bill 425, House Bill 1553, and House Bill 1741. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation and Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 663; 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 635, House Bill 654, House Bill 656, House Bill 735, House Bill 841, House 1238, and Bill 994, House Bill House Bill Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Ethanol Production Oversight, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1399. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 06, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1610, and House Bill 1660; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 943, and House Bill 1425; 'recommends be

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

adopted' House Joint Resolution 25. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Drivers Education & Safety, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' House Bill 116, House Bill 145, House Bill 293, House Bill 329, House Bill 559, House Bill 630, House Bill 801; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 262, and House Bill 1786. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is House Bill 796, House Bill 1077, House Bill 1256, House Bill 1257, House Bill 1453, House Bill 1538, House Bill 1540, House Bill 1643, House Bill 1732, House Bill 1799, House Bill 3510, House Bill 3604, House Bill 3762; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 892, House Bill 1082, House Bill 1758, House Bill 1759, House Bill 1882, and House Bill 3475."

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

Molaro: "Yeah. Thank you. I have an inquiry of the Chair and I would hope that my Republican colleagues can hear this. Here's the question I have and the Speaker's right here, maybe he can help me answer this. Ya know, we're supposed to eat in either one of the rooms on either side, correct? Well, the problem is there's been a couple times where I went on that side to eat and I've been told by Republicans, hey, this is our side. Now, I wanna know is it me or is

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

there some rule that I don't know about or should I take it personally? Well, I'm... I'm not eatin' over there, but there's no rule. They're sending me a message was that it..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, that... this beautiful chamber belongs to all of us."

Molaro: "I was afraid of that."

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

Rita: "For an announcement. Mr. Speaker, we're gonna change the time for the Tollway Oversight Committee to 2:30. So, at 2:30 the Tollway Oversight Committee will meet."

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

Dugan: "For an announcement, Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

Dugan: "Yes. I just wanted to let committee Members know, the Homeland Security meeting scheduled for tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. has been canceled. The Homeland Security meeting tomorrow morning at 8:00 has been canceled."

Speaker Madigan: "The regular Session will stand in recess. The Chair recognizes the Doorkeeper for an announcement."

Doorkeeper Crawford: "Mr. Speaker, the Honorable President Jones and the Members of the Senate are at the door and seek admission to the chamber."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Doorkeeper, please admit the Honorable Senators. As designated in House Joint Resolution 33, the number of 12... the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Joint Session of the 95th General Assembly will now come to order. Will the Members of the House and our esteemed guests from

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

the Senate please take their seats. Mr. Clerk, is a quorum of the House present?"

Clerk Mahoney: "A quorum of the House is present."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. President, is a quorum of the Senate present in this chamber?"

President Jones: "A quorum of the Senate is present in the House chamber."

Speaker Madigan: "There being a quorum of the House and a quorum of the Senate in attendance this Joint Session is convened. The Chair would like to announce some distinguished people who have joined us today. We're joined by the Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn; the Attorney General Lisa Madigan; the Secretary of State Jesse White; the Comptroller Dan Hynes; the Treasurer Alexi Giannoulias; Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court Anne Burke; the Auditor General Bill Holland; interim Superintendent of Education Christopher Koch; Mayor of Springfield Tim Davlin; Chair of the Illinois Arts Council Shirley Madigan; the wife of Senator Jones, Laurie Jones; director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs Tammy Duckworth. In advance, let me just acknowledge that the Governor will be joined by three of his people: 1) John Harris, the Chief of Staff; Ginger Ostro, the budget director and Tony Rossi, the Deputy Chief of Staff. Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Clerk please read Joint Session Resolution 1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Joint Session Resolution #1.

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- RESOLVED, That a committee of ten be appointed, five from the House, by the Speaker of the House, and five from the Senate, by the President of the Senate, to wait upon his Excellency Governor Rod Blagojevich and invite him to address the Joint Assembly."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for the adoption of Joint Session Resolution 1."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Pursuant to the Resolution, the following are appointed as a committee to escort the Governor. From the House the appointments would be: Representative Chapa LaVia, Representative Coladipietro, Representative Cole, Representative Flider, Representative Osterman."
- President Jones: "The Senate Members are: Senator Willie Delgado, Senator Gary Forby, Senator Linda Holmes, Senator Randy Hultgren and Senator John Millner."
- Speaker Madigan: "Will the Committee of Escorts please convene at the rear of the chamber and await His Excellency the Governor. If the committee would please proceed to the rear of the chamber. The Chair recognizes the Doorkeeper. Mr. Doorkeeper."
- Doorkeeper Crawford: "Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Governor of the State of Illinois, Rod Blagojevich and his party wish to be admitted to the chamber."
- Speaker Madigan: "Admit the Governor and his party to the chamber. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

please take our seats. If everyone could be seated, please. Please take your seats. The Members can please take their seats. Mr. Molaro, please take your seat. Mr. Governor." Governor Blagojevich: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Senate President Jones, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Before I begin today, I'd like to make a quick acknowledgement. I wanna take just a second to acknowledge a genuine American hero who served our country in the military in Iraq, who flew a Blackhawk helicopter, who suffered grave, grave injuries and among the many medals she has received was a Purple Heart. She's now serving our state as the director of Veterans' Affairs. She is serving us with great distinction. She will play a leading role in our efforts to expand access to health care to everybody including our veterans. Ladies and Gentlemen, Duckworth. This budget address is prescribed by our Constitution; the proposals I will offer today prescribed by our collective conscience and what I believe, is a moral imperative. Today, we will begin the biggest, most fundamental change, in our 4-year effort, to put middle-class and working families at the center of who we fight for. It is a change that is long overdue and a change that is desperately needed. For decades, it's been the middle-class and the working families of Illinois that have shouldered more and more of the tax burden. And while they've paid more, the wealthiest corporations in our state have paid less and less. The impact of this imbalance weakens our economy, it burdens our families and it holds our state back. And the saddest irony of all, the very

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

people burdened by an unfair tax system, middle-class families and working families, were hurt by the underfunding of education, health care and pension funds. Let me give you two facts to frame the moral imperative of what we face. Fact one: the average taxpayer in Illinois pays fifteen hundred dollars (\$1500) in state income taxes, not mention ever rising property taxes. Fact two: twelve thousand five hundred twenty-one (12,521) of the biggest corporations with sales of over two hundred and sixty-three billion dollars (\$263,000,000,000) in Illinois paid on an average one hundred and fifty-one dollars (\$151). The moral imperative is this: while the middle-class pays more and huge corporations just walk, a child pays the price with increasingly crowded classrooms, the family in need of health care pays a price in health care they can't afford, the worker depending on a pension pays a price with a retirement that is no longer secure. Illinois has one of the most regressive tax states in the nation. It's unfair and it doesn't work. It puts small and medium-sized businesses at a competitive disadvantage. It underfunds our schools, shortchanges health care, and it has forced a generation of our leaders here in Springfield, over the last 30 years, to underfund the pensions of teachers, state employees, and retirees. It's a tax system... it's a tax system that increases the burden on middle-class families, doesn't ease them. It's a tax system that is archaic and ignores the realities of today's economy. It's a tax system that is holding us back and it is a tax system we must change. So today, I will unveil a historic Tax Fairness

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Plan that will replace the loophole-ridden corporate income tax with a simple, fair Gross Receipts Tax. This will close corporate loopholes, give the middle-class the tax relief they need and allow us to meet our needs on schools, health It will allow us to make and pensions. unprecedented commitment to education that will relieve the The choice is simple: higher pressure on property taxes. property taxes or having corporations pay their fair share. It will allow us to expand health care for all, to help small businesses with the cost of health care and to improve the quality of care. The choice is simple: we can ignore health care or have corporations pay their fair share. will allow us to fund our pensions, removing this long, created threat to our fiscal health. The choice is simple: we can let the pension challenge worsen or we can have corporations pay their fair share. We can take this historic step now because for the past 4 years, you have rejected the old politics that accepted failure. Four years ago, our budget had a five billion dollar (\$5,000,000,000) deficit, our economy was weak, our leadership misguided. We have done so much to fix this mess. We gave nearly four billion dollars (\$4,000,000,000) more to our schools; we created higher standards and gave every three-year-old and four-year-old a chance to go to preschool. We made the biggest payment to our pension fund in Illinois history. We gave more working parents in Illinois health care than any other state in America and we made Illinois the first state in the nation to cover every single child with health care. And don't forget... and don't forget for a minute that along

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

we cut millions of dollars the way, in waste; consolidated agencies and made government answer to you, the From the mismanagement, debt and failure we taxpayers. inherited, we've turned things around. Our actions were built on the fundamental belief that we could create a new set of priorities that put the needs of people ahead of the political system. That's why we squeezed government waste. It's why we pushed and prodded the system. It's why we never have, and never will, just accept it... things the way they are. It's why we focused on real progress for people, in schools, and health care, but now we are at a crossroads. Do we spend the next 4 years standing still, falling back on tired old solutions, or do we once again offer new ideas and rise to the challenges we face? I say, it's time for new It's time we act boldly. It's time we seize the moment and do more for the people of Illinois. So here is my Tax Fairness Plan: it is big, it is bold, it addresses challenges, it solves problems, it will get the job done, remake our state, strengthen our economy, and meet the needs of the people. And here's what we can achieve when fairness becomes reality, beginning with our schools. MvFairness Plan will allow us to invest a record ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000) more into our schools over the next 4 years, ten billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000) to improve schools, to support our teachers and to help our kids learn. This increase in funds is nearly three times bigger than any increase in Illinois's history. Ten billion (10,000,000,000) new dollars that will help relieve the pressure on local property taxes and finally, finally bring

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

an end to the savage inequality in how we fund our schools. A permanent, dedicated... a permanent, dedicated, sustainable source of revenue. No short-term fixes. The money our schools need, money to help build new classrooms, for more teachers, more training, more technology and better results and, more reforms, more accountability. Consolidate more school districts, cut more administrative waste and put more money into the classroom where it belongs. Our education program seeks to build new schools, help schools afford special education teachers, fund after-school tutoring for underachieving students, extend the school day and the school year for underachieving schools, fully fund preschool for all so every three- and four-year-old can continue to attend preschool, and bring full-day kindergarten to every school in Illinois. So, here is the choice we now face: overburden the steelworker, the farmer, the nurse, janitor, stick it to the people who clock into work, who count pennies and cut out vacations to make ends meet, stick it to them again, by raising their income taxes or increasing their sales taxes, or get the biggest corporations who are making billions of dollars in Illinois, to simply pay their fair share. To me, the choice is simple. I stand with the people. When we embrace tax fairness we can fully fund our schools and make good on the promise of opportunity. The time is now. Let us seize the moment. But let's not stop there. Public education is a right. And I believe so is access to affordable, quality health care. I am proud to say that our 'All Kids' program has helped more than three hundred and thirty-two thousand

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

(332,000) kids stay healthy by providing access to health care. All Kids has given every child in our state a chance to see a doctor. That's real progress. But there are still tens of thousands of people across Illinois who can't. were right to start with kids the first time around. That's as it should be. But now it's time to give everybody that There are those who say, 'Go slow. Don't attempt to do this. It's too big of a job. There's only so much you can do. The politics is complicated. And isn't this an issue the Federal Government should take up? This isn't something states can do by themselves.' Well, I just don't see how we can pass the buck. Illinois has not and will not wait for Washington to act. Ya know, it was 42 years ago today that Dr. Martin Luther King began his historic march from Selma to Montgomery. When I was thinking about that, I remembered something he said about health care. He said, 'Of all the forms of inequality, it is the injustice in health care that is the most shocking and inhumane.' I'd like you to just think about what that means. I heard a story the other day about a young mother with three sons. Her boys are 13, 11, and 7. They were younger then. Her husband is self-employed, a contractor, in business for himself. But as he was working to build his business, he couldn't afford health insurance. Little by little this young mother began noticing that she was getting tired But in the day-to-day juggling of raising her family, she put it out of her mind. As time went by other symptoms appeared. Something was wrong. She was sick. Only then when she started feeling so bad, did she stop

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

putting off something she felt the family couldn't afford to do. So she went to Cook County Hospital, but by then it was She was diagnosed with stage IV cancer. too late. didn't take long after that. Her cancer spread and took her life and now her boys will be raised without their mother. I wonder how much of her putting off going to the doctor, when she first experienced some of her symptoms, was because she didn't have insurance, or a regular doctor, or didn't feel she could afford to spend the money to get a simple checkup. Had this family had health care, it's very likely that this mom would have seen a doctor earlier and received the treatment that, maybe, could have saved her life. sure all of you here have heard stories like this. It's all It's the inequality in health care that Dr. King spoke about. Those of us who make the rules have the benefit of good health care. We're fortunate. But how many of us have neighbors who don't? Some can see a doctor, some I don't believe that's how God intended it to be. can't. For me personally, I can't think of a more important challenge for us to solve than this. I believe this is the most important thing we can do. We cannot accept inaction; it's not enough to just blame Washington. We must act. need is clear. The time is now. And our Tax Fairness Plan gives us the way to do it. There are one point four million (1,400,000) adults in Illinois who don't have health insurance, but our health care challenges go way beyond just covering the uninsured. There are nine point seven million (9,700,000) adults in Illinois who do have health insurance, but their costs keep going up as they keep getting less and

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

They pay high premiums for plans with high deductibles and high copays. These families are getting squeezed and they're worried. They know there are no guarantees. They know that if they lose their job, they lose their health care. Or they may be stuck in a job, afraid to pursue their dreams. Maybe they want to start a new business, but they can't do it because if they lose their job and leave their job, they would lose their health care. Or they are the people, who year after year, buy health insurance but then they get sick. Then the time comes to renew their policy but their health insurance company doesn't want them anymore. Or they are the kids that are now grown up. They've left home, gone to college, joined the workforce. They're on their own. They're under 30 but over 20. They're mostly healthy but mom and dad, understandably so, are worried that, God forbid, something happens and they don't have health insurance. There are dozens of other examples of families and small businesses that are at the mercy of a health care system that may not be there for them when they need it. People who have health insurance no longer feel secure. That is why we have spent the last several months talking with experts, meeting with health care advocates, lawmakers, medical service providers and others with a commitment to reform, all in an effort to get it right. I am proud to say we have developed a plan that is secure, it's affordable, reliable and leaves nobody, nobody behind. We call it 'Illinois Covered', and it has three main components: first, we will cover the one point four million (1,400,000) uninsured adults here in Illinois.

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Second, we will help provide assistance to middle-class families to help them get, keep, and afford the health care they need. And third, we will help small businesses pay for health care for their workers. At the heart of our plan is one simple goal: everyone, everyone should have access to affordable, quality health care. So here ... so here is the choice we now face: ignore the needs of the working families for health care, burden our small struggling to pay businesses costing us jobs and deny health care hardworking families, or, improve health care by having the biggest corporations pay their fair share. We have made historic progress on health care. Now, let's finish what we started. Which brings me to the third great challenge our Tax Fairness Plan will help us meet. We inherited a pension system awash in red ink. We recognized early on that we would have to take swift and serious action to slow the bleeding. We were saddled with the largest underfunded pension system in the nation: forty-three billion dollars (\$43,000,000,000). And, while the numbers are still staggering, we have made significant progress. Thanks to the help of many of you here, we have invested more than thirteen billion dollars (\$13,000,000,000) into the pensions. That's more than any administration in Illinois history. We've reduced the unfunded liability but in spite of the progress we've made, this problem, it's getting worse, not better. I wonder how many of you remember the story from Greek mythology about Hercules and the Hydra headed monster. I bet Alexi Giannoulias remembers this story. Grappling with this pension mess reminds me of that

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Hercules knew that if he cut off the head of the Hydra with his sword, two would grow back. You cut off another head, two more would grow back, and on and on. That's a lot like the interest payments on the pension liability we inherited. It's not enough just to pay down the interest, you have to take a sword or a club to the principal. When we were all elected last November 7th, the unfunded pension liability was down to thirty-seven billion dollars (\$37,000,000,000). Then we got together for the fall Veto Session where we raised the minimum wage, celebrated Thanksgiving, enjoyed the holidays with our families, welcomed in the New Year, watched the Bears in the Superbowl and honored Abraham Lincoln on his birthday. here we are now, back together again in the first week of March, and lo and behold, our pension debt is back up to almost forty-one billion dollars (\$41,000,000,000). Now we know how Hercules felt, the more heads you cut off, the more heads grow back. My Tax Fairness Plan will make paying down the principal a reality. Our plan will free up an asset like the Lottery, lease it, generate ten to twelve billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000 to \$12,000,000,000) and put that toward our pension obligation. That, along with another pension bond refinancing, will put an infusion of twenty-six billion dollars (\$26,000,000,000) into the system and bring down our liability from forty-one billion dollars (\$41,000,000,000) to fifteen billion (\$15,000,000,000) and most important of all, it will make a big dent in the principal and finally put an end to the many-headed monster of out-of-control interest payments. My

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Tax Fairness Plan will also free up revenue from other parts of the budget so that we can finally pass and fund a capital So here is the fundamental choice we face. We can fund education, health care, our pension system, strengthen our infrastructure by having the corporations in Illinois pay their fair share or we can continue to burden the middle-class. That is our choice. I side with the middle-class. Join me in this fight. And it will be a fight. But it's a fight worth having. And it's a fight that's long overdue. In 1977, the corporate share of the state income tax was 21 percent, individuals paid 79 percent. Fast forward to today. Even after closing 17 corporate loopholes over the last 4 years, the corporate share of the state income tax has gone from 21 percent in 1977 to 12 percent now. At the same time, the people are stuck with 88 percent of the tax bill. This is happening at a time in America when the average CEO of a corporation earns four hundred (400) times more than the average worker. That worker today has to work more than 1 year just to make the money that his or her CEO makes in one day. In 2004, and that's the year we have the most complete available data, eight hundred and eighteen (\$818,000,000) of the eight hundred and fifty million dollars (\$850,000,000) collected in corporate income taxes were paid by four thousand nine hundred and fifty-six (4,956) companies. That same year, there were eight thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight (8,928) corporations with gross sales Illinois of more than two hundred and fifty-six billion dollars (\$256,000,000,000) that paid, are you ready for

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

this, no corporate income taxes. In fact, 20 percent of the businesses in Illinois, 20 percent of the businesses in Illinois paid 96 percent of the corporate income taxes, 80 percent paid little or nothing. That puts the businesses that do pay taxes at a competitive disadvantage, but it's worse than that. In 2004, ninety-nine (99) of the Fortune 100 companies filed income tax returns in Illinois, thirtyseven (37) of those paid no state income taxes even though they averaged one point two billion dollars (\$1,200,000,000) in sales in Illinois. These thirty-seven (37) firms reported total profits of ninety-five billion dollars (\$95,000,000,000) nationwide and paid no taxes, ninety-five billion dollars (\$95,000,000,000) in profits, in profits, and paid no corporate income taxes in Illinois. And don't think for a moment that this is somehow just confined to 2004, that 2004 was just a bad year, an aberration. The sad reality is that 2004 represents the same trends as every other year. In fact, from 1997 to 2004 48 percent of corporations with annual sales in Illinois of fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) or more paid zero corporate income taxes, zero corporate income taxes, zero, nada, bupkis, nothing. Yet... yet these companies still enjoy all the benefits provided by the state paid for by the taxpayers: education, roads, health care, emergency assistance, police protection. When large corporations don't pay their fair share to the state, our schools are underfunded, our health care needs go unmet, local governments suffer and property taxes go up. This is grossly unfair. It is unfair... it is unfair to individuals who play by the rules, who go to work

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

and pay their taxes. It is unfair to homeowners trying to afford ever-rising property taxes. It's unfair to smalland medium-sized businesses who don't have fancy accountants or powerful lobbyists. It's grossly unfair that 20 percent of businesses pay 96 percent of the corporate taxes. tax system that allows this is flawed and broken and needs to be changed. Let's change this system; the time to do it So I am proposing that we adopt a Gross Receipts Tax on corporations that will replace the loophole-ridden corporate income tax. This will ease the burden on the middle-class and force big corporations to start paying their fair share. A Gross Receipts Tax is not an income It is based on the amount of receipts of a business. No business with sales of less than one million dollars (\$1,000,000) will pay it. This means 75 percent of all Illinois companies, 75 percent of all Illinois companies will be exempt. Small businesses will be protected. Illinois exports will not be affected, which means the goods and services we make here, but sell to another state, or other countries, will not be the subject, I repeat, not be the subject of the GRT. This is vital to protect our manufacturing and agricultural industries and keep Illinois an attractive and competitive marketplace. The GRT we are proposing would set rates at 0.5 percent on the goods economy and 1.8 percent on the service economy. Ву eliminating the loophole-riddled corporate income tax and replacing it with the GRT, we will generate six billion dollars (\$6,000,000,000) in recurring, new revenue. will give us the funding we need for schools and health care

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

and allow us to commit the Lottery to the pension funds. games, no ifs, no buts, we pay-as-you-go, and the biggest corporations that have burdened the middle-class finally pay their fair share. Delaware, Washington, Texas, Hawaii and Ohio currently use the GRT and with great results. the period from 1980 through 2000, wage and salary employment grew by 64 percent in Washington State. growth rate is almost 50 percent faster than the U.S. average of 42.5 percent. Ohio recently moved to a GRT. A study performed by Ernst & Young says the GRT will increase Ohio's gross state product by five point six billion dollars (\$5,600,000,000) and create nearly eighty thousand (80,000) new jobs. The GRT is the right and responsible thing to do. It is fair to all taxpayers in Illinois. It is fair to individuals and to businesses. It is the tax reform we desperately need. But the corporate business community has proposed a different solution. They want me to raise the income tax and increase the sales tax. They want us to raise taxes on people. How on earth could any of us possibly entertain the thought of taking another one thousand (\$1,000) out of the pocket of the guy who is making fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) a year, who is struggling to raise his family and build a better life, when a big corporation that generates more than fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) in sales pays nothing. I'm going to say again... I'm going to say again what I've said before a million times: I will not raise the income tax; I will not raise the sales tax; I will not raise taxes on people. Instead, I intend to make our tax system fair, one that is

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

less regressive, more progressive and one that meets the needs of funding our schools and giving people access to affordable health care. Now, get ready. You're going to hear the usual old refrain from the guardians of the status quo who want to keep the tax system the way it is. Keep it, where they pay less and you pay more. Here's what they'll They'll say that doing this will cost us jobs. you know what? They are just as wrong today as they have been for the last 4 years when we closed corporate loopholes and raised the minimum wage. The unemployment rate today is at one of its lowest levels and despite their usual cries of doom and gloom, today, business in Illinois is enjoying record profits. They're simply wrong again. On the GRT, here are the facts: fact: 75 percent of businesses are exempt. I'm gonna say that again. Seventy-five percent of businesses are exempt. Fact: sales of food and medicine are exempt. Fact: exports are exempt so there is no competitive disadvantage for Illinois. Fact: the loophole-riddled corporate income tax costs us jobs because it's inefficient and unfair. Fact: small businesses need affordable health care and better schools and this delivers that. leading business groups warned we need to address the pension debt. Fact: even the anti-tax and conservative Chicago Tribune called the Gross Receipts Tax 'a good idea'. You will be lobbied, you will be pressured, your arm will be twisted, the defenders of the status quo will invent all sorts of excuses to convince us to back down, to give up, to raise taxes on the middle-class instead. Let us say loudly and clearly, no. No, to the special interests; no, to the

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

politics of inaction; no, to excuses and half measures. also know there will be a temptation to settle for half a loaf. Let's just fund health care and let education remain unfunded. Or, let's just fund education, and ignore our health care needs, education and health care, health care and education, one and inseparable. Families need both; they should never have to choose and neither should we. time for fundamental reform is now. The average family in Illinois pays fifteen hundred dollars (\$1500) taxes, and even more in high property taxes. thousand five hundred and twenty-one (12,521) of the biggest corporations in Illinois pay, on average, one hundred and fifty-one dollars (\$151) in state taxes. If you are middleclass and you feel squeezed, you're right. business, but I'm also pro reform. Doing what's right demands that the middle-class not carry the entire burden of our schools, our health care, and our pensions. That's even more pressing now with middle-class families already getting hit with higher consumer costs. Everyone in this room knows about the huge impact of double and even triple increases in electric utility rates. I know you've been working on plans to reduce the impact of these rates. I'm eager to work with you and sign legislation, just as soon as you send it to me, that protects families and businesses from crippling rate hikes. But remember... but remember... Are you safe over there now, Don? But remember, as we take these short-term steps to help the middle-class, we must address the fundamental unfairness of our tax system. As I said when I took my oath of office, I work for the people who work hard and play by

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

the rules, for the families without lobbyists, inside deals, stock options and hedge funds. For the vast majority of the people in Illinois, they live in every part of our state, in every neighborhood, on every block. You will not hear them in the legislative chamber, but your child will be taught by You will not get a call from them, but they will answer our call and serve our country with distinction in the military. You will not be arm twisted by them, but they will use their arms and clean hotel rooms, collect garbage, build buildings, and make our cars. I side with the middleclass, with working families, with those who every day work to build a better life. Now we have a chance to take up their cause, to address the challenges that for three decades have burdened the families of Illinois. Let us be the ones, let it be this General Assembly, that solves the school funding crisis, that gives everyone access to health care, that makes fundamental fairness a reality. Let it be this General Assembly that rises to the challenge and does what others were unable to do. Let it be said by the school teacher, the parent, the nurse, the factory worker, the shopkeeper, that in this great chamber, at this unique time, we rose to the occasion, and we did great things for the people of Illinois. Thank you. And God bless all of you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Will the Committee of Escorts please come forward to escort the Governor from the chambers. The President of the Senate is recognized for a Motion."

President Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Joint Session do arise."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Speaker Madigan: "The President of the Senate has moved that the Joint Session do now arise. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Joint Session will now arise. The regular Session will come to order."
- Speaker Turner: "If the Senate would retire to their chamber, the House is ready to go to work. Will the Senate please retire to their chamber? If the Senators would leave, the House has work to do. Could the Senators please leave and go back to their chamber. Senator Hendon, could you follow the Governor? On page 9 of the Calendar, on the Order of House-Bills Third Reading... On page 9 of the Calendar, we have Representative Schmitz on House Bill 181. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 181, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "...from Kane, Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 181 very simply states that if you get assigned in court and your... you have to do weekend time, that that's all you get credit for. If you come in Friday, Saturday, Sunday, those are the three days. You do not get credit for the full week. That's what it simply states. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 181?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 182. Representative Bellock. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 182, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 182 is one of the main recommendations that also came out of the rural health care task force reguiding... regarding forensic psychiatry. And what this Bill does is to set up fellowships that would be training forensic psychiatrists in the State of Illinois. And it would be divided between the University of Illinois in Chicago and Southern Illinois University. Fourteen hundred (1400) of the beds for mentally ill people in Illinois... there are fourteen hundred (1400) beds, seven (7) of those are forensic beds. So, there is a dire need for forensic psychiatry in Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, for what ren... what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Franks: "A question. Is this only for the University of Illinois at Chicago?"

Bellock: "No. We separated it. It's between the University of Illinois in Chicago and Southern Illinois University where they used to have a forensic psychiatry program which was cut out a couple of years ago, so this would put it back in. So, it's being endorsed by all of those groups."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Franks: "How many forensic psychiatry programs do we have in the State of Illinois?"

Bellock: "I'm not sure about that, Representative."

Franks: "'Cause I'm wondering if there are any private institutions that also may offer a master's or a doctorate in forensic psychiatry and if so, whether those could also then be available for some of the grant funds."

Bellock: "All I know is that this specifically was asked for through the University of Illinois in Chicago and Southern Illinois, especially since Southern Illinois had had theirs cut out a couple of years ago and so this is why they were asking for it."

Franks: "I think it makes sense. I'm just wondering if it might be more beneficial if we amended this to allow for any institution that provides this type of training that way more... more individuals would have access to it instead of just those at those two institutions. Is that something you'd be willing to do? I don't know if you heard the question. I don't know if that'd be something you'd be willing to do to amend the Bill to allow it for any institution that provides the doctorate's or master's in forensic psychology."

Bellock: "I've had a hard enough time working on this for the last year to get this where it is right now, so I don't know if you wanna ask them to do it in the Senate. I'm not really interested in doing it right now because I can't get back to anybody that I worked with on the Bill..."

Franks: "Okay."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Bellock: "...and the universities were really in support of this, especially since SIU had had theirs taken away."

Franks: "Can we find out what other ones do it and then in the Senate, if you'd be in agreement, we could ask for them to make that Amendment and... when it gets to the Senate?"

Bellock: "You mean find out what, exactly?"

Franks: "How many other institutions provide this type of training and that way we could include everyone in the State of Illinois."

Bellock: "I'm willing to find out what other institutions provide it. There are none others in the State of Illinois that provide it."

Franks: "Well, that's just... that's..."

Bellock: "Sorry, I took..."

Franks: "Thank you."

Bellock: "It took the staff a little while to get here. I'm sorry. I should have known that myself."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, given the popularity of television shows, et cetera, give me a definition, if you would, of 'forensic psychiatry'? I think my perception of forensic is obviously different than... than what this Bill is about."

Bellock: "Forensic psychiatry... well, I don't have the definition right here... but it's psychiatry that deals with mentally ill

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

offenders and sex offenders, people that are in the criminal realm."

Black: "All right. But it would not preclude them working with any segment diagnosed with a mental illness, would it?"

Bellock: "No. It wouldn't preclude them. I guess what's happened is is there's such a need for this because of people that are mentally ill in the criminal realm that need extra training."

Black: "Okay. And... and I assume because the word 'psychiatry' is in the Bill, this means that these people must have a medical degree."

Bellock: "Yes. They're psychiatrists."

Black: "And then they go on into a residency for psychiatry, is that how it works?"

Bellock: "They have a master's in psychiatry already."

Black: "Okay. Fine."

Bellock: "All right."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Bellock: "It's a specialized training."

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

Miller: "A question for the Sponsor?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Miller: "Just... I can't remember in committee. Why do you need legislation on this, Representative Bellock?"

Bellock: "They had this before. I think we talked about that in committee and this was a program that was conducted by SIU for forensic psychiatry and so they were hoping to get it put back in because it was cut out a couple of years ago and

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

being that there are no other institutions that provide it, that's why they asked to do these fellowships."

Miller: "I guess... I guess since SIU is a proponent and every... it looks like there's no really... there's no opponents, why can't SIU just do it as an implementation of their program as opposed to going through this route?"

Bellock: "This is what they asked to do and it was provided before by DHS and then it was cut out. So, it was funded by DHS before."

Miller: "But there's no assurance that DHS will fund the program again?"

Bellock: "No. But I guess there's nobody else in the state that's providing this, so that's why they came to us to do the fellowships for them and there are a lot of other fellowships that are provided by universities for special studies already now. So, this would be a special study for forensic psychiatry."

Miller: "Well, a last question. Do you know of any other scholarships or special programs that require legislative... legislation to ensure that that program exists?"

Bellock: "I... I can't answer that, Representative."

Miller: "All right. Thank you."

Bellock: "Sorry."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 182?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 202. Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. House Bill 204, Representative Froehlich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 204, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Froehlich."
- Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 204 is the identical Bill the House passed unanimously 2 years ago. It simply requires the Department of Public Health to designate one existing staff member as a coordinator of men's health issues. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I'll be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien, for what reason do you rise? Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 204 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 209. Representative Krause. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 209, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I present at this time House Bill 209 which does provide that the Department of Health Care and Family Services, in conjunction with Human Services, will proceed under the Federal Opportunity Act. This Act does provide for additional funding grants that can be applied for for community-based alternatives for residential treatment for children. Seriously ill children require extra funding and extra help in health care. Under this new Act, this would provide that for any federal funds that may be available that the department would proceed to apply for these grants. Be pleased to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 209 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Verschoore. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 212. Representative Sacia. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 212, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 212 is a Bill brought to me by the Housing Authority of Jo Daviess County. They are insured through the local government health plan and accordingly they pay into Reserve Fund 193. For the past several years, the

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Governor has been sweeping these funds creating a financial burden on these type of organizations that pay into local government health plan. As a result, there has been a 5 percent increase in their health care premiums directly attributable to these fund raids... raidings. I know of no opposition to the Bill. And I ask for your support simply put so that the state cannot sweep the funds from Fund 193, Reserve Fund 193. Be happy to answer any questions."

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

Stephens: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Stephens: "Representative, are you telling me that the Governor of the State of Illinois is helping to increase the cost of health care for some workers in Illinois? I've..."

Sacia: "Absolutely, Sir. It... it has been determined that..."

Stephens: "Wait a minute. Governor Rod Blagojevich who just talked to us about the need for health care relief?"

Sacia: "That's correct, Sir."

Stephens: "I'm shocked."

Speaker Turner: "No... Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 212?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 217. Representative Sacia. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 217, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Sacia: House, House Bill 217 was brought to me by a automobile dealer in my district. It does affect dealerships throughout the State of Illinois. If you purchase a new or used titled vehicle, the dealership has 20 days to get the paperwork and documentation to the Secretary of State. Businesses typically do that. What is happening is the information is submitted to the Secretary of State; it is not moved in a timely manner from the Secretary of State to the Illinois Department of Revenue. Accordingly, Revenue then sends out assessments to the automobile dealerships because they didn't receive it in 20 days. The simp... The Bill simply states that they must go by the postmark as opposed to when Secretary of State or Revenue physically receives it at their desk. I would ask for your support. And I would be an... happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 217?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 228. Representative John Bradley. Out of the record. We have

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

House Bill 258, Representative Smith. Out of the record. We have House Bill 277, Representative Holbrook. Read the re… read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 277, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 277 is a Bill that is a permissive Bill that allows an independent not-for-profit group to be able to handle intermery... intermediary between the state and businesses looking to clean up their LUST areas, the leaking underground storage areas. I know of no opposition to this Bill. It's supported by the industry. It's supported by IEPA, by the Illinois Petroleum Marketers and it's worked well in a few other states. I wo... we would hope that it would work well in Illinois also. The... one piece of legislative intent to read in and that is that in this Bill it is not the intent of the proposed language in the current House Bill 277, as I'm presenting today, to prohibit finance charges by the assignee from being paid by some portion of the reimbursement that is received from the agency. It is permissible to do so. Glad to take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is,
'Shall House Bill 277 pass?' All those in favor should vote
'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The
Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are
115 voting 'aye', 0 'nays', 0 'presents'. And this Bill,
having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Representative Golar on House Bill 281. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 281, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, House Bill 281, Ladies and Gentlemen, actually passed the House in the 94th Assembly unanimously. However, in the Bill going over to the Senate, it got hung up in Rules. So, I am again coming before this Body asking for an 'aye' vote. This Bill is a current statute. The only thing that I'm doing is extending the statute of limitations for mortgage fraud which is real property from 3 years to 7 years. I ask for your support. And I'm also requesting an 'aye' vote. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to ask... answer those at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 281?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 295. Representative Colvin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 295, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Colvin."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 295 is a piece of legislation that deals with the extension of the monthly meter surcharge for gas and electric bills here in the State of Illinois which is... creates an additional supplemental funding mechanism for the LIHEAP fund. House Bill 295 simply changes the repeal date which creates supplemental low en... low-income energy assistance fund from December of 2007 to December 31 of 2013. This surcharge which was authorized by the General Assembly raises approximately seventy-five million dollars (\$75,000,000) per year that goes into the LIHEAP fund. The state supplemental fund was created as part of the 1997 deregulation law and it will expire... it has expired at the end of 2007. This legislation simply continues the fund to... dollars to be collected in the fund. It's a tremendous public safety and public health issue in terms of allowing Illinois to be one of the country's leaders in terms of LIHEAP dollars used to fund poor and low-income families. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 295?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 304. Representative Coulson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 304, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 304 requires the health facilities planning board to provide written reviews and to allow public written comments be entered into the record concerning permit applications. And I can answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 304 pass?' All... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"

Franks: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? I'd like to know...

I'm sorry. I wanted to hear what the explanation over this
Bill."

Coulson: "Want me to repeat it?"

Franks: "Yeah."

Coulson: "Okay."

Franks: "I'm not sure exactly what it does."

Coulson: "Okay. Well, what this Bill does is to allow for a public input to the CON process of the health facilities planning board. When... A lot of the changes occurred in the last few years. Unfortunately, public input has been limited because they've called it ex parte. We're working with the Illinois State Bar Association. I wanted to make sure that due process and an open process is allowed in the CON process and this is the language that we came up with."

Franks: "It's my understanding that the certificate in (sic-of) need process would be sunsetting in less than a month. Is that correct?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Coulson: "I believe that's so, but I still would like to keep this Bill alive in case it is... does not sunset because we are not, at this time, allowed to have public input into the process when we need it."
- Franks: "I thought that now, if one wanted to give public input, you could write a letter or testify at hearings. Is that incorrect?"
- Coulson: "There are public hearings that are sometimes held many... several months before the actual CON hearing. And what we are asking here is to require the board to take public input during the time of the hear... of the actual hearing on the CON."

Franks: "Okay. And I presume the board's against that?"

Coulson: "They have not talked to me."

Franks: "Has anyone reached out to you?"

- Coulson: "The Depar... the Department of Public Health mentioned that they were concerned that it might extend the process.

 That is not at all our intent and we said that we would work with them to change it. They have not come back to me to say that they needed any changes at this time."
- Franks: "I understand what you're trying to do, but if this is gonna send... sunset in a few weeks, you'd be better off holding off on this Bill until after April 1 to see whether it was necessary, 'cause I'm wondering if we're sending mixed messages if we vote to have more public input, but in reality we may wish to vote just to get rid of the entire process."
- Coulson: "My concern is we wait too long and let it... the sunset done... does not... gets extended that we could end up with less

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

public input and I really feel strongly that if we do have a CON process we must be able to have public input."

Franks: "Did you have a chance to read the latest report, the Lewin Report?"

Coulson: "Yes, I did."

Franks: "Was this one of their recommendations?"

Coulson: "It was part of the recommendation to... if the CON process continues to include public input."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Coulson: "Thanks."

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

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This came up before our committee and we had a lot of discussion about it and being that the Lewin Report just came out regarding the CON and in their third recommendation even though it was not as conclusive it did recommend that the CON board be kept because of safety net hospitals. I'm sure that that will be debated quite a bit, but I wanna commend Representative Coulson and the State Bar for allowing more transparency to that board and allowing more public comments. Thank you."

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

McCarthy: "Sorry. I just had one question. I'm sorry. I was trying to pay attention and look at the actual Bill. This does extend the sunset date?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Coulson: "No. This Bill has nothing to do with the sunset date.

 It just allows public due process input into the current CON process."
- McCarthy: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 304?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 318. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 318, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentle... the Lady asks leave to have the Bill brought back from Third to Second. The Bill will be moved to Second. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 358. Representative Chapa LaVia. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 358, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House.

 House Bill 358 amends the Vehicle Code to permit vanity and
 personalized options for various military plates. It
 eliminates the extra fee for acquiring vanity or
 personalized military plates. And I would ask for an 'aye'
 vote. Thank you."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 358?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have House Bill 364, Representative McGuire. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 364, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I have House Bill 364 which is kind of a rerun of a Bill we had a couple years ago for the West Nile Virus. I believe it was Representative Novak at the time. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote and if there's any questions, I'll try to answer 'em. And there are no opponents that I know of."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Meyer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

McGuire: "Sure."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Meyer: "Representative, in committee I'd asked the question if this fund had been swept. If I recall correctly, this is what you're asking for is fifty cent (.50)... a permanent fifty cent (.50) tire fee on top of an existing two dollar (\$2) tire fee. Is that correct?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- McGuire: "I'm not sure if that's correct because at the time in committee I... I think I mentioned to ya, Representative, that in all honesty I didn't know if there was a swept involved or not. And I thought we got the information to you since the committee meeting. Did you get the information that you were looking for?"
- Meyer: "Well, no, I haven't. But... though the point is that in committee, if I recall correctly, the testimony was that the fifty cent (.50) fee that was there on a temporary basis and for which you now want to make permanent had not been swept, but there had been a swept... a sweep of the underlying two dollar (\$2) fee or a portion thereof and my question to you is, well, if we're sweeping part of the two dollar (\$2) fee, why aren't we just not sweeping the two dollar (\$2) fee and getting our fifty cents (.50) that you need which I agree we should be spending or collecting, but why aren't you getting that fifty cents (.50) out of the portion that's being swept instead of charging additional?"
- McGuire: "Not charging additional, in fact the… both of these… they'll sunset. House Bill 364 deletes the sunset date of January 31, 2008, for the two dollar (\$2) fee and it also deletes the sunset date January 1, 2008, for the additional fifty cent (.50) fee which is charged for each new and used tire sale sold at retail."
- Meyer: "Well, in effect, you are increasing it because if it sunset it would no longer be collected and why aren't you collecting what you need out of that two dollar (\$2) fee and making... and extending that instead of extending both the two dollar (\$2) and the fifty cent (.50)?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

McGuire: "Well, the two dollar and fifty cent (\$2.50), as I understand it, is to deal with the problems of the West Nile Virus, so I think the two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) is well documented as being used properly and is well documented that it is. And I'm not sure I understand your question, Jim, but..."

"Well, my... my question centers around the fact that, in Meyer: fact, that fifty cents (.50) was tacked on to a two dollar (\$2) fee in addition to it because the two dollar (\$2) fee was being utilized and therefore, we needed the extra fifty cents (.50). I supported that at the time. I still believe that we need to fund West... our fight against West Nile Virus. That's not the point, but now the two dollar (\$2)... now we find out that the two dollar (\$2) underlying fee which at one point we were convinced we needed to add onto it by the fifty cents (.50). Isn't... in fact, it's partially swept and rather than to give the people of the state a tax break by just taking our money, we're... and we're allowing it to be swept in the General Fund. Well, I've made my point. I'm not gonna belabor it. Obviously, we need to... to have an effort against West Nile Virus. It's just a shame that we're sweeping the underlying fund and just sweeping that fact under the table."

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

Hamos: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in strong support of this Bill as one of those communities that was affected by West Nile Virus a few years ago. Keep in mind that this Bill only pertains to the fifty cent (.50) portion

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

that does have to do with the public health emergency fund and all of the proceeds from this fifty cents (.50) proceeds goes to the public health departments for public health purposes including West Nile Virus. Now, the previous speaker spoke about the underlying two dollars (\$2) that we also collect and I would... I would disagree that we sweep it, in fact, what we do is that we've set up a formula that allows some portion of that to go to GRF. And I think it is up to us as public officials, if we wanted to change the underlying formula, we certainly could, that has nothing to do with this Bill, but it's not... it's not a sweeping mechanism. It's something we passed to allow some portion that's collected from used tires to go to GRF, some portion not all. Again, this Bill is important to maintain our public health goals and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 364?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 464. Representative Colvin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 464, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 464 is a very simple premise and it deals with changing the Chicago School

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

District Code. It simply allows for the City of Chicago, teachers in the Chicago Public School System, to work in Chicago Public Schools who do not live in the City of Chicago. As we continue this debate about education in the State of Illinois, one of the principal precepts of all of this is the ability to attract good teachers into our schools. Having said that, I think, in this day and age, it's a little bit archaic to have a school system as big and diverse as the City of Chicago's which is surrounded by any hundred... any number of municipalities and the Chicago Public School System cannot go out and attract good teachers who live less than a mile from Chicago's borders to teach in our Good math teachers are good math teachers schools. regardless of where they live. Good science teachers are good science teachers regardless of where they live. think, this day and age, to remove this stipulation and to allow better teachers for a more diverse and more broad community to come into Chicago Public Schools who are willing to take on those tasks is imperative in improving education particularly in the city I live in, Chicago, Illinois. I know of... There is some opposition from, I believe, the Commerce Club of Chicago, but the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the Chicago Teachers Union are strongly supporting this Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Black: "Representative, in my experience, residency requirements generally left to the collective bargaining process. Why... why are we circumventing... maybe that's the wrong word... but it... in attempts that we're... it looks to me like we're attempting to bypass the collective bargaining process on where a teacher should or should not live who works in that system."

Colvin: "Well, currently, residency in a school district can be determined if it's already... if it's required at the time of employment. If the school district residency is not required at the time they're employed, then it cannot be used. Currently, the Chicago School District requires teachers to become residents in Chicago within six months of their employment and after that, they'd have to be a resident of the City of Chicago."

Black: "So, what you're asking me to do is to vote on a... a law that supersedes what the Chicago Board of Education has evidently bargained or contractually agreed to with their teachers. Because as you say, they have six months to live into the... to move into the city limits of the Chicago Public School System, but this Bill would say they never have to do that. They could live, it's a long commute, but I suppose they could live in Danville."

Colvin: "I suppose, I guess they could."

Black: "All right."

Colvin: "If they're willing to make the commute."

Black: "Thank... thank you very much, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. In my experience, I think, and these are always very emotional decisions, and that's why I

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

think it generally best left to the bargaining process as to whether or not an employee must live within the corporate boundaries of that taxing body that employs that person. know many cities have done this with police officers, fire... firefighters and again, it's... it's generally collective bargaining. As difficult and emotional as it could be, when you accept employment, if this is a condition of employment and the Gentleman said it is, currently, that you have six months to move into the Chicago Public School District boundary, then I would assume that that has been bargained over the years. And I've always felt that if you are paid out of tax money, and as we all know the property tax contributes most of the money to local education. If you're paid out of property taxes and yet you don't wanna live in that district and pay those property taxes, then I just have a fundamental concern about that. Chicago, being a very cosmopolitan city, I know that some places are extremely expensive in order to try and maintain a residence. I would assume other areas of the city are less so, but I really believe that this Bill interjects itself in the collective bargaining process and tells a local school board that we don't care what you say, we don't care what the condition of employment is, if all things are equal and you hire a teacher, that teacher can live in Tinley Park, that teacher could live in Kankakee, Joliet, wherever they choose to live and work in a taxing body but not pay property taxes to that body. I just have a fundamental problem with that. great respect for the Sponsor, but I can't in good

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

conscience and I've tried always to vote against these kind of Bills and will be voting 'no' as well this time."

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

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Osterman: "Representative Colvin, I guess kinda where I'm at is I understand that we want the best qualified teachers to teach the kids in Chicago Public Schools, the largest school district in the State of Illinois. Issues that happen in Chicago Public Schools, whether it be funding or other things, affect the entire state, but I think it's good for our city to have the teachers, the best qualified teachers, ones who choose to teach there but also live in our community. I think it's good for your community to have teachers living there; I think it's good for my community to have teachers living there, if they can afford it. And my fear would be moving forward that not only is it gonna concern teachers who wanna choose to teach tomorrow in the Chicago Public Schools, I'm concerned that there's gonna be a migration out of Chicago, exodus, out of Chicago of teachers that are there now. And I don't know what... what that'll do for our city and what that'll do for the schools and the teach... students that they teach. And I don't know if you have... what you think about that."

Colvin: "I appreciate your comments, Representative. One of the things, I guess, my perspective is a little different in response to your question about a mass exodus. I don't see it from that perspective from the... I see it from the

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

perspective is that this Bill, I don't think that given a teacher's ability to move to Calumet City tomorrow means she's gonna uproot her family and husband and children and buy a house out in the suburbs. What I see here is an opportunity for a lot of schools in the City of Chicago who have a very difficult time attracting and retaining good quality teachers. What it will allow Chicago to do is to broaden the pool of prospective teachers. Before I turn it back over to you, I did wanna address one concern of the previous speaker when he mentioned about the collective bargaining agreement. A voice in the sky reminded me that this residency requirement was imposed unilaterally and this is very important. It was imposed unilaterally by the Chicago board... by the Chicago board. It was not part of any union negotiations. The Chicago board... School Board imposed this provision unilaterally without any discussion or debate with respect to a union negotiation or any other type of negotiation. I understand your concern in terms of teachers livin' in Chicago. I do agree and in many precept... in many instances where an employee of Chicago Police Department or the Fire Department live in the City of Chicago, but I... I look at teachers the same way you look at good doctors to impose some type of provision, some artificial provision that will keep good doctors from coming and working in particular hospitals because they may be in the City of Chicago doesn't make much sense. It's a highly specialized profession where quality really matters. There are schools in the Chi... City of Chicago that can't get enough math teachers, can't get enough science teachers, we have to do

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

something about that. And to say that they have to live simply in the City of Chicago to be considered for employment or be willing to move to the City of Chicago within six months to me is a artificial barrier to prevent us from getting good teachers to teach in our schools."

Osterman: "Let me... let me close by saying this. I think, you and I both want the same thing and that's the best education for our students. I think where we differ is maybe reaching out to try to figure out a way that we'll bring in the best qualified teachers for our students. And I don't know if this is strictly the answer. Ya know, maybe there are ways that we can do grants for people to become... housing grants... for people to become teachers. My understanding is the city... Chicago Public Schools has a fairly aggressive program for recruiting teachers and making sure that Illinois students that are going to be teachers come to Chicago. So, I'm not sure how I'm gonna vote on this, but I... I'd like to work with you more on this issue to see what other things we can do. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "I'd like to remind the Members that this Bill is on Short Debate. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, my understanding of this Bill in committee was that this amended the Chicago School District Article of the School Code. Is that correct?"

Colvin: "Correct."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Eddy: "Okay. Because I would not be in favor of injecting the General Assembly into the bargaining process. I think Representative Black is 100 percent correct about that, that we should... should not engage in that here. My understanding of this, however, would be that this would allow it actually to be bargained because currently the law disallows the bargaining and so really by passing this it throws it into the proper arena which is collective bargaining, if they wanna bargain. If they bargain at that point, that this doesn't really actually change an existing bargaining agreement."

Colvin: "Well, to repeat what I said earlier is that this was never bargained by the union or Chicago Board of Education."

Eddy: "Okay. So, this is... this is simply changing..."

Colvin: "This was done unilaterally by the Board, imposed on the teachers in the Chicago Teachers Union."

Eddy: "My question is, is this part of the Chicago School District Article of the School Code? Are we changing the School Code or are we impacting a negotiated agreement?"

Colvin: "Yes, only Chicago."

Eddy: "Okay."

Colvin: "Yes."

Eddy: "And we're... we're changing the School Code?"

Colvin: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. And I think that's the important clarification.

This is changing the School Code not injecting ourself in the bargaining because..."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...all we're saying is we're changing the law..."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...and now you can bargain it anyway you want to."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. I just think that's an important clarification here because I agree with Representative Black, we don't wanna be in bargaining. But we're changing the law here; we're not changing bargaining agreements."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. I... I supported the Bill in committee and under that basis, I continue to support it. I think it's... it's important to attract good teachers. I just wanna make sure people understand they are not involved in that negotiated process if they vote 'yes' for this. Thank you."

Colvin: "Representative Eddy, I appreciate you clarifying that.

I think you characterized it 100 percent accurate."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Colvin, how long has this been in effect that they had to have a residency requirement, do you know?"

Colvin: "It has been in effect since, I believe, 1990... 1990...
1995 in the... when they... here in the General Assembly when they passed the Chicago School Reform Bill."

Mulligan: "Was that part of the Chicago School Reform?"

Colvin: "No, that is not."

Mulligan: "I... I didn't remember it."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Colvin: "And that's part of the School Board. The School Board did that. That's not part of the legislation, no."

Mulligan: "Because I represent... well, I also have a little part of Chicago now which I didn't have before the redistricting... but I represent communities that abut Chicago and I have retired teachers and teachers who taught in Chicago that have lived in my community for as long as I can remember and I've lived there for a long time. So, my feeling is that they've been part of the system and they should continue to be part of the system or have the opportunity. And I know I supported your Bill in committee and I'd certainly be willing to support it again out here as many people in my community, for many reasons, I mean, it might be a young person that's still living at home, starting out that may move into the city but might not be ready to move into the city in six months having their first job or people that are looking to maybe teach as a second career after giving up one career that have already established a home community but have a lot to offer the city schools. So, I'm willing to support this, particularly since it wasn't part of a bargaining agreement. I can see the difference between fire and police because they're first responders and you may want them to be close, but I think there's a big difference between fire, police and then you would carry it over to teachers. I think that's a totally different issue. So, I'm certainly willing to support your Bill as I did in committee."

Colvin: "Thank you."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

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

"Thank you. I had Representative Eddy in there. Molaro: guess I'm gonna ask the Sponsor if he'll yield for a question because I don't get this collective bargaining stuff. Someone's gonna have to explain it to me 'cause I don't... I'm havin' a hard time reading this. I'm lookin' at the Bill which is sometimes always a mistake to do 'cause then you get confused. Right now, the State Law, if I read it right now, 'residency within a school district governed by this Article, if not required at the time of employment as a qualification of employment, shall not be considered in determining the compensation of the teacher.' Okay. right now, there's nothing in State Law that requires that a City of Chicago teacher must live in the city. There's nothing in State Law that requires that."

Colvin: "That's correct. The School Board requires it."

Molaro: "Oh, they now..."

Colvin: "They proposed that."

Molaro: "Right. Now, let's go with the School Board. The School Board requires that if you wanna go to work as a teacher in the City of Chicago and they go to a contract, this is what you're gonna make, this is what you're gonna do, all kinds of things that they bargain for. So, here's the point that I have to ask you just on this narrow issue, Representative. Can the School Board, which I think they can and you would have to show me in the statute where they can't. The union and the School Board sit down whenever there's negotiations... right, next month, a year from now...

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

and they say... the union comes in and says we wanna negotiate class size, pensions, longevity, vet tenure and money. Right? And we also wanna talk about having us live in the city and the city says, okay, here's what we'll offer, blah, blah, blah. They go through negotiation in the City of Chicago or the Board of Education, in this case, says, oh, here's what we'll do. We can't give you that raise... can't get... we can't give ya that raise, but ya know what, we're gonna get rid of the residency requirement. So, you no longer have to live in the city; we're gonna take that out as a rule, but we're not gonna give ya the raise we want. Can they do that?"

Colvin: "Theoretically, yes, they can, but what the Board has chosen to do is to act unilaterally, not make it part of any union negotiation and simply de... the Board has refused to negotiate it..."

Molaro: "But..."

Colvin: "...'cause they simply enact it by getting a majority of the School Board..."

Molaro: "...but I understand that."

Colvin: "...to enact it."

Molaro: "But the Board, if they say no class should be over 20 students, right, and they say we're not gonna negotiate that. You're not gonna make... you're not gonna have tenure up to 4 years. You need 4 years for tenure; we're not gonna negotiate that. That's the job of the union to get 'em to negotiate it. And what... what I'm sayin', if they don't wanna negotiate salary, they don't wanna negotiate what tenure means, they don't wanna negotiate class size, I mean,

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

that's the idea of bargaining. You say, well, if you're not gonna do any one or five of those things, well, here's what we're gonna do, we're gonna go out on strike. And they go back and forth. All I'm saying is, I'm taking issue with the fact as to whether or not this can be negotiated and I'm just saying that I think it can. They don't want to and they haven't in the past. That I have to give you; I understand that. But that's the part that ya gotta go after and negotiate. So, maybe we'll just agree to disagree on that. Let's go to a second point that I just wanna get to. I don't know what's gonna happen to people who live in my neighborhood who are teachers that wanna move, okay. guess if we pass this Bill and they're teachers and they wanna move, I guess they'll move. All right. I don't know. I don't know what to say to that. I certainly understand your point that there may be teachers who live in a different part of the state, well not too far, but live close to Chicago, sort of like a great suburb that I represent like Riverside, say I'd love to teach in Chicago, I'd love to teach in the inner city, but I'm just not movin', not 'cause I don't like Chicago, I just don't wanna move. It certainly makes sense to be your part of the Bill. But I guess the question is and Representative Black talked about this, it's very... we're sort of piecemealing this in the sense of do you have anything what you'd like to do about this, right now, city policemen, city firemen, city workers, county employees, county sheriffs, all of them you have to live and I think we should be able to attract good people to work in those departments too. So, should we

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

amend the Bill to include everybody else or are we doin' baby steps?"

Colvin: "Well, we're not talkin' about 15 different provisions.

To use your words, we're talkin' about one narrow provision that the School Board has flatly refused to negotiate, that they have used and imposed their will on and that is the residency requirement. Not... not schools, not classroom size, not salary and all the other things that you mentioned. We're not trying to address all those things. I agree with you..."

Molaro: "Well..."

Colvin: "...that this will be... I agree with you that this will be best if it was part of a collective bargaining effort, but... but the School Board, by themselves, have decided that this issue, not all the other issues you mentioned..."

Molaro: "Right, I know."

Colvin: "...just this issue, that they would not negotiate it.

They would simply impose their will, not have a discussion or dialogue, come up with some reasonable solution, but that they would simply dictate what it would be."

Molaro: "Well, then I can't disagree with you on 'cause I know they have and you are 100 percent correct. The only thing... and then I'm done. Would it be better if we said that this has to become part of collective bargaining, 'cause let me tell ya what the Bill does do. Even if I'm a little bit right that it can be collectively bargained but the school district refuses, that's what I think, and let's say I'm wrong and you're right. But now, the way you changed the law, you now have it that it cannot be bargained, that it

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

must be ruled out as employment because the way it reads now it says, 'residency within any school district governed by this Article shall not be considered in determining employment.' So, as of right now if this Bill were to become law the school district can't even talk about it, you just took it from one place and put in another and saying that employment can never be bargained. State Law dictates that you can live wherever you wanna live..."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Molaro: "Yeah. Well, it can never be considered. That's what this Bill does. It does take it out of collective bargaining and puts it more with the teachers and not the Board. Thank you."

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

Rose: "A point of personal information and then I'd like to speak to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mrs. Representative Stephens is in the gallery with us today and her husband didn't bother to introduce her, so I'm gonna introduce Mrs. Stephens up here. If we could just... There she is."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome, Mrs. Stephens."

Rose: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This Bill makes a lot of sense. It is anathema to personal freedom and individual liberty to tell someone they have to live within some arbitrary jurisdictional boundary line in order to work in that... within that arbitrary jurisdictional boundary line. I support this Sponsor and frankly, this Bill goes to a core belief, a fundamental belief, of all of us, of Americans,

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

that you have a right to work. It shouldn't matter where you live. And for that, I salute Representative Colvin. I intend to vote for the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Colvin, I listened very intently to this Bill in committee and the entire committee decided that this was a good idea. It may be that this swings the strength toward the CTU on the residency requirement. don't agree with one of the previous speakers that it can't still be bargained, everything is subject to bargaining. The problem with the way the residency requirement reads in Chicago now is that it's tied so closely through the city administration, to the police, to the firemen, to emergency personnel that the School Board just simply says, nope, nope, it's already covered, we don't wanna talk about it. This puts it out there where it can be discussed between Chicago Public Schools and the CTU. It simply is a matter of how do we attract the teachers in Chicago because everything else that's been tried hasn't worked. We still have classrooms on the first day of school that aren't filled. We have kids that show up for classes in some schools and there is no teacher. And I think Representative and the teachers' union are just simply saying, put it on a level playing field like every other school district in the State of Illinois and there's some other large districts, not as big as Chicago, but Elgin,

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Rockford, East St. Louis are all big school districts. None of them have the requirement that says ya have to live within a certain mile radius to teach here. I think it's an unfair imposition on teachers and I think it's time to change it and give Chicago Public Schools a chance and a shot at recruiting some of the best and the brightest to teach the kids of Chicago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Colvin is..."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the last speaker is exactly right. I mean, when you look at the entire landscape of the State of Illinois, Chicago is the only school district that lives with this onerous burden which also speaks to the question of why we don't have teachers in every classroom in every school in every community every year. I think this Bill will go a long way in helping with that. Three years ago, many of the people in this chamber worked with me on the Bill we passed dealing with we grow our own teachers to encourage more people in hard-to-staff communities to pursue teaching certificates and to teach in some of those schools, to make commitments to teach in some of those schools. The fruits of that labor have yet to be realized. I think this Bill speaks to the issue in a more direct way. And I simply urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 464?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And this

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 623, Amendment #1 to House Bill 928, Amendment #1 to House Bill 954; and 'recommends be adopted' is House Resolution 128."

Speaker Turner: "Elementary report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on March 07, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is House Bill 466, House Bill 1338, House Bill 1363, House Bill 1917, House Bill 1926, House Bill 1969, House Bill 2787, House Bill 3491; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 1330, House Bill 1335, House Bill 1922, House Bill 223 and House Bill 693; 'recommends be adopted' is House Resolution 115."

Speaker Turner: "Supplemental Calendar #1, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 426. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 426, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

23rd Legislative Day

3/7/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Agreed, Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 175, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 176, offered by Representative Saviano. House Resolution 177, offered by Representative Mautino. House Resolution 178, offered by Representative Jefferies. House Resolution 180, offered by Representative Acevedo."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, W.: "For an announcement, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Give the announcement."
- Davis, W.: "Just like to let everyone... let the Members know that the Health & Healthcare Disparities Committee will meet tomorrow in Room 118 of the Capitol at 12 noon."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further announcements, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned until Thursday, March 8 at the hour of 1 p.m. Thursday, March 8 at the hour of 1 p.m. and there's allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House does stand adjourned."