37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Joint
 Resolution 47, offered by Representative Will Davis and
 House Resolution 296, offered by Representative Howard."
- Speaker Turner: "The hour of 12:30 having come and went, the House shall come to order. We shall be led in prayer today by Donna Mathiesen with the First Church of Christ Scientist in McHenry, Illinois. Donna is the guest of Representative Franks. We ask all Members to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Donna Mathiesen."
- Donna Mathiesen: "Let us have a moment of silence to commemorate the lost lives from the Holocaust to the latest event of the massacre in Virginia. Let's have one moment of silence before we pray. Our Heavenly Father, we come to You with humble hearts as noble men and women, Your sons and daughters, to ask Your guidance in conducting... our duties as public servants. Our beloved creator, father and mother of us all, grant us the courage to stand for principle in our affairs as servants to the people. As we acknowledge the privileges vested in us, we honor You with actions based on integrity, honesty, truthfulness, and compassion. Guide us to live these Christly qualities so that we elevate not only our own lives, but the lives of all whom the government embraces. Help us to perform our jobs effectively and to detect any... any sense of greed or favoritism that tries to work its way into government and undermine the good that is constitutionally structured for us all. Living these ideals

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

that our forefathers established in our State Constitution will continually bring blessings and peace. Our state will be more productive and will progress on a more sure footing. A spiritual sense of goodness, of godliness will prevail. God, in the spirit and mercy of justice, we will ask today that You lead us to our jobs in the strength of Psalms 19, 'May the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, Oh Lord, my strength and my redeemer.' Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Kappa man, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W. 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 Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are here and ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Turner: "That's a good thing. The Lady from... the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Patterson is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect. There are 116

 Members answering the quorum call, and we are ready to start

 business for the day. The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative McAuliffe, for what reason do you rise?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

McAuliffe: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "...your point."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the right-hand side, we have some children from the gifted schools from the Chicago Public School System. We have bo... children from Beaubien, Stone, Norwood and Edison Regional Gifted Center led by Kathleen Scott and Zachary and Susan, her son and daughter. Let's give a big hand to these gifted students coming all the way from Chicago."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on April 18, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #3 to House Bill 8, Amendment #3 to House Bill 147, Amendment #5 to House Bill 232, Amendment #2 to House Bill 313, Amendment #1 to House Bill 415, Amendment #2 to House Bill 680, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1434, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1517, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1638, Amendment #2 to House Bill 1759, Amendment #2 to House Bill 3289, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3453, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3508, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3627; 'recommends be adopted', on the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 47, offered by Representative Will Davis and House Resolution 296, offered by Representative Howard and House Resolution 243, offered by Representative Currie. Representative Nekritz,

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' is House Bill 419, House Bill 587, House Bill 611, House Bill 962, House Bill 1685, and House Bill 1876; 'do pass Standard Debate' is House Bill 858; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is House Bill 263, House Bill 632, House Bill 1619, House 1752, House Bill 1753, and House Bill Representative Molaro, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported same back with the following recommendation/s: the 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2749, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2858. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #2 to House Bill 2304. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 2132 and Amendment #2 to House Bill 2133. Representative Collins, Chairperson from the Committee on Juvenile Justice Reform, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s:

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #2 to House Bill 1322. Representative Gordon, Chairperson from the Committee on Protection, to which the following measure/s Consumer was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported following recommendation/s: the same back with the 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 3218. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on April 18, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 2632. The following measures are referred to the House Committee on Rules: House Resolution 288, offered by Representative Mendoza. Resolution 290, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 292, offered by Representative Younge. House Resolution 297, offered by Representative Tryon. House Joint Resolution 48, offered by Representative Phelps. House Joint Resolution 49, offered by Representative Miller."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 296."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Resolution 296, offered by Representative Howard.

- WHEREAS, The South African delegation will be arriving in Illinois on April 12, 2007, as the fourth leg of the sister-state relationship with Northern Cape Province, South Africa, and the State of Illinois; and
- WHEREAS, The delegation will consist of South African Consul General Yusuf Omar, Dr. Dion Theys, the Director of the Department of Public Health for Northern Cape Province, Ms.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Nomathembi Mazobiko, the Infectious Disease Director, and Ms. Phillis Baitsiwe, the Tuberculosis coordinator; they will be in Washington D.C. from April 8-12; they will arrive in Chicago on the afternoon of April 12th; and on April 18, Consul General Yusuf Omar will address the Illinois House of Representatives in Springfield; and

- WHEREAS, They depart for South Africa on April 20th; this project is an extension of the BASUAH project launched by the Governor in September, 2005; these exchanges have been very beneficial, bringing great benefits to both partners; and
- WHEREAS, The South African Delegation's visit to the State of Illinois represents the fourth leg of an ongoing sister-state process, with the Health Department from the Northern Cape Province, South Africa and the State of Illinois exchanging ideas, interventions, and strategies for addressing HIV/AIDS in both environments; and
- WHEREAS, The State of Illinois has provided training and technical assistance, while the Northern Cape has assisted the State of Illinois in understanding how to improve their relationships with businesses and manufacturers employing large numbers of workers; and
- WHEREAS, The exchange between the Province and the State of Illinois has provided both partners the opportunity to share cultural ideas, understand each others values, and work to understand how these elements contribute to the spread of HIV/AIDS; and

37th Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, We sincerely appreciate the work that has been done over the last two years and especially appreciate the spirit of cooperation between the two partners; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH
 GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we welcome
 the South African Delegation from Northern Cape Province,
 South Africa to the State of Illinois; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the delegation from Northern Cape Province, South Africa as a symbol of our respect."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We are certainly very happy to have with us today the delegation from South Africa. In addition to the fact that Consulate General Omar is going to be able to speak to us, I'd like to make certain that we know that we have in the gallery persons from South Africa in the delegation and also, excuse me, accompanying them are Dr. Eric Whitaker, director Illinois Department of Public Health; Dr. Andre Rawls, who's the chief of the HIV/AIDS division, Illinois in my Department of Public Health; and Lloyd Kelly, who is the director of the Let's Talk/Let's Test Foundation. At this time, I would like my colleagues to hear from Consulate General Yusuf Omar."
- Speaker Turner: "We'd like to ask the staff to retire to the middle of... to the back of the chamber. Welcome, Dr. Omar, to the Illinois House of Representatives."
- Dr. Omar: "Thank you so much. Thank you. Thank you so much. Speaker of the House, Art Turner, Members of the Legislature, our host State Representative Constance Howard,

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

representatives of the Northern Cape Province and the Illinois Department of Health and friends of Africa. It is indeed an honor and privilege to stand before you in this august Legislature and on behalf of the delegation, I'd like to express our sincere gratitude for this opportunity. Let me also say how delighted we were to be able to welcome the delegation representing Illinois's Department of Public Health to the beautiful Province of the Northern Cape in South Africa. This is a very meaningful project for South Africa at the time that is opportune and as the pace of this project has moved, I'm sure, a lot more will come from it. I also bring you greetings from the Premier of the Northern Cape, Premier Dipuo Peters and an entire cabinet. We are particularly pleased, as I said, with the pace of this project and I expect that this will be expanded into other areas of cooperation. In the time that I have, I thought I would spend some time giving you a brief update on how South Africa has fared. On the journey we embarked on just 13 years ago, our baby has now grown into a teenager, smart, ambitious and determined and like all teenagers, stubborn at the best of times. As South Africans, we are clear about our destination. We are building, a nonracial, nonsexual, democracy, free of poverty, full of hope and opportunity and situated in a continent that shares our blessings. Getting there requires patience and skillful leadership. confident that historians will look back on South Africa at the start of the 21st century and conclude that if there was thread that ran through our democratic common transformation it was the capacity of South Africans to

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

through treacherous steer their way shoals and find creative, long-term solutions. I wanna emphasize the word 'long-term'. We have steered clear of expedient quickfixers in favor of laying a solid, well-thought foundation that would deliver the promise of freedom, not just to our generation, but to our children and their South Africans have proven themselves equal to the challenge of building a new and unified democracy on the ashes of centuries of inhumanity, fear and division, but it does not stop there. Everywhere you look in South Africa you'll find South Africans are solving one kind of puzzle or another whether it be finding a way to providing banking services for the poor, using cell phone technology, designing a new generation of nuclear reactor for domestic purposes or turning natural gas and coal into clean-burning gasoline or building the largest telescope into the southern hemisphere for a fraction of what it would cost anywhere else in the world or inventing a system to test the immune systems of HIV patients, cheaply, quickly, and accurately on a massive scale. South Africa is not a one-trick pony. Yes, we are blessed with the strong endowment of natural resources, but what sets us apart is our human resources. Today, our big growth sectors are manufacturing, financial and business services, construction and retail. And one of the most promising sectors is business process outsourcing which relies almost entirely on the quality of our people. It is in this area in particular that we are... will be exploring partners in the State of Illinois and elsewhere in the Midwest, U.S.A. When we reached our democracy in '94, a

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

lot of things in our country were badly broken. Deep wounds had to be healed, the economy was in tatters, we were broke, spiraling into debt, trapped and in no condition to deliver on the promises of freedom. Today, South Africa is in the midst of its longest ever economic expansion which has now run uninterrupted for 7 years. Robust economic growth now running us around 5 percent, which is a big deal for us, and supporting by strong consumer spending and confidence has created over one million (1,000,000) jobs since 2003. With our macro economic balances in good shape, we have embarked to launch a massive fifty billion dollar (\$50,000,000,000) capital expenditure program to improve our economic infrastructure especially transport, power, communications. This will provide increased economic opportunities for businesses and individuals and yet, I must say, we're open, of course, to foreign investment, who's looking at the technology and skill and capacity available here. I see a strong future for partners from this part of the world. For all the good news, there's no hiding that we still face enormous challenges, but South Africans have what it takes to meet them. The poverty, crime and despair portrayed in the Oscar-winning film Tsotsi are real, but is... but so is the films message of redemption. And this for us is an age of hope. The battle against crime is proving long and hard and the challenge is real and it affects all our citizens, but we are making headway with our private sector partners, we are looking at every aspect of our public safety and criminal justice systems to see how we can make them work together and more police are being hired and put

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

on the beat. Our history and the poverty that was... its inheritance left South Africa a horrifying, hospitable terrain for HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, but together government and the private sector and partners like the State of Illinois are meeting the challenge. Our aim is to ensure that all who need treatment receive it as soon as possible. To those who say South Africa isn't serious about HIV and AIDS, I ask that you look at the facts. We have the largest antiretroviral treatment program in the world. are spending billions of dollars, not rands, dollars to prevent the spread of HIV, to care for people infected with HIV, and to develop a vaccine against HIV. And as you will see, if you read our new national strategic plan, we are perfectly candid about where we have fallen short. there's the challenge of joblessness and persistence for poverty which perpetuates the problem of HIV/AIDS and as strongly as our economy has been performing, we need higher growth. Government has taken a hard look at this and we are trying to do everything we can to correct this, to push our economy to grow beyond 6 percent. Much work remains to be done, but as every investor and entrepreneur knows, timing is everything and a growing number of investors and businesses are recognizing the time to get into South Africa is now. A little more than a decade ago, after being isolated, South Africa has become a first-rate trading nation, exporting high value-added manufacturing goods to It is in this area, too, where I feel it would the world. be a strong opportunities for partnership with the State of Illinois. Let me conclude by saying that if you have not

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

visited South Africa, we hope that you'll be among the millions of residents already flocking to our shores every year and that you'll find partners, products and investment opportunities you may be looking for. We are confident; South Africa offers them in abundance. There are many in this and inother countries that played an active and significant role in supporting our fight for freedom. helped bring a country and its people from darkness into a beacon of hope. I often wonder about the sense of satisfaction that they must be enjoying when they observe our people that were downtrodden, brutalized, murdered and robbed of every basic human right have risen, their dignity restored, to put their shoulders to the wheel to build a democracy and an economy that shows beyond doubt that South Africa is alive with possibility. I acknowledge the partnership we have established with the State of Illinois and I pray that we can extend this for mutual benefit. And thank you so much, again, for having us here today. I've enjoyed this. It was a great experience.

Speaker Turner: "Consul General Yusuf Omar, thank you, again.

Representative Howard moves for the adoption of House
Resolution 296. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all
those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair is the
'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The
Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner, for what
reason do you rise?"

Fortner: "I'd like to bring the House's attention over to my left where we have present the state champion girls'

37th Legislative Day

- would ask if the Clerk could present House Resolution 267."
- Speaker Turner: "Clerk, could you read House Resolution 267."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 267, offered by Representative Fortner.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives wish to congratulate the Wheaton St. Francis High School Volleyball team for winning the Class AA State Championship; and
 - WHEREAS, The team had a record of 41-2, the best record in the school's history; it has been ranked as high as third in the nation by www.PrepVolleyball.com; and Wheaton St. Francis is the only school to win both "A" and "AA" State championships; and
 - WHEREAS, This is the school's fourteenth trip to the downstate competition; the school has won eight State championships; and the team this year won the Sportsmanship Award presented by the Illinois High School Association; and
 - WHEREAS, The team carries a GPA average of 3.8; and
 - WHEREAS, The team manager is Peter Byrnes; the Head Coach is Peg Kopec, who has had a career of 920 wins-215 losses and was named www.PrepVolleyball.com "Co-Coach of the Year"; coaching assistants are Lisa Ston, Lauren Sandrik, and Karl Spencer; and
 - WHEREAS, The members of the team are Megan Barnicle, Megan Boken, Morgan Butler, Laura Byrnes, Catherine Culligan, Alex Gitzpatrick, Kristen Kelsey, Michelle Kocher, Molly Madonia, Meghan Matusiak, Alex Morris, Megan Murison, Molly O'Toole, Meg Power, Alyssa Rio, and Kelsey Robinson; therefore, be it

37th Legislative Day

- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Wheaton St. Francis High School Volleyball team and wish them continued success in their future; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the Wheaton St. Francis High School Volleyball team members as a symbol of our esteem."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner moves for the adoption of House Resolution 267. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair is the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the House. I think it's a great honor to have with us a team with such a spectacular record. To be commended in particular, their coach Peg Kopec who has just an impressive record, not just this year, but year after year working with the young women at St. Francis. Also, the athletic director, Paul Lindner and his work and I'd like to name some of the members who are here with us today who include: Megan Barnicle, Megan Boken, Morgan Butler, Laura Byrnes, Catherine Culligan, Alex Gitzpatrick, Kristen Kelsey, Michelle Kocher, Molly Madonia, Meghan Matusiak, Alex Morris, Megan Murison, Molly O'Toole, Meg Power, Alyssa Rio and Kelsey Robinson. And we wish them all a great success in all their future endeavors. Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, again and welcome to Springfield.

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

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present House Resolution 277."

Speaker Turner: "Clerk, read House Resolution 277."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is truly a great pleasure to stand here today and present House Resolution 277 honoring the AA State Wrestling Champions of Carl Sandburg High School located in my hometown of Orland Park. marked the third straight championship for head coach Mike Polz and his team. In doing so, it became the first and only public school in our state to win three straight championships. During these three (3) years, the Eagles have won an unbelievable eight-one (81) straight dual meets against other Illinois high schools. This year's championship was even more exciting because the team was actually regarded as the underdog going into the final weekend and ended up defeating the eventual second place finisher Montini Bulldogs. At the end of the season, the team was ranked #4 in the entire country, so we really congratulate 'em for that. I'd like to recognize the assistant coaches along with the head coach Mike Polz of Eric Siebert, John Polz, Mike Klutcharch, Tony Siebert, Dan Polz, and Ron Farina. The student trainers are: Sharon West, Maura Lohan, and Steph Daly. The team statisticians are Jillian Gentile and Stephanie Gloede. And the adult athletic trainer is Scott Peters and Sandburg's athletic

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

director is Mike Laneve. The State Champion wrestlers are: Jon Morrison, Miguel Guerrero, Dom Polito, J. P. Garrity, Kevin White, Tyler LePretre, Jake Holler, Billy Crowley, Conrad Polz, Will Cosenza, Mike O'Neill, Mo Yassin, Jeff Richards, Matt Cusick, Nick Soraghan, Juan Soliz, Eric Pretto, John Doyle, Chris Frostman, John Syzmanski, Yousef Haswah, Frank Pereiro, Frank Gigliotti, and Eric Rettke. Carl Sandburg State Champions up in the Speaker's Gallery here, please stand and be recognized."

- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. ...man from Normal...

 McLean, I should say... Representative Brady. First of all,
 let me represent... recognize Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to add my congratulations to the wrestling team since Representative McCarthy and I share that district. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will,
 Kappa man, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 47."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 47... House Joint Resolution 47."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 47, offered by Representative William Davis.
 - WHEREAS, The North Central Province Chapters of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. are sponsoring their first annual legislative visit to the Illinois State Capitol; and
 - WHEREAS, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity Inc., was founded in 1911 on the campus of Indiana University by African-American college men; and

37th Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. is an international organization with over 200,000 undergraduate and alumni members; and
- WHEREAS, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. is an organization committed to promoting honorable achievement in every field of human endeavor; and
- WHEREAS, Kappa Alpha Psi members who have distinguished themselves individually include Johnny Cochran, Jr., Reginald Lewis, Bill Russell, Gale Sayers, Ralph Abernathy, Tavis Smiley, Percy Sutton, William Johnson, John Singelton, Cedric the Entertainer, Thomas Bradley, John Conyers, Louis Stokes, Oscar Robertson, Arthur Ashe, General Daniel "Chappie" James, Wilt Chamberlin, Sanford Bishop, Walter Fauntroy, and Montell Jordan; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that, in recognition of the achievements of the members of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity Inc., and the values for which they strive, proclaim Wednesday, April 18, 2007, as the First Annual Kappa Alpha Psi Day in the State of Illinois; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Stevenson Nicholson, North Central Polemarch of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

 Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the 4... four (4) years that I've been here, we've had the opportunity to see some of the other African-American Greek organizations come and lobby particularly the sororities, the ladies of Alpha Kappa

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Alpha, ladies of Delta Sigma Theta, Sigma Gamma Rho, but today I'm extremely honored and pleased to have the men of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated in the North Central Province who are having their very first lobby day. They've been around the Capitol. We've had the opportunity to hear from several Members of the Illinois Legislature, both the House as well as the Senate, so today I'm joined by... on the floor... by Senator James Clayborne who's our fraternity brother as well as Senator Kwame Raoul welcoming the men of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity to Illinois to the Illinois Capitol on their very first lobby day. thank you for the Members of the House for indulging us today and allowing us to share in this experience. gentlemen are in front of us in the red jackets. have seen them around the Capitol today as these are colors that designate our fraternity and I'm very pleased and honored to have them here in the chamber with us today. if you could please join me and give them a great round of applause for joining us today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 46. And all those… 47… all those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. The Lady from Cook, Representative Ryg… the Lady from Lake, Representative Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

As you know, Capitol Capers '08 is well underway. So, all

Members are invited to join us for a planning meeting for...

and maybe some tryouts, some auditions, bring your best

37th Legislative Day

- talent forward. We'll be getting together on Thursday, tomorrow, the 19th, 5:30 or immediately after Session. We'll be convening in Room 118 and new Members are invited to join us and make sure that they know that their talents are appreciated and welcomed. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."
- Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I've asked if the Clerk could read House Resolution 272, as the team is now arriving in the gallery as we speak."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 272."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 272, offered by Representative Brady.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to congratulate the Normal Community High School Football team, the Ironmen, on winning the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) Class 6A State Football Championship; and
 - WHEREAS, The Ironmen were under the direction of Head Coach Hud Venerable; and
 - WHEREAS, The Ironmen won the State championship by defeating Batavia 30-20 in the championship game; and
 - WHEREAS, The Ironmen went undefeated during the 2006 regular season, earning the Big 12 Conference Championship; and
 - WHEREAS, The State Championship was the first State title in the school's history; and
 - WHEREAS, The Assistant Coaches for the Ironmen were Terry McCombs, John McIntyre, Jason Drengwitz, Jason Ruyle, Troy

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Michalek, Neal Sanders, Alec Gordon, Wes Temples, Adam Lester, Bryan Thomas, and Lamar Baker; and

- WHEREAS, The team members are: Max Bakana, Omar Clayton, Chuck Turner, Steven Tucker, Cam McIntosh, Quen Vandermay-Kirkham, Pat Zalesiak, Sam Smith, Dan Moore, Kenny Buchanan, Alex Buck, Matt Lucie, Zach Johnson, Tyler Snipes, Jake Detmers, Matt Nickrent, Chris Lawson, Shawn Cagle, Joey Anderson, Alex Martin, Kennedy Freeman, Austin Davis, Dan DeWeert, Trevor Troutman, Wes Robinson, Cody Gilles, Matt Moberly, Cornell Caldwell, Dawit Derege, Richard Dawson, Nick Steach, Ben Morris, Casey McGarry, Lawrence Petrey, Alex Anderson, Josh Jones, Andrew Blumenshine, Donnie Jackson, Andrew Hamer, A.J. Harms, Derek Logue, Ryan Fitzgerald, Billy Dickson, Ray Gerard, Austin Kull, Nick Price, Travis Dupin, Jon Maxwell, Tyler Sadlo, Taylor Buikema, Mark Steadman, Anthony Guevara, Kirkland Grant, Jake Kretlow, Dan Miller, Zach Smith, Mark Osnowitz, Drew Durbin, Zach Liming, Marcus King, Rhys Shaffer, Ben O'Rourke, Anurag Palekar, Chad Hinshaw, Brian Psculcowski, Jordan McNeal, and Jeremy Ried; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the Ironmen of Normal Community High School on winning the IHSA Class 6A Football State Championship; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the Ironmen Football team of Normal Community High School as a symbol of our esteem."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's indeed my pleasure, and much like the team, it's the first opportunity I have had to have a State Championship Class 6A Football Team in my legislative district and gentlemen and coaches, you've made us all extremely proud. You did an outstanding job to be 2006 Class 6A State Champion and I would simply say that you're truly, truly Ironmen and you exhibit what sportsmanship and professionalism and first place and championship is all about. I would like to ask the Members of the General Assembly to please join me in standing and applauding the Class 6A State Champion, the Normal Community Ironmen, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you very much. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. Rep... Representative Brady moves for the adoption of House Resolution 272. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 86. It's a Death Resolution for a former Member. Will we all rise. Would the Members... guests in the gallery also rise on this Resolution? This is a Death Resolution of a former Member."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 86, offered by Representative Brady.

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of former State Representative Gilbert Deavers of Blowing Rock, North

37th Legislative Day

- Carolina and Naples, Florida, formerly of Bloomington, on December 15, 2006; and
- WHEREAS, Gilbert Deavers was an insurance and financial planner for more than 40 years; he was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives from 1973 to 1979, serving as Assistant Minority Leader his last year; and
- WHEREAS, He was born in Lexington, Illinois on February 28, 1931; he graduated from Illinois Wesleyan University with a Bachelor of Science degree and the University of Illinois with a Master's degree; and
- WHEREAS, Gilbert Deavers served in the United States Army during the Korean War from 1951 to 1953; he served in a Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (M.A.S.H.) unit as an operating room technician and received two bronze stars, a United Nations service medal, and a National Defense service medal; and
- WHEREAS, Gilbert Deavers taught at Normal Community High School for seven years in subjects such as physical education, driver's education, and business education as well as coaching football; and
- WHEREAS, While serving in the Illinois House he served on the Rules Committee as Chairperson and the Recreational Council; and he enjoyed history, golf, poker, and fishing; and
- WHEREAS, Gilbert Deavers is survived by his wife, Jane Deavers; his son, Doug Deavers; and his daughter, Dianne Siverly; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn,

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

along with his family and friends, the passing of former State Representative Gilbert Deavers; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Gilbert Deavers."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Brady: Gentlemen of the House. As a young man growing up in Bloomington, I knew Gil Deavers who was a family friend, a close friend of my father's, who thought it was fitting that the very team and the high school, that he devoted many years to as a teacher and coach, are down here to receive their accolades for being state champion. Gil Deavers was a champion in his own right, not only from service to his country but service to this state, to this very House, where he served as Assistant Minority Leader. We are joined by his daughter Diane, her husband, Brian and their children, Ben and Dana, who are here to my right. In visiting briefly with Diane at Gil's memorial service she echoed how proud he was to have served in this chamber, how proud he was of this institution and what it stood for, and how much he felt that the House of Representatives was truly, truly his special family. I asked Speaker Madigan what he remembered about Gil Deavers, he said, 'Gil Deavers was a great guy and boy, did he like to have fun.' I think that says it all. He'll certainly be missed. We wish him and all the souls of the faithfully departed into the mercy of God to rest in peace. Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady moves for the re... the adoption of House Resolution 86. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Third Readings... I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce, for what reason do you rise?"

Joyce: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "To the point."

Joyce: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a couple guests from my district down here, Jerry and Sheila O'Sullivan, but as I know them Mr. and Mrs. O'Sullivan because I would never dare use their first name to them in person. And so I'd just like to welcome them to the House; they're in the Republican gallery there."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield, Jerry and Gio. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rita, for what reason do you rise?"

Rita: "I... Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "It's your point."

Rita: "If everyone could please join me in welcoming to Springfield members of the Illinois Dental Hygienist Association, who are up in the gallery right behind me."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. I'd like to advise the Members that we're going to deal with Third Reading Bills. We're gonna deal with Third Reading Bills; this is final legislation. We're gonna start with the first Bill today is

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

gonna be House Bill 1366. Representative Saviano. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Saviano: House Bill 1366 represents landmark legislation which not only increases the access to care for eye care across our state, but with the help and the work of the Illinois Optometric Association, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Ophthalmology Association, also protected the quality of care in this process. I have to thank all those groups and also the Members of the Reg & Reg Committee who persevered for the last three (3) years alongside of me in allowing us to negotiate this Bill where not only do we have an agreed piece of legislation, but also, I think we crafted a very good quality piece of legislation that, again, extends more access to care while at the same time providing a quality of care to our constituents across this state. I would ask for the passage of House Bill 1366 and I will entertain any questions. Thank you."

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

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

Miller: "Just a brief question. What are some of the changes that were agreed upon, I think, that kinda came together on this, Representative?"

Saviano: "Representative, we narrowed the scope on the… on the oral medications that they're allowed to prescribe. And I

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

think also in those negotiations and those discussions, we also create an environment where we will see optometrists and ophthalmologists working even closer today than they have prevuous... previously worked and I think that's what... what the magic was behind this agreed Bill."

Miller: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1366?' 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? Representative Colvin. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Well... Order of Third Readings, we have Representative Beiser on House Bill 985. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 985, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 985 is a straightforward Bill. What it does it in... it includes the Prevailing Wage Act to include any maintenance repair assembly or disassembly work performed on equipment whether owned, leased, or rented on state job sites."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 985?' 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? Representative Moffitt. The Clerk shall take the record.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

On this question, there are 71 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 1558. Representative Beaubien. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. It passed the Revenue Committee elev... 11 to 0. It prevents the director of the Department of Revenue from making certain adjustments to late... to base income tax payers without previously expanding the rules and regulations covering that item. It's a very strong probusiness Bill. And I said it did pass Revenue 11 to 0."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1558?' 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? Representative Crespo. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Munson, for what reason do you rise?"

Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the last Bill, House Bill 985, it was my intention to vote 'yes' on that Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect.

Munson: "Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: The Gentleman... the Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Pea... Speaker, a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Bellock: "I would just like to introduce to the General Assembly another group that's down here today visiting us from my area and they're working on the issue of funding for gifted programs throughout the State of Illinois. I'd like them all to stand up and take a... acknowledge them. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Beaubien on House Bill 3327. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3327, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Beaubien: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Safety Education Public School Act. And it allows that the… if they choose to teach these classes, they may include adding the course of Consequences of Alcohol Consumption and the Operation of Motor Vehicle as a part of the safety education course. I know of no opposition to this Bill. It simply adds addition of… of factor in determining what can be taught in public safety classes and again, it's a 'may' not a 'shall' resolution."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3327?' 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

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Berrios on House Bill 811. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 811, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- "Sorry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The purpose of House Bill 811 is to restore the exemption from sales tax for limousines engaged in interstate commerce. Prior to June 30th, 2003, rolling stock trucks and limousines engaged in interstate commerce were exempt from sales tax. When the law was changed, the definition of 'interstate commerce' was substantially changed to, in effect, eliminate the exemption. the General Assembly modified the definition to again restore the exemption, however, it was only restored for vehicles weighing more than sixteen thousand (16,000) pounds. This had the effect of continuing the tax on limousines and was removed for trucks and other delivery vehicles that were doing virtually the same thing. This Bill simply strikes that weight limit. I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 811?' All those in favor... The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know you're in a hurry, but will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Black: "Representative, in your remarks you said vehicles weighing more than sixteen thousand (16,000) pounds. I think you meant less. Correct?"

Berrios: "No. The exemption was restored for vehicles weighing more than sixteen thousand (16,000) pounds so limousines didn't qualify."

Black: "The total exemption was removed from vehicles over eighty (80)... sixteen thousand (16,000) pounds? I don't think that's true. You haven't... Somebody correct me if I'm wrong, but we've lost twenty-one thousand (21,000) trucking jobs in Illinois because we have yet to repeal the onerous commercial distribution fee. I think we repealed about 50 percent of it, but I think there's about 50 percent that we have said we would repeal that we have not."

Berrios: "Representative, I'm sorry. I really don't have that answer. I'm not too sure. That's what I was given."

Black: "Well... So... so, basically, what you're asking me to vote on is to eliminate the CDF, the commercial fee on motor vehicles for limousines, correct?"

Berrios: "Yes."

Black: "Do you know how many limousines I have in my district?"

Berrios: "Probably not many?"

Black: "I have two or three. You probably have..."

Berrios: "A little bit more than that."

Black: "I would think so. I don't have any problems with your Bill, but at some point people are going to ask me, in my district, when are we going to remove the onerous burden of the commercial distribution fee, as we said we would, and I think we did it to get it on 25 percent, I think we did

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

another 25 percent, but I think we... So, I think we still have something... some... some dollars to take off of that fee and these trucking owners are gonna call me and say, well, wait a minute, if you can take it off of limousines, which is a... I don't know, a matter of convenience or what people want to do or by their choice, that's okay, but my business hauls vital and necessary freight and I'm at an extreme cost disadvantage in Illinois and that's why... and I think that the Secretary of State can verify these figures... in the first year of the CDF we lost seventeen thousand (17,000) truck registrations. And I think since that time we've lost five six thousand (5,000-6,000)another or registrations. That's not only a loss of business. One of these was in my old district, now in Representative Cultra's district, in the town of Milford, Illinois, an entire truck line moved, lock, stock and barrel to Kentland, Indiana. Now, it's not the trucks I miss as much as the one hundred (100) people who worked there that no longer have jobs. I'm not speaking against your Bill and I won't vote against your Bill, but I'm going to vote 'present' simply as a... a mild protest in that... this is fine. I know where you live limousines are important and take people to the airports and they take people to sporting events and so forth and so on and I... I don't wanna kill anything that's that important to your district. I'm just gonna vote 'present' because I think we need to continue our efforts to repeal the Commercial Distribution Fee on commercial freight vehicles in the State of Illinois, vehicles up to eighty thousand (80,000) pounds. Now, as always, you do a wonderful job for

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

your district and I'm certainly not opposed to what you're doing, my vote should simply be construed as, that's fine, I wish I could help you and vote 'yes', but I'm gonna vote 'present' simply because there's a lot of work yet to do on the Commercial Distribution Fee."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Sacia: "Representative, if I understand this correctly, this means if I am a limousine business and I go to buy a new limousine, which I'm gonna guess probably costs a hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand dollars (\$150,000 to \$200,000). Probably safe to say a hundred and fifty (\$150,000), but whatever, a lot of money that I don't pay any sales tax at all on that vehicle. Is that correct?"

Berrios: "I don't think so. We're taking off the... the tax... just the rolling stock tax, so it's like their fees and..."

Sacia: "But it is..."

Berrios: "That's the way I understood it."

Sacia: "...it is the sales tax that they would normally pay is being removed. So, let's just say it's a hundred thousand dollar (\$100,000) vehicle, so that means if it's six and a quarter percent, it's a hundred and six thousand two hundred and fifty dollars (\$106,250) so six thousand two hundred and fifty (\$6,250) is not charged on that vehicle. The reason I have some concern here, Representative, is I know that there was some activity going back to when the... when the commercial tax was actually taken away from the trucking

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

industry that there were those going out there buying vehicles like Hummers and similar high-dollar vehicles that were not required to pay sales tax. Now, this is going to be specific to limousines as opposed to and being purchased, I'm assuming, by limousine companies as opposed to someone like myself buying a limousine for my own personal use. I quess what I'm concerned with here is a little bit of legislative intent what really is the under... What intrigues me is that it appears this was brought by the limousine industry. I see no opposition from Revenue; I see no opposition from Secretary of State. It's like this is kind of okay, but it carries me a step further. We had many out there buying and selling trailers and what I'm specifically referring to is like living quarters, horse trailers. have been told that there are those dealers that are selling them claiming an exemption. Do you have any information about that and does it relate at all to your Bill?"

Berrios: "I do not have information on that, but I was told this is strictly for limousines, the companies with limousines."

Sacia: "Okay. Well, I guess I'm a little bit like the previous speaker. I know how hard you work and the kind of legislation you carry and I certainly want to support you, but this seems to be a Bill that... it just seems like something that hasn't been properly vetted, if you will. I... I think that we're missing something in this legislation. There are many other professions that should be exempted along with the limousine industry. I can see you're... you're momentarily... And I... Go ahead, if you wanna have a conversation there with... with the young lady."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Berrios: "I can explain what I was just told."

Sacia: "Please do."

Berrios: "This... this only goes for limousines that go across state lines, so it would not count for Hummers or any other big vehicles like that. It has to be a commercial use."

Sacia: "I... I guess, if I had a request, Representative, it... it really seems to me like this is a Bill that's not been vetted and that's the only word that comes to mind. It seems like something that somehow slipped through committee and... and maybe it's... it's wonderful, but I just really wonder why we're just saying limousines. What about the other industries that are directly involved in similar-size vehicles that are transporting, ya know, going interstate and issues other than our heavy trucks, other than our eighty thousand (80,000) pound trucks. There are many others out there involved in similar interstate activity that, in my opinion, should qualify for the rolling stock exemption."

Berrios: "Right now, only the limousines were requesting and it's a policy issue that we can...

Sacia: "Okay."

Berrios: "...definitely bring other industries into."

Sacia: "Understood. That being said, I hope you understand my 'present' vote as well. I just feel that this is not a vetted Bill and it should be so... Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Berrios to close."

Berrios: "I'd ask for a favorable vote."

37th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 811?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? ...all voted who wish? Representative Currie. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no' and 8 'present'. This Bill, having re... passed... having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Jakobsson: "I'd like to introduce and have the House give a big welcome to students from Stratton School. They are here today. They are gifted and talented students. And if you could meet them, you would absolutely recognize that they are gifted and talented. And they're up here in back of me in their yellow T-shirts. Please give 'em a big welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 1718. Representative John Bradley. On the Order of Third Readings, we have House Bill 473. Rich Bradley. I'm sorry. Mr. Clerk, Rich Bradley, House Bill 473. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 473, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Bradley, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 Representative Fritchey has worked extensively on this Bill and he will do the honors of the presentation."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. I'm proud to have the opportunity to work with Representative Bradley on this Bill. This is similar be it somewhat more extensive to legislation that Representative Bassi had earlier this This is legislation that is modeled after and was crafted in conjunction with Senator Obabma's office to seek greater transparency in the granting of state funds so the public would be able to go to a database and see where their salaries are going to, who the recipients are and what the dollars are being used for. We can think of no more direct sense of getting at transparent and open government than this. We know of no objections to the Bill. I sincerely hope this comes not only out of this Body but gets to the Governor's desk. It will make the operation of Illinois government much more open and much more honest and available for the public to see. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 473?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Bradley on House Bill 1718. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1718, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Bradley, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would address a problem with small five-member bodies being able to talk to one another without violating the Open Meetings Act. It would allow two members of the body to discuss matters, but it would raise the threshold in terms of what would actually be required to pass a piece of legislation. It'll address the concerns of the Illinois Press Association and Illinois Municipal League. And it's an agreed Bill. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1718?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black on House Bill 586. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 586, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill arises from a court case in my district regarding tax... property tax deferral on... on property that would normally be under the Outdoor Space and Acquisition... the Land Development Code. We have a privately owned water company that said the dam they... that they own, that impounds a body of water which they then sell that surplus water, that's how they are in business, that the dam should not be taxed because it's part of outdoor space.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

PTAB did not agree with that; the Circuit Court did not agree with that, but the Appellate Court overturned those rulings. This law will simply say that if you, in fact, own an appurtenance like a dam, a multimillion dollar structure that gives you the product that you are then selling, that particular entity should not be tax-exempt. I'll be glad to answer any questions that you have."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 586?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black on House Bill 1382. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1382, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill arises from an incident in a district next to mine, actually it took place in Representative Jakobsson's district. It involved a motorist who admitted she was downloading ring tones on her cell phone, left the road several feet and hit and killed a bicyclist who was in full compliance with the law. The... the investigating officer and the state's attorney could only find that a... in the applicable statute, that they could only charge the driver with an improper lane usage. So, she paid

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

a thousand dollar (\$1,000) fine and I think received some intermittent probation. This Bill would create the offense of negligent vehicular homicide which would be a Class A misdemeanor. This Bill is in response to Matt's Law Coalition. It was suggested by the Champaign County State's Attorney. I'd ask a favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Gordon: "Thank you. Representative Black, you and I have had discussions about this Bill and the importance of it, but there were some questions in committee about negligence being a civil standard. Are there any other states that have this similar statute, written as it is, that have passed Appellate muster or Supreme Court muster in any other state, by chance?"

Black: "Representative, I... and I should know the answer and I apologize. Without staff being here, the floor file doesn't have all of the material that I have in my file back in the office. I don't know the answer to your question. I'll certainly try to find out."

Gordon: "Okay. And... and the only reason I ask that, I'm obviously going to support this Bill, but I just don't want it to get... someone to be convicted of this and then have it tossed out when the families and the... the families of the victim, are going through such a difficult time. I would... if this is going to go through in our state, I want it to be a good law that's going to stand and we're going to have

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

something to point to for it to pass... pass muster with the rest of the statutes. I see you're having a conversation. Are there other states, do we know?"

Black: "Yes."

Gordon: "Okay."

Black: "Staff informs me that California has a... almost identical statute, but also informs me it has... there are no... there's no case law as to whether or not this will withstand a court challenge. But they do have a law that is almost identical."

Gordon: "Okay. And... and it's the trier of fact, either, the judge or the jury that's going to decide whether the action or inaction, in some cases, of the driver would constitute a substantial deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable person would exercise. Is that correct?"

Black: "That..."

Gordon: "It's completely up to the trier of fact."

Black: "That is certainly my understanding. I don't think anybody but a judge or a jury can determine that. I doubt... unless the arresting officer clearly could see something out of the ordinary and would testify to that fact, this would have to be decided by a jury of your peers or if you chose, a bench trial since it's a misdemeanor. There's no question that, I think, the answer to your question is 'yes'."

Gordon: "Okay. Thank you very, very much, Representative."

Black: "Thank you."

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

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Molaro: "Thank you. Just on the Bill, just real quick. I spoke to the Sponsor, he knows that obviously we're changing the law, but he's gonna continue to work in the Senate if we could see how we could do this because I do agree there certainly should be a message sent from Springfield that you're out there, negligent driver, all the new toys we come up with that me and you probably can't work, Bill, but with all these new toys there are out, are in Springfield, and distractions when you're driving, I think someone has to say, hey, wait a second, you're gonna cause death or great bodily harm. It's not just gonna be okay, a hundred dollar (\$100) fine then you're on your way. And then your insurance company says, okay, let's settle for the policy limits and it's almost like you went through a red light with no problems. Somewhere there's gotta be a promapelace... public policy statement made and this is a good start, hopefully we'll get the right language. So, we appreciate 'aye' votes."

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

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just also wanted to call… add my support to this legislation. The unfortunate incident that happened in Representative Black's area is something that, as a person who's out on the roads on a bicycle frequently, it does concern me and I… I see it that people are driving more erratically and I very… while I try not to be paranoid while I'm out on my bicycle, I do believe that… that there are people who are lookin' at other things and that when they do that they do have… while they may not

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

have an intent to harm someone else that's out on the roads, they... they are, I think, so negligent in their behavior that we need to make a stand here and say, no, you've really gotta be paying attention to what you're doing when you're driving. So, I appreciate the Gentleman bringing this forward and also urge your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Black to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank all the Members of the House for their comments. This Bill, as Representative Molaro has said, still needs some work. I would hope that Senator Frerichs picks it up in the Senate because it was in... in Champaign County that he represents. We know we still have some work to do, but this was a particularly egregious case and we wanna move forward and hopefully we'll come up with a very reasonable Bill before the process is over. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1382 pass?'
All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed say
'no'. The opinion of the... 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', 1 '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
3455. Representative Bellock. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3455, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is it just changes the wording; it doesn't change what the

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

statute does. But it changes the wording and replaces the phrase 'authorized involuntary treatment' as it appears throughout the Mental Health Code with the actual services that this phrase refers to psychotropic medication. This change is needed because the word 'involuntary' in this phrase has been interpreted to mean that when someone agrees to these services but lacks the capacity to give the informed consent. In some cases, they do have the ability to give consent and so that's why the Mental Health Association and all the mental health groups have asked that this wording simply be changed."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3455?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brosnahan on House Bill 780. Out of... out of the record. Representative Burke... Representative Bost on House Bill 151. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 151, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 151 as amended, the Bill there will eliminate hunting license fees for active duty military personnel. The… if they are active duty, now that does not include National Guard that are on temporary assigned duty, but… but they

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

actually have to have an active duty status. They can come and if they're home on leave or they come into the state to visit somebody, they should be able to be granted a hunting license to hunt. Very simple Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Dunkin: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor... Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is there a fiscal impact with this here...?"

Bost: "The physical (sic-fiscal) impact... I believe there is one, hold on just a minute. Our analysis shows there's not one at this time unless there's been some modification that I don't know of."

Dunkin: "Can I ask what brought this Bill on?"

Bost: "Yeah. There was a person that is known this to be in another state that lives in my district. It is for active duty personnel, that encourages them when they are home on leave and when they are back in the states, if a hunting season is going on, that they would have the opportunity to go and hunt with family or friends that might be located here in the State of Illinois."

Dunkin: "So, we're doing this for one particular constituent?"

Bost: "No. We're doing it for every person who serves in the United States military."

Dunkin: "Okay. And I'm, ya know, for the record, ya know, a four (4)-year ROTC man, my brother served seven (7) years in the Marines."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "Right. And on... this is only if they are active duty, though."

Dunkin: "Correct."

Bost: "So, not... not our National..."

Dunkin: "Not incl... So, this is..."

Bost: "Even though you'd love to do up our National Guard, it's just not affordable in that aspect. But we… this is for active duty personnel."

Dunkin: "Sure. How many people do you think would utilize this will be active... I mean, would this impact?"

Bost: "Ya know, it's awful hard to figure that because, I mean, there are tremendous amounts that could use it. The reality is how many people will come here to Illinois and visit. I'm sure it will be minimal. Of course, that is also minimal in the fact that you can't just call in for it. We're trying to work to figure out how you can do that to call in, but right now the Amendment, what it did, was make it to where you have to travel here to Springfield..."

Dunkin: "Mmm mmm."

Bost: "...to the IDNR office and to get that permit. And so, because of that that's gonna reduce the amount of people that are actually eligible to receive it."

Dunkin: "So, let me ask, who is it for in your district?"

Bost: "It's absolute... for every serving military person in my district."

Dunkin: "No. Who requested, Representative. Who requested this?"

Bost: "Actually, to tell you the truth, who actually talked to me about it?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Dunkin: "Yes."

Bost: "There was a local radio personality that said that he'd heard it from another state and thought it would be very appropriate for the State of Illinois to do it."

Dunkin: "Okay. Any idea of how... how many people are gonna be impacted?"

Bost: "No. There's no... no estimates because, ya know, we don't...
we don't know how many people who've actually served
inactively that will come back home and do that."

Dunkin: "Sure. According to your analysis, is the Department of Natural Services (sic-Resources) are they for or against it or...?"

Bost: "They were neutral and neutral as long as they didn't have to special... set up a special program out in the places where you could be out at an outpost location, whether it's your local Wal-Mart or wherever you're picking up your hunting license at, so they have to come to Springfield here. So, that's when they were neutral."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, I'm the chair of Tourism; I've been hunting.

Can you make Legislators or at least the Members of our committee a part of..."

Bost: "Probably not."

Dunkin: "Why not?"

Bost: "Because... and what..."

Dunkin: "We're active... we're active Legislators."

Bost: "If, ya know, if you're an... ya know what, if you're an active duty service member, you... it's for you as well."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Dunkin: "I am acting very... very actively, such as yourself here in this chamber servin' the public. We're... we're public servants."

Bost: "Yes, but you're not active military duty service personnel."

Dunkin: "I see. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Representative."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

McCarthy: "...on our analysis here, it says that House Amendment #2 eliminated the National Guard from this."

Bost: "Yes, that's because originally the Bill wasn't real clear. See, if we did all of the Illinois National Guard, they wouldn't have to be active duty. That was not supposed to have been included in the Bill originally. They need to be, ya know, where they're serving out and away. Now, if the National Guard is activated, then they reach this status."

McCarthy: "Okay. How about the Army Reserve?"

Bost: "Same situation."

McCarthy: "Same situation, okay. And just for my own clarification. As far as the department... I should have said the Department of Military Affairs, which says it in Amendment #3."

Bost: "That's correct. No, it was IDNR, actually, came up with Amendment #3."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

McCarthy: "What department is it that verified that this person is an active duty..."

Bost: "It would be IDNR based on their ID and their qualifications and certifications of showing that active duty status."

McCarthy: "Did they say who they would work with to make sure that the records were accurate?"

Bost: "Yeah. We did... we said that it would be with their presentation that it would be... not DD214... but they're actually military ID that shows an active status."

McCarthy: "Okay. Because we have a kind of an associated thing goin' on in our hometown... my hometown that Representative Kosel and I represent, a fire district, that had a guy that said he was on active duty and wasn't on active duty and it took 'em like three (3) years to figure this out before they caught him. So, I was wondering if this could be used the same way to verify..."

Bost: "Yeah. There... there are ways that you can verify. Now, is it subject to fraud? That's... that's some pretty chargeable offenses..."

McCarthy: "Yeah."

Bost: "if they would go to that extent."

McCarthy: "Okay. Thank you for the answers, though."

Bost: "Mmm mmm."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 151?' 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,

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1320. Representative Bost."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1320, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1320, this is the… it creates the Personal Protection for Judges, State's Attorneys, and Public Defenders Act, establishes a statewide uniform standard for the issuance of permits to carry concealed firearms in the authorizing the county sheriff to issue concealed fire permits to judges, state's attorneys, assistant state's attorneys, public defenders and assistant public defenders, requiring an applicant to complete a training course in handgun use, safety and marksmanship and amends the Code of 1961 and expands the... an unlawful use of weapons and aggressive unlawful use of weapons violations. Judges, state's attorneys and assistant state's attorneys, public defenders, assistant public defenders who carry and possess firearms in accordance with the Personal Protection Act for Judges, State's Attorneys and Public Defenders Act. It does preempt Home Rule. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Dunkin: "Representative, we've talked about this Bill."

Bost: "Yes, we have."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Dunkin: "I'm curious. Now, how many state's attorneys are there in the State of Illinois, would you say?"

Bost: "Well, there would be a hundred and nine (109). Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "No, no. Excuse me."

Bost: "A hundred and two (102)."

Dunkin: "This Bill will address all Cook County... excuse me... all county state's attorneys?"

Bost: "All county state's attorneys."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Bost: "All assistant state's attorneys, public defenders, and judges."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, out of a hundred and two (102) counties, how many public state's attorneys are there?"

Bost: "I can't give you that answer."

Dunkin: "Do you happen to know how many public defenders?"

Bost: "No, I do not. There's several for each county."

Dunkin: "Okay. Do you have any idea how many judges there are in the State of Illinois?"

Bost: "No, I do not."

Dunkin: "Okay. Those are three important questions, Representative, because that's a lot of guns out here. And I think we need to pay attention to this, this particular legislation. Can we get some order, Mr. Speaker? Okay. So, you don't know how many judges there are in the State of Illinois?"

Bost: "Well, I've just been told that there's about eighty (80) in DuPage, so, ya know, oughta let you know from that from

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

based on population you can kinda figure out what we're looking at."

Dunkin: "This legislation will be specifically for the State of Illinois exempting Home Rule?"

Bost: "Yes. It would..."

Dunkin: "Help me understand it."

Bost: "Okay. Basically, Home Rule communities that ban handguns or whatever, when you put that exemption in there, that means that if they have a conceal carry permit they can be charged for going in there when they have... when they actually have their weapon on them and they have their certificate and papers with them permitting them and allowing them to do that."

Dunkin: "Can I ask you what prompted this particular legislation?"

Bost: "The state's attorneys came to us and... concerned about the safety as they prosecute and as judges bring down rulings and concerns that they have of, ya know, life-threatening situations."

Dunkin: "So, are there... I mean, is there a rash or series of incidences that have happened... that have occurred to prosecutors or public defenders or judges. I'm sure at some point there may... were, but..."

Bost: "Well, there's... there's no one in particular incident except for the fact that every day they deal with these threats and these concerns and that's the reason they brought this informa... ya know, brought this to us and said would we be willing to carry it."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Dunkin: "Okay. Just give me an idea of how many... Let's say, if every pros... prosecutor, every defender... public defender, every judge is allowed to carry this weapon, how many... lets say just give me roughly an idea. If you don't know, I understand, but an idea of how many...lets say all of them decide to take advantage of this particular law."
- Bost: "Mmm mmm. I can't give that answer. I guess it's... the number we could run at some time, but I can't give you that answer right now to even... because your public defenders vary, based on the size county as well as the assistant state's attorneys on how many assistant state's attorneys exist in each county. The judges are naturally a set number and then state's attorneys are a set number."
- Dunkin: "So, you have, according to my analysis, you have the judges, state's attorneys, assistant state's attorneys, public defender and even assistant public defenders. I'm sure in Cook County there's probably..."
- Bost: "Actually... actually in Cook County it would actually be kind of an expansion of what's already occurring with the aldermen there, 'cause the aldermen can already do this."
- Dunkin: "Well, I'm not addressing the aldermen. I'm addressing the myriad of public defenders and state's attorneys and judges that you're asking and yet, you don't have a number or an idea of how many people would be impacted by this."
- Bost: "Well, and as I said, there is a set number as far as the state's attorneys, there's a set number as far as judges, but the number as far as the prosecut... public defenders and assistants state's attorneys is gonna vary depending on the county, so I can't give that answer to you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Dunkin: "Oh... So..."

Bost: "But the reason I did bring that up about the aldermen, aldermen do not actually prosecute criminals every day and are under those threats. How much more is it important that we make sure that our public defenders or state's attorneys, those people who are judges that are dealing with these people every day that have a higher risk of someone being in a situation where they would be able to threaten them with a firearm because obviously most of... several of them have proved already that, ya know, that they have no consideration for someone in authority, that they need to make sure that they're able to protect themselves."

Dunkin: "So, let me ask... Representative, do you believe that Members of this Body here and maybe over in the Senate pass some pretty controversial and intense legislation that upset people across this state?"

Bost: "We do every day. Yeah. Yes, we do."

Dunkin: "Every day we're down here, at least."

Bost: "Yeah. We have some real serious. We have some like that and we have others where we, ya know..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin, bring your remarks to a close."

Dunkin: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Mr. Speaker, can I get some attention here."

Speaker Turner: "They're listening."

Dunkin: "Can you get some order? Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This Bill, 1320, and ya have to pay attention to this right here. This is a gun Bill, plain and simple. Now, all of us have a great deal of respect for us who are state's

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

attorneys, who are public defenders, and are judges. They in an environment oftentimes where it could be potentially a not so good environment because people can be vindictive, potentially, the pay isn't as great, but the reality is all of us here in this chamber also work in very stressful environments. Some of us live in districts, our Representative Districts, that have a crime... that has such a high crime level that most people in this chamber here wouldn't even wanna live. And so, we're just as at risk as any other state's attorney, as any other judges, et cetera. I think this is a bad precedent, quite frankly, because the Sponsor doesn't even know how many state's attorneys there are in the state. He doesn't know how many public defenders there are. He doesn't even know how many judges there are in the State of Illinois, but yet we should allow just anybody, even the assistant state's attorneys, even the assistant public defenders, the ability to carry a handgun. Now, all of us wanna be protected, all of us wanna make sure that we are in the right or the best environment, but this legislation..."

- Speaker Turner: "You're time is up. The Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Fritchey. I wanna remind the Members that
 this Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Speaker, first of all, I'd move to take this off Short Debate and put it on Standard Debate."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to move the Bill from Short Debate to Standard Debate. Leave is granted."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fritchey: "Thank you. Second of all, Speaker, inquiry of the Chair as to how many votes this Bill will require for passage?"

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Parliamentarian. I've been informed by the parliamentarian that this will require 71 votes for passage."

Fritchey: "Next, Speaker, I would ask that should this Bill get the requisite number of votes there be a verification."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has requested a verification."

Fritchey: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative Bost, what was the vote in committee on this Bill?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fritchey, hold on just a minute.

Representative Black."

Bost: "It was unanimous, 10-0-0."

Black: "Mr. Speaker."

Fritchey: "Is this out of order, Sir?

Speaker Turner: "Just a minute. Representative Black."

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

Fritchey: "Is this out order, Sir?"

Speaker Turner: "I... I did recognize him. He raised his hand after the..."

Black: "The only thing that's out of order is the parliamentarian's response. This is subsection (i). It no more requires 71 votes than any normal Bill. Now, let's... let's either follow the rules or let's just throw the rule book away again. This does not require, under subsection

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

(i) of the Home Rule Act, it does not require a 71-vote majority."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Black: "And I would ask that that ruling be overturned."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your point is well-taken. We will respond to that just shortly. Let me double-check in the book again."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "That's no problem. Yeah. Representative Fritchey, you may go ahead and start your debate, continue."

Bost: "In answer to your question, Representative Fritchey, it was 10 to 0. It was unanimous out of the committee."

Fritchey: "So, the Criminal Judiciary Committee passed this Bill 10-0?"

Bost: "That is not correct. That did... this did not go to the Criminal. This went to the Department... Agriculture debate... Committee."

Fritchey: "Does this allow farmers to carry guns?"

Bost: "Excuse me?"

Fritchey: "Does this Bill allow farmers to carry guns?"

Bost: "Well, some of my state's attorneys may be farmers as well."

Fritchey: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, yesterday, had a very apt question about how a certain Bill came out of a certain committee."

Bost: "Right."

Fritchey: "How did this Bill wind up in Agriculture, Sir?"

Bost: "Well, let me see. Is the Speaker around today? We may go ask him. I have no idea. I, ya know..."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fritchey: Did you..."

- Bost: "Each one of us know, you and I know, that we kinda put our Bills in and it goes before Rules and however it comes out, it comes out. I... we don't..."
- Fritchey: "Honest... honesty about the answer. Representative,
 I'm looking at our analysis and it shows neither proponents
 nor opponents to this Bill. Who came to you with this
 Bill?"
- Bost: "It was... it was a public def... or not public defenders... a few state's attorneys came to us and they said it would be appropriate."
- Fritchey: "Had any of... did any of them slip in support of this Bill in committee?"
- Bost: "It was slipped in committee."
- Fritchey: "By who, if I can ask? And I don't mean to sound confrontational, Representative Bost. I just... when I'm looking at our analysis, I don't see anything on here."
- Bost: "Right. I'll give that to ya. The proponents were the Illinois State's Attorneys Association, NRA, Illinois State Rifle Association. Opponents were the Chicago Police Department, Illinois Citizens for Handgun Control, City of Chicago, Cook County State's Attorney, Cook County Board, and Metro Counties."
- Fritchey: "So, the Cook County State's Attorney is explicitly saying that they don't want state's attorneys to have weapons."
- Bost: "That's... that's correct and I'll be glad to answer that.

 The Cook County State's Attorney was in opposition if it included the assistant state's attorneys and the problem I

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

had with that, and... and, ya know, they asked for an Amendment on that, the problem I have with that is if you if they're good enough to be assistant state's attorneys and they're trustworthy enough to that, shouldn't they be trustworthy enough to protect themselves. Now, he would have supported, according to what the conversation we had, he would have supported had it only been the state's attorneys and judges that would have been able to carry, but it... since it includes the assistant state's attorneys and the public defenders. Now, in my case, I have to look at that as, if you're in charge of your office and you're making decisions on who those people are going to be and... and, ya know, putting that I'm out there, if they're trustworthy enough to defend the rights of people, then they should be trustworthy enough to go through these tests to qualify, certify and then receive a conceal carry to protect themselves."

Fritchey: "Well, I... I think we can both agree that being a good attorney does not make one a good marksman. I started my career as an assistant attorney general and I noticed the assistant AGs are not covered in this Bill."

Bost: "And that's right and I'm glad you brought that up. A good attorney does not make a good marksman. However, a training course that they're required to take makes sure that they are before they receive that permit."

Fritchey: "Did the Illinois Judges Association weigh in on this Bill?"

Bost: "Yeah, not to my knowledge."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fritchey: "Why are you included... this is brought to you by state's attorneys from a couple of counties?"

Bost: "Yes."

Fritchey: "Why are you including judges statewide when the judges aren't asking for this?"

Bost: "Well, because the judges fall under that same situation of day-to-day facing prosecution of criminals and threats from criminals and, ya know, this doesn't force them... if they choose not to take a... we're not gonna force them to have a conceal carry permit. We're giving them the opportunity, if they feel threatened, to protect their own selves and, ya know, this isn't anything new or wild in any other state."

Fritchey: "Mike... Representative..."

Bost: "Mike works for... fine for me. Sorry, John."

Fritchey: "You... no, you and me both. I get that and I get the argument and we can respectfully disagree about protecting oneself and listen, we all face threats..."

Bost: "Right."

Fritchey: "Ya know, with... The female bartender in Chicago faced a threat from an off-duty police officer. We face threats down here. If your intention is to allow everybody to try to protect themselves, do this in a straightforward manner and bring the straight conceal carry Bill again."

Bost: "Oh, I... Ya know, at times I have and I would be glad to support that legislation. This is specific to them because of their request and I'm glad to carry it for them."

Fritchey: "But... All right. Just to the Bill and I appreciate the Gentleman addressing my questions. Ladies and

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Gentlemen, to try to change statewide law for the request of a couple of State's Attorneys Offices from a couple of counties this is a major deviation for Illinois policy on this issue. This is, intended or otherwise, a test vote on concealed carry in Illinois. This is an intention to such open that door up..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fritchey, bring your remarks to a close."

Fritchey: "Gettin' to the good part. This is not about a need to protect a certain class of citizens, otherwise we're gonna start to open this door up to a wide range of people. People face threats in every walk of life, that's why we have law enforcement, that's why we have other means of protecting individuals. The means of protecting these workers or anybody else in whatever their professions may be is not to strap a gun on their hip. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you support concealed carry, you're entitled to do so and vote accordingly, but don't think that this is a half step toward that direction, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is bad policy and it's unnecessary. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Black, regarding your inquiry the parliamentarian has a response."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Black, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, House Bill 1320 preempts Home Rule... Home Rule powers under Section 6(g) of Article VII of the Illinois Constitution and requires 71 votes for passage."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Black."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Black: "Yeah, we'd like an explanation of that. We don't agree with that at all. This Bill clearly does nothing that we've not done in the past in precluding Home Rule. Why... why is... We don't understand the gentleman's ruling."

Speaker Turner: "We'll..."

Black: "We're gonna... we're gonna discuss it right here."

Speaker Turner: "There. You two can take and discuss it."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Turner: "In the meantime, we'll continue to discuss the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

Osterman: "Representative, it's been asked, but if you can clarify again, what's the real purpose behind the Bill?"

Bost: "The purpose is strictly allowing these judges, state's attorneys, public defenders to... to be able to carry firearms to protect themselves in case they may be threatened and/or otherwise attacked by criminals who they have prosecuted and that protection given to them."

Osterman: "In their day-to-day environments, don't they have protection now?"

Bost: "They have bailiffs, but those bailiffs do not follow them home, those bailiffs do not travel down the roads with them, those bailiffs do not go into the locations where people that they've prosecuted before might be present specifically seeking to have ha... ya know, harm them or their families."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Osterman: "But aren't… aren't there probably laws on the books about trying to intimidate state's attorneys and public defenders and former judges?"
- Bost: "Well, I'm sure there are, but... but sometimes the law...
 Okay. There's also laws on the books to stop those
 particular criminals from doing what they did in the first
 place and that always seemed to work."
- Osterman: "So, you want them to be able to take the law into their own hands and..."
- Bost: "No. I want them to be able to protect themselves."
- Osterman: "Okay. And in their home, currently, if they have firearms or shotguns or they're able to do that on their home, but you wanna be able to have them walk around and carry those firearms."
- Bost: "Well, actually, it depends on which particular community they live in whether they can protect themselves in their own home. However, but yes, because they shouldn't have to be tru... only feel safe or only be able to protect themselves in their own home."
- Osterman: "And thi... this preempts Home Rule..."
- Bost: "This would give them the opportunity..."
- Osterman: "...and in Cook County the Cook County State's Attorneys

 Office was against this and that's the largest court system
 in the... in the country, if I'm not mistaken."
- Bost: "Yes and I explained that already what... Now, he was okay with the fact that he was going to be able to get that.

 Okay, just so you know. He was okay with the fact that he was gonna get conceal carry and the judges, but he didn't want it for the state... for the prosecuting attorney... All

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

right. I'm sorry. The public defenders and/or the assistant state's attorneys. Now, the concern I have is if you are in a position to where you are elected to handle and coordinate those people as well, then you should be very wise on who you choose those people are so that... that you make sure that they are able and capable of handling a situation like this as well."

Osterman: "So, could someone carry a firearm then into a court setting or if I'm a public defender I'm interviewing my client am I gonna be able to carry a firearm..."

Bost: "Yes."

Osterman: "...into the courtroom?"

Bost: "Unless... unless that... unless that is ruled unappropriate with the... the building code or whatever. They could make that rule up."

Osterman: "So, a criminal's locked up, the nearest access they would have to a firearm to potentially escape or to do damage to someone, might be that the public defender has a concealed carry firearm. Now, does that make a lot of safety sense to you?"

Bost: "That... that is still up to the local control on that issue and the fact that you could go ahead and say that if you were going to enter the courthouse, then the guns need to be set off and checked and put in a proper place. That doesn't allow the criminal that way. I think... I think common sense can weigh out here and we should be able to trust those people who have been elected to public office. I know there are times that you might question that, but... but that have

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

been elected to public office that would be able to make sound decisions on their own."

Osterman: "Let me go back to the state's attorney of Cook County, who I've known since I was a young boy..."

Bost: "Wonderful man."

Osterman: "...I'm not sure that you talked to him specifically but knowing him and his view on gun violence, I'd be very surprised if he would: 1) wanna carry a firearm to conceal himself..."

Bost: "Right."

Osterman: "...or to protect himself, but also the fact I think he very much cares about the fact that he is the largest prosecutorial arm in the country and he does not press... think that this is probably wise idea for public safety from a public safety standpoint."

Bost: "Representative, all I can do and I've always been very honest from the floor, I'll be honest right now. The… his Representative came to me and said, if you amend this Bill where it does not include public defenders and assistant state's attorney, the Cook County State's Attorney would be fine with this. Now, that was the word…"

Osterman: "Okay."

Bost: "...specifically from them in my office while carrying this
Bill in the early partid... before we went to committee and I
so chose to know it... not do that."

Osterman: "To the Bill. Representative Bost, I... I, for one..."

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

Osterman: "To the Bill. Ya know, this issue's on the floor and there are a number of other conceal and carry pieces of

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

legislation on the floor and quite honestly, I think that our Body should have this debate. We should debate this issue in full public view so that the people of the State of Illinois can make a decision and look at what we are doing as public policymakers on the issue of gun violence and gun And it's good that we're debating these Bills instead of having them not be debated, but I think having been around this issue for a while that having this be the first conceal and carry Bill on the floor of the Illinois House of Representatives since I've been here and the fact that it deals with judges and prosecutors, I'm suspicious that the NRA who was the architect behind this legislation and the drafter of the Bill that they're the ones that wanna use this as a foothold on the issue of conceal and carry. And quite honestly, I would much prefer if we're gonna have a debate on conceal and carry, let's have the full debate. Let's not have a little foothold in here..."

Speaker Turner: "Yeah, you've concluded. Go ahead."

Osterman: "But that we should vote on the full Bill which is ultimately what they want and advertise that they want which ultimately is gonna make people in our state less safe. I would ask for a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Froehlich. Not in his... The Gentleman from... Okay."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to address the Bill because this is one of those issues that gets very polarized and it presents... prevents us from judging the merits of the proposal whether it's a gun control proposal or a gun carry proposal on its own merits. We always discuss it in terms

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

of slippery slopes; it's gonna lead to something else, gonna make something else easier. And let me point out, there are some gun control Bills that are gonna be coming up this week probably and we're gonna have folks ask us to analyze those proposals on their merits. And rather than looking at 'em as, ya know, the first step down some, ya know, improbable slippery slope. Here's the reality. Talk to some judges, see if they like it. I've talked to several in Cook County who like this notion. We also know retired police officers already have concealed carry under Federal Law. These folks in the criminal justice system, some of them do get threatened, some of them have been harassed, followed. judge I talked to last week said he was once followed by a gang member to his home. They're... they're representing us in the criminal justice system. It's not unreasonable to allow them this protection if they choose. I'd just say, why don't we do something different for a change and... and evaluate a proposal on its own merits instead of tying it in to all kinds of unlikely slippery slopes. Thank you."

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

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a couple questions. Does this... Representative Bost, would teachers be allowed to carry a concealed weapon?"

Bost: "Only if the prosecuting attorneys or... or public defenders or state's attorneys or judges, and if they're also teaching then they would qualify, but..."

Biggins: "No, I mean teachers in the classroom..."

Bost: "No, just teachers in the classroom would not, no."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Biggins: "Well, aren't they, obviously, places where they could be in danger..."

Bost: "Oh, sure."

Biggins: "...whether or not they have the gun in the classroom."

Bost: "Sure they are."

Biggins: "I'm not suggesting that, but... Let me ask a question."

Bost: "Okay."

Biggins: "In their line of duty, wouldn't they be placed in a dangerous situation?"

Bost: "Well, sure."

Biggins: "A lot like Representative Jefferson sometimes, Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Do I look like a Representative... the back of Representative Winters."

Biggins: "Winters. I can't tell Winters from Sommers..."

Bost: "They need to get turned around."

Biggins: "...you know that. But what about my question, though?

Why aren't we letting... why aren't you including..."

Bost: "That just wasn't in the… in the Bill. If another time that might come up, then we could debate that at that time. This language, ya know, we… Each Bill is language specific. We've had the… where we would have concealed carry for the whole state where everybody could go in and qualify and certify and do all that. But this really was, ya know, I'm a little bothered by the fact that one person earlier said that he doesn't believe… he believes this language was in our lang… a language; it wasn't. It really was from the state's attorney, so… and it's specifically for them."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Biggins: "Well, it seems we're creating different classes of citizens and certain lengths for someone from our area."

Bost: "Well, and ya know what, I wouldn't do that myself and I don't think you would either, but I think we opened that door and they said, oh, this'll open the door. Actually, it was open... the door... many years ago when we said Chicago aldermen could carry."

Biggins: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

Gordon: "Representative Bost, is there some specific instances where you've heard stories where an assistant public defender or a prosecutor needs protection? Do you have any specific instances?"

Bost: "No, I do not have any specific. I just simply deliver the message that they've brought to me."

Gordon: "Okay. Because the situations that I was in was if you were out on an investigation or before you brought something to a Grand Jury, it was with an officer. Now, there's that. And then also you brought up that they need protection outside of the courtroom for revenge purposes..."

Bost: "Whatever reason. Right."

Gordon: "...for someone they prosecuted or someone..."

Bost: "Sure."

Gordon: "...who potentially a public defender didn't, ya know, do a good enough job in that person's opinion. Is that correct?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "Sure."

Gordon: "So, this is not just in the course of their duties..."

Bost: "No, no, no. It is actually... Once... once you receive this... and I need to be straightforward here... once you receive a concealed carry permit, you would be able to carry that permit with... or carry that weapon through your day-to-day life, no matter where you went, at your, ya know, your own discretion."

Gordon: "Okay. Just... just by virtue of the status... statuses that are covered in the Bill: a state's attorney, assistant state's attorney, public defender..."

Bost: "And judge."

Gordon: "...ssistant public defender and judge."

Bost: "Right."

Gordon: "Okay. And the judge would be able to have it in the courtroom."

Bost: "If that... if... if the courthouse so ruled, yes. But, yes, I would say he would."

Gordon: "So, the chief judge's office..."

Bost: "Would make that call."

Gordon: "...who's in charge of the courthouse, could... could overrule a personal judge's decision to do that?"

Bost: "That's... that's the way I understand, yes."

Gordon: "Okay. Is this... I'm a cosponsor of concealed carry Bills. I get it. I understand it."

Bost: "Correct."

Gordon: "And I support people's Second Amendment rights, but my concern with this is this is just a... a small part of society as a whole that deal with a very bad element..."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "Yes, that's true."

Gordon: "...in some cases. And so, I think the potential for abuse and even violence in some cases is more prevalent with these groups than... than overall because of what they're exposed to on a daily basis."

Bost: "From... from the fact that they would be in dang... You're talkin' about they would need it more for protection."

Gordon: "No, I'm saying the potential for abuse and violence is there more... I never felt I needed a gun for protection. I was threatened...inside and outside the courtroom, all of these things."

Bost: "And you wouldn't be..."

Gordon: "I... and ya know...

Bost: "And... and you... if you chose not to do this, then you wouldn't have to."

Gordon: "Okay."

Bost: "This is strictly if you wanted to say, okay, I feel I need to have a concealed carry permit, then you go to the local sheriff, you go through this procedure and then you can receive that. Now, the question is, there may be some that don't wanna do that and that's fine. This doesn't force you to carry a concealed weapon. It simply says that if you are in these jobs, you do feel threatened or you feel that you are capable and wanna be qualified and certified, you have to go through this procedure and you'll be issued a permit."

Gordon: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Bost: "Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Gordon: "...Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to give my time to Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Speaker Turner: "Turn on Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "I'll be real brief, Representative. Again, Mr. Representative Bost, did you find those numbers of how many state's attorneys, assistants, judges..."
- Bost: "Yes, yes. Yes, I did. Let me... let me explain to you that in Cook County it's nine hundred (900), in DuPage County it's one hundred and seventy-five (175) and... and..."
- Dunkin: "Representative, my original question was statewide."
- Bost: "Okay. And you can assume since those are the two largest counties that all other counties are gonna be less than that and I would know that from my own it... from my own county you're talking about probably less than twenty (20) people. So..."
- Dunkin: "Help me with the number, Representative. Is it ten thousand (10,000)? Is it fifty thousand (50,000)?"
- Bost: "No, it'd be less, a lot less than ten thousand (10,000) because if you're talking the two largest counties in the state, Cook and DuPage, and you're talking a thousand (1,000) there. Okay. You're talkin' just over a thousand (1,000) in... in those two... nine hundred (900) in Cook, a hundred and seventy-five (175) in DuPage and if you know the other counties in the... ya know, there's very few. So... so, you're gonna be a whole lot less than ten thousand (10,000)."

Dunkin: "Those are state's attorneys, correct?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "That is correct."

Dunkin: "Or both?"

Bost: "That's both from what I'm understanding."

Dunkin: "I'm tryin' to get the… I'm tryin' to get the combined assistant for the defenders, the defense, the state's attorneys, assistants, the judges. All of these items… all of these particular individuals here that you've listed here, how many, how many? Because we're generalizing in saying, look, we're gonna give roughly ten thousand (10,000) more guns to people…"

Bost: "No, we're not giving ten..."

Dunkin: "And... and that means there are ten thousand (10,000) more guns out there and kids and other folks who will acc... equal access to these... some of these guns 'cause everyone won't be completely responsible."

Bost: "Representative, with all due respect, that... that number is a little high. I just told you that... that obviously we're talking a whole lot less than by... probably less than five thousand (5,000), by the way, we're looking here, because if you've got the two largest counties and understand, the thing you wanna remember is the majority of the voters, two-thirds of the voters, could probably see the Sears Towers on a clear day. So, by the time you get down to my area, the numbers in those counties are gonna be a lot smaller. It might be... many of our counties only have one state's attorney who doesn't have any assistant, may have one assistant. You have a public defender or two public defenders because you just don't have that load in that area and you don't have the population base. Now, that being

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

said, not every one of those are going to go out and get a concealed carry permit. It's up to them if they wanna do that. They don't have to; this doesn't force them into that. So, they can go out, they can apply for it, you're not putting new guns on the street because odds are that, ya know, the reality is that no one's making new guns here, you're just giving them the opportunity to carry to protect themselves."

- Dunkin: "So, we can... While... Let's say I'm a state's attorney or I'm a judge. Can we carry our gun while we're campaigning?"
- Bost: "If... if you have a concealed carry permit, you can carry that weapon 24 hours a day on your person as long as you're not entering a facility that has specific rules and guidelines that make you give up that gun at the door."
- Dunkin: "Go through a metal detector, for example. We have a lot of metal detectors in most or our courts, if I'm not mistaken. And I'll... and most of the... at least the heavily populated portion of the state..."
- Bost: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the first part of your question."
- Dunkin: "Do we have metal detectors and... in Cook County, DuPage County and most of our court systems?"
- Bost: "Yes. I mean, ya know, I don't know... I think we do because, ya know, we've got fairly small counties in my area and all five of my counties that I have do have metal detectors as you go into the courthouse as well as a officer usually there to use the same way we have here."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Dunkin: "Sure. So, would you be willin' to... 'cause these, again, these are judges, these are all kind of state's attorneys and defenders. What about elected officials at this... in this chamber and at the next chamber and in the Executive Office?"

Bost: "Hey, ya know, you and I talked, ya know, you and I've talked about that and ya know, if we bring another Bill that supports that, I'd be more than willing to support that. I've never hid the fact that I would be very open to that type legislation."

Dunkin: "Okay. To the..."

Bost: "This doesn't do that."

Dunkin: "To the Bill. My time is ticking. Ladies and Gentlemen, 71 votes, this needs a nice 'no' vote on it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Lindner: "Representative, I have looked on my computer through the whole statute and I just can't tell. Does this apply to judges, state's attorneys and public defenders only when they're in that office or after they are retired would they be allowed to carry also?"

Bost: "If they retired... if they retire, it is revoked."

Lindner: "But..."

Bost: "It's required for them to hold that position while they have this concealed carry permit."

Lindner: "All right. Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

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

Rose: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would simply state a couple things. When I was in the State's Attorneys Office one day I was out raking my yard, Saturday afternoon in the fall and an individual just happened to be walking by, stops, stops me and says, hey I know you. I looked at the guy and in fact, if I did know him, I'd sent him to prison, caused me great pause at that point in time. Just here I am standing in my front yard with nothin' more than a rake, beyond that though, nothing happened, no big deal. Beyond that though, our state's attorney, at the time, John Piland, at one point in time while I was there, had a contract out on his life, a contract out on his life. He needed protection. I think of all the members of the assistant state's attorneys who might be in the drug unit or violent gang unit. It is not uncommon for these people to have threats, all kinds of threats, veiled and otherwise and sometimes not real, sometimes drug threats to their health, safety and wellbeing. I think this makes imminent good sense that we help protect those who we ask to protect us. And for that reason, I would ask you support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "...man from Cook, Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Bost: "You bet."

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I wanna make sure I understand everything the Bill does and everything the Bill doesn't do. So, as I understand it, those who would be able to have concealed weapons would be: a judge, a state's attorney, and a public defender. Is that correct?"

Bost: "And assistant state's attorneys."

Lang: "And assistant state's attorneys."

Bost: "And public defender, yeah."

Lang: "So, why do you include public defenders but not private defense counsel?"

Lang: "And assistant state's attorneys.

Bost: "They weren't part of the people asking for it, I guess.

Ya know, I mean, this is the court system where a lot of this occurs. I mean, yes, each attorney could be out there.

Is that something we need to look at later? This just doesn't do that at this time. This is... these are officers of the court either appointed and/or elected."

Lang: "Well, I'm not... as you know, I'm not a big proponent of concealed carry..."

Bost: "Yes. Yes, I know that..."

Lang: "but I am a big proponent of comprehensive legislation."

Bost: "I... I know that..."

Lang: "that does a whole thing, but you don't do a whole thing here, I don't think, Representative."

Bost: "Well, no..."

Lang: "If you leave people out that are involved in the system..."

Bost: "You're right. And... and I would... I have supported where it does the whole thing in the past. And, ya know, as I said earlier, there was a person for... somebody from the

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

other side of the aisle there who debated it with me, this issue that said that this was brought by the NRA. It was not. The language is at the request of the state's attorneys. It was very clear and ya know... would I like to see it other places? Oh, I... I... everyone on this floor knows that I would."

Lang: "So, Representative, you're trying to protect people involved in this criminal law process."

Bost: "In the criminal process"

Lang: "What about the jurors, Sir? Why aren't you include jurors in this? Aren't they ta... at risk?"

Bost: "Well, it..."

Lang: "Their names are public."

Bost: "Right."

Lang: "Their addresses are part of the public record."

Bost: "Right. And... and ya know, if we wanna carry a Bill later on for that, which you'll be..."

Lang: "No, I don't wanna carry a Bill for that."

Bost: "Okay. Well, then... then I..."

Lang: "I... I would like you to have a Bill that does what you purport you're doing..."

Bost: "Sure. And I would... I would..."

Lang: "...which is to protect everybody in the process."

Bost: "And... and I would love to have a Bill like that as well, but that's not what I have before us. You know that each time we bring these Bills up, ya know, it's... all of this is a work in progress."

Lang: "What about the spouses of these people? It wasn't Judge Lefkow..."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "It... it doesn't include them."

Lang: "...it wasn't Judge... it wasn't Judge Lefkow that was assassinated, it was her husband and her mother. Is that correct?"

Bost: "Well, that is true and... and ya know, we could set and argue that we ought to include everyone. You're never going to get me to say I don't believe that each person..."

Black: "Mike, he's... don't even answer those questions. They have nothing to do with the Bill."

Bost: "I..."

Black: "...to the nth degree. (Inaudible)."

Bost: "I will be glad to answer your questions."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope you're gonna give me this time back that's being wasted by Mr. Black. Thank you."

Bost: "Representative, I'll be glad, at any time, to carry a Bill that will deal with this issue on a statewide level and have before."

Lang: "And it would..."

Bost: "Now, wait."

Lang: "And it would be fair, Representative, to say that it would be perfectly all right with you if we had concealed carry, period, in the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Bost: "No one... I have never argued that that's the case that that's how I feel. People know how that... that's how I feel..."

Lang: "Right."

Bost: "As well as Members on your side of the aisle feel."

Lang: "Right"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Bost: "But this specific legislation has and was been brought to me by the state's attorneys and their concerns."

Lang: "Which state's attorneys, Sir?"

Bost: "The State's Attorneys Association is the one that brought this forward at first."

Lang: "The State's Attorneys Association..."

Bost: "Yes."

Lang: "...support this legislation?"

Bost: "Yes."

Lang: "Is Repre... Is State's Attorney Devine in favor of this legislation?"

Bost: "The State's Attorneys Association is in favor of this legislation."

Lang: "Is... I asked you if State's Attorney Devine was in favor of this legislation."

Bost: "No, no. I already said that he's not."

Lang: "All right. Thank you. And Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, that, ya know, it's pretty obvious I'm opposed to concealed carry, so I make no bones about that and... But it seems to me that even if I were for concealed carry we have a responsibility to perf... provide Bills that deal with the whole problem not with part of a problem. So, Mr. Bost, in his comments, has indicated that... Mr. Speaker, will you fix the clock so I can speak?"

Speaker Turner: "...talkin'."

Lang: "Thank you. It's seems to me that people are left out here. If you're really serious about protecting people in the system, then we've got not only judges and prosecutors

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

and assistant prosecutors and public defenders, but there's private defense counsel. There are spouses of these people, children of these people, jurors in these cases. Now, I'm not advocating that we do all of that. I'm simply advocating that if we're going to have a Bill that is purporting to protect people in the courthouse and people who are involved in the criminal court system when they leave the courthouse, then we should include everyone. We should include bailiffs; we should include court clerks; we should include the people that are in the entire court process, but instead we have a Bill that picks and chooses certain people. I think it's the wrong direction. Certainly, I'm opposed to concealed carry generally, I don't need to even debate that issue on the floor. This is a bad Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham, for what reason do you..."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I... I respect the Representative for bringing this piece of legislation forward. I do understand the concern, but in my opinion, this is not commonsense gun legislation. In our current climate, with all the issues being what they are, everybody in our life has issues. Each day in the news we find things that really surprise us, that really set us back and say that how could this be happening in this day of... in time. We've even seen in current days judges crying on television for issues that seem to shock the nation as to why are they having personal feelings on certain issues. I commend judges and state's attorneys for

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

doing the job that's difficult for most people to do. I, in fact, want everyone to be safe: judges, state's attorneys, jurors, even my neighbors. That's why I'm sponsoring a dealers' license to make sure that gun dealers are selling guns to the appropriate people is something I think this Body should be considering seriously, minor protection and making sure that guns don't wind up in the wrong hands of young people. Today, we're living in a climate where all kinds of stresses are causing people to act out of behavior. And I think that if we vote and allow this piece of legislation out of this Body, I think that we're setting ourself up for yet again another amazing tragedy to happen. People that we're close to, concerns that we're having, even down here when we had an incident in our great State Capitol when someone came. We dealt with that by putting metal detectors at the door and allowing the people to be searched and supplying IDs and things of that nature to protect our own safety. So, I would ask this Body... I respect the Gentleman for bringin' forth this piece of legislation, but it does not address the problems that we have. It doesn't do very much to protect our community. And we're dealing in a system where society is tired of us putting one class of people over another class. I, in effect, really am concerned for are... all of our safety including our judges and state's attorneys because we do need them. None of their jobs should be taken lightly. But I would ask that this Body work along with the state's attorneys and all those other agencies and groups that were impo... a proponent for this legislation to work with us to make sure that our

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

entire state is prepared so that we don't have to go through other tragedies like other states are going through and not continue to say that measures like this is an okay measure. I would urge a 'no' vote on this legislation."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Washington... the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Washington."
- Washington: "You said the Gentleman from Washington, right? No, can you believe that? Representative Lake here at the mike.

 Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "...cates he will."

- Washington: "To... Representative, I wanted to ask you a question. I might have missed it. The genesis of the Bill before us, what is the genesis of that? Why is there... is there a documented need across the state now for judges and what have you?"
- Bost: "This was let... this was language brought forward by the State's Attorneys Association requesting this. And we put it together, worked with them, and this is the language that we've come up with that allows them to carry a concealed weapon."
- Washington: "But don't you think that if this was to pass, don't you think this opens up the gate for us to be something like Texas..."

Bost: "No"

- Washington: "and others would have a justified reason also why they may need concealed weapon?"
- Bost: "No. Let... let me tell ya that I don't believe that and here's why. We, in the State of Illinois, have already permitted concealed carry with the aldermen of the City of

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Chicago. They already have that. For whatever reason, the Body, this chamber, before you and I were here, decided that if you're an alderman in the City of Chicago, you are the… and this is what they ruled and made the statement on… you're the first line of law enforcement. Now, what we have now is, is we're just saying that if that door's already been open, this would make sense for the protection of these people who prosecute and deal with our criminals every day that they should be able to protect themselves, carry concealed weapon, if they qualify, if they are certified, if the sheriff deems that they are and they choose to, they can."

Washington: "But Representative, do you carry a gun?"

Bost: "Not at this time."

Washington: "Not at this time. Would you like to carry one?"

Bost: "Someday."

Washington: "Someday."

Bost: "I... believe me, I would support... I would support... See, I never have hid that and I told you that. I support concealed carry, always have and I can go into that debate, but that does... that's not what this deals with. This deals with specific people. It doesn't deal with a statewide concealed carry. It... we've debated that on the floor before; I've debated that on the floor before. Right now, what we're dealing with is these people who deal specifically, straight up with the criminals every day and it gives them that opportunity."

Washington: "But I'm just sayin', even though I made a joke, in a joking fashion, but don't you think lawmakers who give the

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

judges the ammunition and the fuel that they use in an environment that they do their business every day, you don't think that the Legislators too would be directly and indirectly... that we need to have concealed weapons as well?"

Bost: "If you will carry that Bill, I'll be a cosponsor with ya.

I guarantee you I will."

Washington: "Well, you know, it's interesting the way sometime we get so emotional here on the floor, I can imagine if all of us had pistols, we could just go outside and duel."

Bost: "Well, actually, ya know, we could go into a whole debate but then we've be off on something else and I'm not gonna do that. But... but actually, you might be shocked to know that actually in the General Assembly in this United States that used to be the case, that they were... actually had open carry. Now, for whatever reason, they changed that even to where they've changed the portrait of George Washington and they painted his han... sidearm out, in Washington, D.C. But that's all right, that's not what we're debating here today. What we're debating is... here is whether or not these people deserve this opportunity to be qualified, certified and have this opportunity to protect themselves."

Washington: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... I appreciate the intent because I, too, in my district I have a state's attorney who is a friend and I have other people, judges who are friends, but I don't... I just see something wrong with that. If you've got someone sitting in a position to admonish others for carrying guns and to symbolize a balance, I just don't see where the judges could really be rightfully trying to set the example and they themself are

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

carrying guns, I just don't see that as a solution. Just like I don't think you can legislate morality; I don't think you can legislate people doin' the kind of things that they do like we're experiencing on the Virginia Tech campus. would have known that someone with a gun would have came and decimated a student. So, I'm just saying when the act is getting ready to happen, there's nothing going to stop that from happening if it happens. So, I, too, would join Representative Graham in suggesting that this is not a good This does not solve the problem, but only legislation. could be another 'feel good' measure that is more symbol And I urge than substance. a 'no' vote legislation."

- Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have one other speaker, but I would like to make an exception to recognize a very special guest a... that's in the gallery today. And if you would just allow the Chair to do this, I wanna recognize Representative Brady to introduce our special guest. Representative Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's indeed my pleasure to welcome back to the Illinois General Assembly a friend, for many, many years distinguished service in the Illinois State Senate, who's here behind me in the gallery with his wife Joanne. Please welcome back to the Illinois General Assembly our good friend State Senator John Maitland."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield, John. Welcome back.

 You're looking good. The Gentleman from Vermilion,

 Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I ask the Gentleman if he would yield, let me just say I had the privilege, as you did and many of us in this chamber, of serving with former Senator John Maitland and no finer man, no finer Legislator that... that any of us ever had the opportunity to... to serve with. And it's good to see... it's good to see John back. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, you've tried to debate the Bill and everybody on that side of the aisle has tried to do what... some courtroom theatrics. What if, why not, why don't you do this, what if you do that, do you carry a gun, would you like to carry a gun, do you wear lace-up shoes or loafers, has nothing to do with the Bill."

Bost: "That is correct."

Black: "Let me just go over a few questions. If this Bill would become law, if a judge did not want to carry a concealed... a handgun or a state's attorney or an assistant state's attorney or a public defender, they don't have to, right?"

Bost: "That is correct. They do not have to."

Black: "So, you're not making them do anything. You are giving them the opportunity if they feel the need for that kind of protection they could avail themselves of the permit and the training course, then they could do so, correct?"

Bost: "That is correct, but only if they meet those requirements."

Black: "So, there's... there's no mandate here at all. The Bill is relatively straightforward. And by the way, for those of you on the other side of the aisle, almost every one of you

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

voted just before spring break, including some of the most anti-gun people in the General Assembly's history, almost every one of you voted three weeks ago to let arson investigators carry a concealed firearm 24/7. It only got 8 'no' votes. And just before that Bill passed, you... many of you on that side of the aisle voted to let probation officers and parole agents carry a concealed weapon. Evidently that slipped by you. And now, this Bill comes up and all of a sudden, oh, my goodness, we've got to do something here. You've already voted for concealed carry twice in the last month. And here comes this Bill. know, we... we had somebody call Cook County and for the twentieth time the Sponsor of this Bill clearly told you that the state's attorney of Cook County does not support the Bill. Do you know why he doesn't? He has a security detail given to him at taxpayer expense 24/7. If I had a security detail, I wouldn't need a concealed permit either. The Governor runs around the state. First, he was almost... well, he was for guns his first campaign, now he's... now he's changed. Does the Governor worry about security? He has enough State Troopers that surround him 24/7 the press can't even get to him to ask him a question. Mayor Daley, who's anti-gun, has 24/7 police protection around the clock, at his house. Everywhere he goes he's protected by Chicago police officers who are armed. Why is it only us poor folk who have to worry about things out on the street because we can't afford 24/7 security. These people in this Bill are officers of the court. These aren't your run-of-the-mill citizens like me. They are officers of the court.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

have either been elected or undergone a background check to hold the job that they do. I would remind you that the last federal judge that was... whose family was attacked was in Chicago and her family was murdered which... which started a new federal movement to increase security for judges. was a circuit judge murdered in Denver, Colorado, by a disgruntled defendant who didn't like the sentence. Champaign County a few years ago a disgruntled defendant came in and threw a Molotov cocktail, literally incinerated the courtroom and could have easily killed the judge and the state's attorney. When I came down here twenty-one (21) years ago, we didn't have 50 or 60 people running around the House Floor carrying guns or in the State Capitol. know how many people we have here now carrying guns. didn't used to have that. I don't know that I feel any safer, but it's the fact. When all is said and done, Ladies and Gentlemen, if an officer of the court who handles some of the dregs of society, who threaten to kill them often in a verbal explosion in a courtroom, if that judge wants to petition the sheriff for a permit to go through a thorough training course and carry a concealed weapon, I think that should be up to the judge. I don't have any problem with that. And last but not least and none of you ever respond to this from Chicago, the parliamentarian doesn't even respond to this. How is it that this takes three-fifths vote, how is it that by State Law Chicago aldermen are peace officers and get to carry a concealed weapon. Now, how is that? I've asked many of you individually. Can you explain that to me? Why does a Chicago alderman by State Law, by

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

State Law, in a city that it's against the law to own or possess a firearm, why is it that Chicago aldermen can carry a concealed weapon? I guess it's good enough for Chicago aldermen, but it's not good enough for anybody else. I'll make you a bet that that Bill didn't pass by a threefifths Majority that enabled Chicago aldermen to a carry a gun and I'm gonna... I'm gonna here tell once more and I shouldn't do this, but I won't give names unless I'm sworn in and under oath. When I came down here 21 years ago, I met three Democrats, all of whom carried a concealed weapon, bragged about it. One of 'em got mad and ran down that aisle over there one night and the gun fell out of his ankle holster and clattered down that aisle way. So, don't talk to me about the sanctity of the gun laws when the only people I've ever met on the floor of this chamber who told me flat out that they carried a concealed weapon were Democrats from the City of Chicago. This Bill deserved a much better debate than it got. If you don't wanna give an officer of the court the right to carry, then vote 'no'. If you do and let the officer of the court decide, then vote 'ves'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost to close."

Bost: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the people have heard a very lively debate from all sides. You know, one of the people that debated here today said that, why are we piecemealing this way? Well, why do we piecemeal on education? Why do we piecemeal on our Department of Corrections on how we handle different things? Why do we piecemeal when it comes to existing law whatever it may be?

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

It's because we see a need and we make a decision. believe that this piece of legislation by itself should be voted on on the merits of the language which is that it says that those people who are dealing with criminals every day, every day, making judgment calls, either defending or prosecuting those particular individuals who might feel, who have already got a criminal record, who might feel that they were harmed or in more danger than others and that this would give them the opportunity. We have, as a previous speaker said, given that opportunity to fire marshals, police officers, other law enforcement officers. We changed our policy after an incident here in the Capitol on whether our guards at the doors would be armed. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is sensible legislation. We can argue the debates of concealed carry statewide some other time, but this is specific on who it is that it's for. It's a vote for those people who want themselves to be protected who work in these fields. It's not radical legislation; it's sensible legislation. I would encourage your 'aye' vote and I thank you for the debate."

Speaker Turner: "The Chair would like to remind the Members that a verification has been requested for this Bill so that you are to punch your button and your button only. And on that, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1320?' 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? This Bill requires 71 votes. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Could you put this Bill on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Turner: "...ask leave to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration is granted. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like the record to reflect that we strongly, strongly disagree with the ruling of the parliamentarian. The Bill is crafted in such a way and them the page that we were given, the handout we were given explaining why this requires three-fifths, would take five Philadelphia lawyers to interpret and I... we could only get a hold of two on the telephone. We want the record to reflect that we disagree with the parliamentarian's ruling. We think it is disingenuous at best, incorrect and absolutely wrong at worst and should this come up again, we will be prepared to take our parliamentary fight to the Chair. We will not do so at this time."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take a minute to… I guess a point of personal privilege… to introduce or recognize up in the gallery today a number of kids and parents from my hometown, Oswego, they are a part of the gifted program at the… Oswego School District. They're down here advocating for money in the state budget to further along gifted programs around the State of Illinois. Are a great group of kids, sharp kids and I wanna thank them for

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- being in Springfield. So, they're right up here, all these kids from Oswego. Thank you, guys."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Bro... Representative Burke, we have House Bill 1656. Danny Burke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1656, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This very, very simply would amend the Prepaid Tuition Act to reflect the fact that the College Illinois Prepaid Tuition program is now federally tax-exempt instead of tax-deferred. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Williamson, Representative John Bradley."
- Bradley, J.: "A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Bradley, J.: "Up in the gallery, we have the former sheriff of Jefferson County, Roy Dean Bradford's here. And wanna give him a central Illinois welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Roy, welcome to Springfield. The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lindner: "Yes. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "State your point."
- Lindner: "Yes. I'd like to introduce and welcome to Springfield, Roger Bryce who is the executive director of the Batavia Chamber of Commerce. He's my constituent and Tim Schmitz's neighbor."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- 1656?' 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? Representative Gordon, The Clerk shall take the record. Flowers. there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Third Readings we have House of Bill Representative Chapa LaVia. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3476, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and gender... the General Assembly. The... the House Bill what it simply does it allows any of the... the Members of the General Assembly to also use their state GA scholarships for public community colleges. Currently, the GA scholarships can only be used for state universities. So, it gives you the ability to have the flexibility to do that for individuals that are... are either workin' in the districts and can't get away to a university. It's optional. You don't have to do it, but it's givin' you the ability to do that so you could give scholarships away to local community colleges. I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, probably the best 10 years of my life was working for a community college and I left there as an administrator in charge of... of student services to come over and serve in the Illinois General Assembly, a decision

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

that lately I've begun to question several times during the day. I... I have no problem with what the Sponsor is doing. The problem that I have is that we are loving higher education to death. The General Assembly tuition waiver... some people call it a scholarship program, I call it what it is... it's a General Assembly tuition waiver program is about a hundred and three (103) years old. I have never been able to find out how it started or why, but it's continued over the years and it has been guarded rather jealously over the years by Members of the General Assembly. I no longer participate in the program for a number of reasons, but the primary reason, other than the fact I think that at one point some point in the far distant future and no reflection on the Sponsor of this legislation at all, but newspapers have clearly documented the abuses of the General Assembly tuition waiver program, so I don't need to go down that road. I got out of the General Assembly waiver program for one reason and one reason only. They hand out these tuition waivers and I... and to deserving students, now, in most cases, I'm sure, but we don't send the college or the university one cent to cover the cost. So, at the University of Illinois alone last year they estimated the cost of these tuition waivers that many of my colleagues send students in their district to the University of Illinois and other universities and now, perhaps, community colleges. The University of Illinois estimated that it cost them about five million dollars (\$5,000,000) in tuition money that they did not receive. Now, you know what that does. It's just a classic cost shift. Ya know, you can't

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

come here on the House Floor and complain about tuition going up when we're part of that problem in many, many Community colleges operate differently than cases. universities. They're supposed to get one-third funding from the state, they do not. They get one-third funding from property taxes, some do some don't. And they get about one-third of their revenue from student tuition. Now, you will be giving them additional students for which they will not be paid. Last year, just on the veterans tuition waiver program, my community college, a relatively small community college in Danville, lost almost a hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in tuition because we're not funding that program, although we've got a Bill that says hopefully we will. I don't have any problem with the concept. I certainly respect the Sponsor and I know of her service to our country in the military. But at some point, all I wish we would do is to fund these waivers. The college accepts these kids, does the best job they can do. I think it's only fair that if we send them a student with a tuition waiver that we pay for the waiver. We're not doing that, this Bill doesn't change that and until we pay for those waivers, I cannot and will not in good conscience support such a Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Davis, W.: "Representative, if I understood what you said correctly, you said that the Bill is for public community colleges, right?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "Are there any private community colleges in the State of Illinois?"

Chapa LaVia: "Not within this Bill. This is... this was a... I went to the Community College Board and they were very much in favor of this 'cause they felt that they were getting different treatment as far as the state as far as being, you know, not put on the same category as universities. So, they thought this would be a great idea for their... their communities to spark more interest in secondary educa... I mean, university life, if you will, to go on to from community colleges and universities."

Davis, W.: "No, actually, I think you misunderstood my question. Since you designate public community colleges, I'm asking are there… are there only public community colleges…"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "...in the state? So, we're talkin' about every community college in the State of Illinois?"

Chapa LaVia: "Community college, correct."

Davis, W.: "Every community college in the State of Illinois?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Now, this doesn't stop us from using those tuition waivers as the..."

Chapa LaVia: "No, absolutely not."

Davis, W.: "...does this, Representative, from... for state universities, four (4)-year institutions?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "So, it's a combination of both now?"

Chapa LaVia: "If you'd like to. You don't even have to do this, if you don't like to. Sometimes, especially in communities like Aurora, there's a lot of minorities that have to work a job, they can't go away to a university even to Northern, so what I, ya know, what I'm trying to do and for people that are retiring or people that are forced out of the market... job market because they're fifty (50) and issues with pensions and things like that, is give a tool for the citizens that pay into the taxes of the state to utilize the GA scholarships at a different level. But it's within the Member's district or it could be a communication of a trans agreement between different district community colleges to allow your individual to go into that. But you don't have to use these in that way. They can still remain the eight (8) one- (1) -year full university scholarships. there is... there's a... do you know... I don't know if you get this response, Representative Davis, but I get, you know, do you have any scholarships for bonds at community college. I can't go away. I've gotta help my family pay for the bills, but I want an education. And... and I turn a lot of kids away 'cause I, ya know, I give 'em pamphlets on how to get money but not from the state."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I mean, I don't want you to think that I don't understand the intent of what you're..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...what you're trying to do, but the competition...
since there are only eight of them anyway... is so... so tight

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

as well. So, now, my pool of applicants could possibly go from thirty (30) students to seventy (70) or eighty (80) students because... 'cause you don't necessarily wanna..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...limit the opportunity for students. If... if this Bill passes and it's signed into law..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "...you don't necessarily wanna limit the opportunity..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...for students attending community colleges, but now my... my pool..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...of applicants..."

Chapa LaVia: "Well..."

Davis, W.: "...is increasing, but... but... So... so what is the... with the scholarships you see how they're broken down into one 4-year..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...four (4) two- (2)-year, eight (8) one- 1-year. So, what is the length of a scholarship now for a student in this case?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, in this case, it would be the same equivalency if you want it to be. It could be a one- (1)- year scholarship, it could be a two- (2)-year scholarship, it could be a four (4)-year scholarship."

Davis, W.: "Well, community college generally..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. Well, in two (2) years, undergrad, right."

Davis, W.: "...we generally look at it as being two (2)-year..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Davis, W.: "... so"

Chapa LaVia: "So, it's your... up to your discrepancy and once again, it's optional. You don't have to use this program. It's just nice to have that ability. If you get that kid, that's an amazing kid, ya know, it's... we want to go on to become an attorney or, ya know, whatever field or profession. They also have the ability to get in that door and start. Not all children have the capacity, or young people, have the capacity to go straight to university, nor do some of 'em have the tools to go on to a university right off the bat."

Davis, W.: "Absolutely."

Chapa LaVia: "So, it just gives another avenue for our kids to get educated and go beyond, as parents, what we have."

Davis, W.: "So... so, it is possible that a student can obtain this scholarship for perpetuity, as long as they wanna continue attending a community college. So, let's say they go two (2) years; they get an associate's degree. Ya know what, I don't like this associate's degree; I wanna go back, go two more years. So, they can keep applying for..."

Chapa LaVia: "No."

Davis, W.: "...this scholarship?"

Chapa LaVia: "You can only get it for one (1) or two (2) years.

That's it."

Davis, W.: "One (1) or two (2) years?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Maximum?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Chapa LaVia: "For... for the community college, but you would set the parameters. But I mean, undergrad is only 2... two (2) year. Well, undergrad, but I mean, at community colleges your associate is two 2 years."

Davis, W.: "Well, I understand that. That's why I was asking about the..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...essentially the length of time you want someone to move on to something..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...else. So, if we're talkin' about in the same context..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...in which we can offer that scholarship for a student based on your criteria who can receive it for four(4) years at a four (4)-year institution..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...so are we talking multiple years, more than even two (2) years, at a community college?"

Chapa LaVia: "It's possible. It depends on how you structure your committee on... on how you wanna give out the scholarship. On my committees... I know we're all different... but the committee that takes care of all my scholarships, we give out one (1)-year university scholarships and that's it, right now."

Davis, W.: "Right."

Chapa LaVia: "And if the child wants it again, they have to come back, the committee has to reconvene and if... if that person's the best scholar or they've gotten the grades and

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

they need it economically and stuff like that, then they might be selected again. I don't do any of that stuff, I have a committee, so..."

Davis, W.: "Well, I understand. I understand you have a..."

Chapa LaVia: "...it's up to whatever way you'd like to structure it and the possibility is that maybe it never comes up in your district, but with some of us that have districts that have community colleges, you do see an influx of young kids and older individuals tryin' to get back in the workforce with a different vocational ability and they can't do it because they're trying to raise children. They can't go to university, ya know..."

Davis, W.: "Right."

Chapa LaVia: "...so the complications become quite... quite tenuous."

Davis, W.: "So... so... so... Also, let me make sure I understand.

So, we're not talkin'... right now, you can give eight (8)

one-(1) -year scholarships for students attending a four

(4)-year institution. So, does this increase the number..."

Chapa LaVia: "No, absolutely not."

Davis, W.: "...of waivers? So, you're still within the same..."

Chapa LaVia: "We're still within the same parameters."

Davis, W.: "...parameters."

Chapa LaVia: "You'll still have eight (8) one-(1)-year scholarships."

Davis, W.: "You'll have eight (8) (1)-year scholarships."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

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

Chapa LaVia: "No, thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "I wanna thank everybody. This... this piece of legislation... I hope to get your support on it, but this piece of legislation draws out of a lot of, especially in the minority communities, where children can't travel far or they don't have the ... they don't have the resources. They don't have a car; they don't have... they have to have a job. They... there's... quite... it's quite complicated especially in minority communities and especially within the Hispanic community where the household and the structure of the household is a little bit more strict. So, I really would appreciate your support on this Bill. Once again, you can use this ability or this tool in your pocket or you don't have to. It's just giving us the ability to award in our district that can't travel to a recipients university. Thank you for your support."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3476?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. ...voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Scully. Gordon. Harris. Kosel. And Gordon. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 53 'ayes', 59 'noes', and 4 'presents'. And this Bill fails. The Lady asks leave to put the ball... Bill on Postponed Consideration. Leave is granted. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Brady, we have House Bill 3512. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3512, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3512 would amend the Privacy of Child Victims of Criminal Sexual Act... Offense Act and would simply allow that in cases where an arrest had been made that those documents by the law enforcement agency or the clerk's office be presented instead of left for inspection by the superintendent of which the individual arrested worked for in the school district. It is certainly... just simply allow them the ability to receive the records if the individual is an employee in that district. And 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 very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates..."

Black: "Representative, is this... the genesis arise from a relatively recent case in Bloomington-Normal area and Champaign area?"

Brady: "Bloomington. What you're alluding to is a different set of circumstances."

Black: "All right Okay."

Brady: "This arose from a situation to where an individual school employee was arrested and the information was not shared with authorities. Therefore, the individual after the arrest was back working within the school district and authorities not knowing something they should have known."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Black: "Okay. The analysis clearly states that no one signed a slip in opposition, but I was under the impression that the IEA opposed the Bill and I'm not sure why or whether my information is correct. Have they indicated any such opposition to you?"

Brady: "No."

Black: "Okay. I... and I may be wrong. I... I think we're talking about the same case and I think it's a very egregious situation where a teacher leaves one district, goes to another, creates some problems there and at some point, I think we ought to say enough is enough. I appreciate what you're doing with the Bill."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3512?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, we have... I'm sorry. Representative Brauer, on the Order of Third Readings we have House Bill 1362. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1362, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a noncontroversial Bill. It was brought to me by the Autism Project at SIU and by Hope School. And

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

very simply what this Bill does will put more behavior analysts out in the schools to recognize autism at a very early age. This is subject to appropriations. And I'll answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1362?' 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Crespo, we have House Bill 1434. Representative D'Amico, we have House Bill 2749. No, I'm sorry, Representative, we're gonna wait. That's on Second. Representative Coladipietro. Representative Coulson on House Bill 983. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 983, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Coulson: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 983 amends the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law. Basically, it allows the glen in my district to be... to add the equalized assessed valuation of the development that was built in a former navy base to be added to the tax roll when the TIF is retired. And it basically corrects a problem with a change in the law a few years ago that was not included in this Section of the law."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 983?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddy on House Bill 1400. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1400 simply adds a statement to the form that you receive in your driver's license renewal that encourages the investigation of E85 and alternative fuels. And I'd appreciate favorable consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1400?' All those in favor should say... vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. 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 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Readings, Representative Fortner, we have House Bill 1080. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1080, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1080 gets to the issue of what do you do to help discourage juveniles who might be in gangs or have gotten involved with gangs. It gets to one of the things that's

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

very important to any person of that age and that's their privilege that we've afforded them to drive a vehicle. And what House Bill 1080 does is it identifies that if a juvenile has been convicted of a gang offense that the judge will revoke their driving privileges. The Bill also recognizes there may be legitimate reasons such as going to work that would require one to drive anyway and it provides for a judicial driving permit option for the judge when there is the proper cause. I would appreciate an affirmative vote on this."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "I apol... I was actually behind the chambers and I heard this and I thought what I heard couldn't be right and I think it's actually was right. So, if you are convicted of any offense related to gang activity, you would lose your driver's license?"

Fortner: "For a juvenile with the option of a judicial driving permit being issued if there was need for that person to have one."

Fritchey: "And the logical nexus for this is what?"

Fortner: "For the young people, one of the most important things for them to consider is... is their ability to drive. It's very important to them and I think this sends a very discouraging message that one of things that's very important to people of that age is going to be subject to loss."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fritchey: "Okay. So, the kid that gets involved... Here... there's a hundred and eighteen (118) people here; there's a hundred and eighteen (118) that are against gang activity. We have a hundred and eighteen (118) Members that are against gang violence; we have a hundred and eighteen (118) Members that want kids to be good, productive, developing citizens that do good things. You're right. Going after a driver's license is something that would get their attention. So, the kid that gets picked up for being involved with a gang loses their driver's license. The kid that goes and tags twenty-five (25) buildings with graffiti just as an act of vandalism, nothing happens to them, correct?

Fortner: "When you say just being picked up, this is... that's with conviction."

Fritchey: "All right. Convicted, that's fine."

Fortner: "Thank you."

Fritchey: "Here, let... I... I won't go through all the dramatics with you. If you wanna have a child that is convicted of criminal activity lose their license, go across the board, but not... I mean, here. It's a cleverly drafted Bill and I don't mean this facetiously and I don't mean it in a dismissive manner. It's a cleverly drafted Bill from the standpoint that everybody wants to be tough on gang violence. Everybody wants to try to keep our kids in line in a time when in society it's getting tougher and tougher to keep kids in line. But to say that the child... the youth that is convicted of gang activity loses his driver's license, but the 17-year-old that stabs somebody doesn't lose their driver's license?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fortner: "Well, I think... I think you point out part of the importance of the Bill. There's another factor and that is within gangs frequently the younger members are used to transport people around. There's a... there's a specific need for the gangs to move around, certainly it's happened in my area and I think it's a little different than just someone who stabs somebody, in that respect."

"Representative, you've... you've proven yourself Fritchey: previously way too smart to make that argument. Tak... taking the driver's license away from one of them is not going to deter packs of kids driving around in somebody else's car. You're not gonna be able to take away the driver's licenses of everybody that's in the gang affiliated with the kid that got convicted, so nothing in this Bill remotely prevents them from getting around, be it on foot, bicycle, car, bus, take your pick. The Bill either goes too far or not far enough. If you want to go after kids convicted of any criminal activity and go through... Ya know what, I may even support that Bill because it's a... ya know what, we need to do something. You are right. These are dramatic times; we need to do something. If the carrot's not gonna work, maybe the stick will. But there's no logical underpinning here to say that the kid that paints gang signs on a building loses his driver's license, the kid that shoots three (3) people doesn't lose their driver's license. It doesn't work. doesn't make sense. Would you... you... Representative, you've been here long enough to concede that one."

Fortner: "I understand what you're saying. I'm trying to address specifically the issue of gangs. I understand what...

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

what you're trying to address. That goes beyond what the scope of this Bill is and if we wanna look at something beyond that for a future Bill, I'm surely open to those discussions, but right now, the focus here is on gangs and what we can do for that class of crimes."

Fritchey: "Yeah. Representative, you'll have to bear with me because I'll pull up the full text as I'm speaking to you, but do you have specified offenses that would trigger this or do you just say... Well, here. No, I'm pulling it up here. So, they would have to be adjudicated under Juvenile Court Act based upon an offense that is determined by the court to have been committed in furtherance of the criminal activities of an organized gang, as provided in 5-710 (sic-705 ILCS 405/5-710). So, in furtherance of the criminal activity. So, how about the kid that puts a gang graffiti... that puts a gang logo on a building side, that's gang activity, is that in furtherance of criminal activities of a gang?"

Fortner: "There's a statute..."

Fritchey: "Yes, there is."

Fortner: "...and that's why I reference it rather than try and come up with a separate independent list, the idea is to reference the specific statute which..."

Fritchey: "Repre..."

Fortner: "...this Body has decided the list of gang crimes and gang offenses."

Fritchey: "I... I've told you publicly and privately I respect you, I respect your staff. This is a poorly drafted Bill. It's technically poorly drafted. The issue that you are

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

trying to go after here is incorrect. As I said, you're either going too far or not far enough. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, we all... Speaker. Am I back on? There we go. Okay. We all decry gang activity; we all wanna keep our kids in line after school. Going after driving privileges may be a way to do it. This Bill, as it's worded now, is not. It's an easy 'yes' vote. nice mail piece. Ya know, I'm gonna take gang members off the streets. That's not how this Bill is going to work. You're gonna require probably a factual adjudication in each case for there to be a judicial finding that there was not just... not just an offense but an offense not just related to a gang but an offense that was in furtherance of criminal activities of the organized gang. And again, you may hope... you may have a stiffer penalty than you're gonna put on the graffiti artist than you're gonna put on the shooter. You may have a lesser penalty put on a graffiti artist that's not putting up gang graffiti than... I think if somebody spray paints Mickey Mouse on a building they don't lose their driver's license. If somebody puts a Mickey Cobra tag on a building, they do lose their driver's license. doesn't necessarily make sense. And again, I... I get where you're goin'; this isn't the way to get there. Ladies and Gentlemen, please think twice about this one. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Lang: "Representative, I think everyone on this floor respects your desire to stop gang activity, but I'm also, as Representative Fritchey, very concerned about the way the Bill is... is drafted. So, let me first make an overall observation and ask for your comment. Have we not had some laws that we have passed out of this chamber, out of the House and Senate and signed by a Governor, voided because this whole driver's license issue has nothing to do with the actual activity that is the criminal activity? Let me ask it in a different way. I'm... I think I'm asking the question in a confusing way. My... my understanding is that the Supreme Court of Illinois has more than once voided a law where we've tried to link driver's licenses to unrelated criminal activity. Are you aware of that?"

Fortner: "I am aware of that and that was actually a question that was raised. When I looked into this I saw that there were examples in statute where there are offenses that might have been also construed, but if... are still certainly part of statute, for instance, people convicted of certain sexual offenses. I don't know that that has any more or less nexus than what we're talking about here."

Lang: "All right. But... but why just gang activity? I mean, we don't... we don't... there's no law that says a felon can't drive. There's no law that says an arsonist can't drive. There's no law that says a rapist can't drive, I don't think. But there... you wanna have a law that says a person who does activity in furtherance of a gang activity can't drive. Doesn't that sound like we're just picking and choosing, like parts of a chicken?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Fortner: "Well... well, again, I would bring your attention to the fact that: 1) we do have... we recognize certain types of criminal activity that might be affected such as sexual offenses. Second, there's often a motor vehicle component having to do with the furtherance of gang activities."

Lang: "I'm sorry. I missed your response."

Fortner: "The first part was that we certainly have at times identified that there are criminal activities that we've singled out such as sexual offenses. We also have identified that there are... frequently is the case that there are motor vehicles used in the furtherance of gang activity."

Lang: "Well, all right. Representative, I'll cut ya some slack, you're a freshman, but you know and I know that's not a complete answer to my question, but I'm gonna let it go and move on to another point. Let me... let me... let me ask you this. The... the... Let me... let me get my thought together here. The Bill talks about... the Bill talks about how serious it is to be involved in a gang and you wanna tell a gang member, not a murderer, not an arsonist, but you wanna tell that gang member or someone that even does anything having to do with a gang, they can't drive because it's very, very serious, right?"

Fortner: "That's... that's certainly a goal."

Lang: "And yet, you have an Amendment on the Bill that says, but if you need to drive to go to work, that's perfectly okay with us. What if... what if the person's only work is the gang activity? What if that's their job? What if their job

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

is drug running for a gang, then can they get a JDP, because that's what your Bill says."

Fortner: "Well, I'm not a judge, but I would trust the judge would recognize that that is not a legitimate reason."

Lang: "But that's what your Bill says. Your Bill says, we don't care how bad your crime is but if you're a gang member, we do not want you to drive. That's your punishment, but we'll let you drive if you have to go to work. Now, does this make sense?"

Fortner: "I think it does make sense."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. It seems to me that every once in a while on the floor of this House somebody oughta advance a Bill that actually makes some sense just for the heck of it. A Bill that from page 1 'til the last page everything flows, everything makes sense, everything fits together. This Bill doesn't fit together. This Bill was drafted to make a point about how serious gangs are. Well, we get that. And this'll probably pass 'cause most of the people on this floor don't have the guts to vote against the Bill where the word 'gangs' is on the board. I get that. I get that this Bill is gonna pass, but the Bill doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. First of all, we have court cases that say driver's license laws have to make sense with the crime otherwise we cannot stop a person from getting a driver's license. And then the Bill has this great logic that says, you can be any kind of criminal that you wanna be. We'll let ya..."

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

Lang: "Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Turner: "Give him a mike."

Lang: "You can be any kind of criminal you wanna be. We'll let ya drive, but not if you're a gang member. But gang member, if you gotta go to work, well, we'll give you a license to do that. We'll let ya work. Maybe if ya work, you'll quit the gang. The Bill makes no sense. Don't vote for it."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Fortner to close."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I wanna just reiterate a couple of important points. First of all, in working with the committee and I value the committee's comments. They made a lot of sense that there were very specific and narrow instances whereby one could have reason to drive even if otherwise subject to this Bill, subject to the penalties that this Bill would impose. And in that case, it made sense to let the judge decide if those specific cases really were a cause and I don't think we're talking about the types of causes where there are... people would be engaged in other illegal activity. I trust our judges aren't going to do that. With this Bill, I think we do send a message. We discourage those people who might be on the fence about a gang that one of the things they value most is going to be taken away if they engage in that activity. I thank you for your support. Would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1080?' All those in... The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1080?' Those in favor should vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hannig in the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coladipietro, I'm advised you wanna move House Bill 3767 back to Second. Is that correct? So, Mr. Clerk, we need to return House Bill 3767 from the Order of Third Reading to Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bill 1711."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act concerning horses. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "Thank you. Well, we'll... I'll try to be brief and then we'll answer any comments. For those of you who remember... for those of you who remember the horse slaughter Bill that came last time, which got very close to being passed... basically, the reason I took this Bill is a pretty simple one. In the State of Illinois and in the country and in the United States, cannot eat, sell, distribute, serve horsemeat anywhere in the United States, which makes sense because we put horses in a higher culture and that's the law of the State of Illinois and the law of the United States. What happened was two Belgium firms, one in Texas, one here in DeKalb, Illinois, bought cattle plants, turned 'em over to horse slaughter, and what we allow is horses to be slaughtered for human consumption even though we can't have human consumption in the United States. It's hypocritical.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

It doesn't make sense. The question is where do we put horses in our culture? We have 'em as companion animals. If we don't have 'em as companion animals then maybe we should allow it and eat it and serve it and do what we want. It's dis... disingenuous, it's hypocritical, and it doesn't make sense. And from that cultural standpoint, that's how I got involved. Now, I have a bunch of comments but I won't make 'em now because I don't know what the comments of the opposition are gonna be or if they have any questions, so I don't wanna have to repeat ourselves three or four times. We've heard this Bill a few times and I'll close with a couple extra comments. But with that, I'd answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. We're gonna put it on the Order of Standard Debate to accommodate some of our Members. Representative Black, you'll be recognized now for 5 minutes."

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

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

Black: "Representative, you're right. I... we've had this debate and I know all the answers to your questions. Let me just speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. When I saw some people come into the Speaker's gallery a little while ago I knew this Bill would be called because the Gentleman now has an audience to play to. And all of you who embrace this Bill with the fervor as if you've ever owned a horse in your life see the celebrity in the Speaker's gallery so you want to make sure you can make points with the people who are here

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

to carry the message from other states. As my spouse owned a horse and loved that horse very much, we had this debate. I would point out to you that this Bill two (2) years ago failed. Last year, it failed to get out of the Judiciary Committee, 3 'yes', 7 'no'. So this year it's sent to the Executive Committee. Gee, even I could've guessed that it would've passed out of the Executive Committee. I will just simply... and I know most of you have already made up your mind how you're gonna vote on the Bill so you can go to the reception tonight and get your picture taken with someone whose picture hung in my room at the fraternity house a few years ago. I won't say how many years ago. I don't wanna embarrass either one of us. I would simply point out to you an article in the Chicago Tribune on March 15, '07. 'Some horses are being turned loose to starve to death because there's no market for an old, infirmed horse.' article in the paper in my district on the 27th of March, 'Horse surplus is now driving the slaughterhouse debate.' And there were people who tell... will tell you that Cavel is closed. It is not closed. The Federal Government decided to pull some inspectors out for a period of time and then if the federal inspector wasn't there they couldn't operate. My wife, if she were here, would tell you it's sad to see any animal become old and infirmed and aged and blind and lame. They had farm ground at the time with enough acreage so that they could bury the horse. There are restrictions on what you can do with a dead horse. You can't bury it in your front yard. You can't bury it in the backyard. You can't haul it out to the curb because nobody's gonna pick it

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

So what we're seeing in my part of the State of Illinois, people at 2:00 in the morning drive to a country road, open up the horse trailer, let the horse out, smack it on the rump. You're not my problem any more. Get out of here. It costs up to four hundred dollars (\$400) to dispose of a horse. It's part of the life cycle. We're all gonna Some of us a hell of a lot sooner than others. don't care where I die if you send me to Cavel and ship me to France. It might teach the French a lesson. This Bill is not about sound animal science. I am a dog lover. I've never in my life been without a dog and I have cried like my 4-year-old grandson when I've had to put dogs down. one of the toughest things I could ever do. Would I send my dog to a slaughterhouse to be shipped to Vietnam where they consider dogs to be delicacies? I don't think so. But my dog is not as big as a horse. It is... and I've talked to many, many horse owners and breeders, it is an option that some consider. And it establishes... whether or not we like it or not, it establishes a base price for horses. That's a sad fact of life. But all the horses and the horses that my wife loved so much, her name was Peaches. Obviously, the horse must've known my deep-seated views because the horse never liked me and bit me on more than one occasion. wife insisted that I ride Peaches one day, and I did on the farmstead up in Iowa and she threw me off. And I went to my wife and I said, 'You know, I just am not a horseman. afraid of horses.' And she said, 'That's why Peaches got rid of ya. She knows you're afraid. You...'"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

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

"Well, I wish I could but I'm just getting on a roll Black: But I... I would simply say... my wife told me and I think with some accuracy the horse knew I was not in charge and the horse decided that there was no reason for her to run around the pasture with somebody on her back that didn't know the first thing about a horse, so she got rid of me. And that always made me think to this day, horses are a lot smarter than I thought they were. But my wife loves horses. She has been around them all her life. I asked her when this came up two (2) years ago and she simply said, 'Then ask the Sponsor what he intends to do with horses who eventually get sick and die.' Do all the horse owners have the means to dispose of the animal? No, they do not. Whatever the Chicago Tribune says, I've learned over the years... except for the 'Dewey Defeats Truman' headline, the only mistake the Tribune ever made. They're turning horses loose, leaving people in my district to try and corral the horse, try and take care of it temporarily. But we don't have any people that will come to rescue the horse. And I don't think somebody from California is gonna pay to ship a hundred and fifty (150) horses now roaming the abandoned coalmine land in my district to take care of 'em for the rest of their natural life and dispose of them when their life is over. I don't like the fact that people eat horsemeat, but they do. The business you are gonna vote to close is a legal business under Illinois law. They export a legal product under Federal Law to countries that regard it

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

as a delicacy. Well, what do you expect out of the French? If you've ever been to French... no, we don't call them French fries anymore, remember? We call them, after 9/11, freedom fries. Another bit of American hyperbole, but that caught on for a while. But if that is what the French want to eat and that is what Cavel will process... it can't be sold in this... in this state. Although, I'm old enough to remember one of the great scandals in the State of Illinois about fourty (40) years ago was, and the state was complicit in this, allowing horses to go through slaughtering plants and be sold as beef. There were a few people who lost their job over that. I know with some of you it's an emotional issue, with some of you it's an issue of wanting to be on the side of people who legitimately have celebrity and cache and come from another state and therefore... I mean, obviously anybody from California is certainly smarter than an old country boy from Illinois. I've known that for years. But all my wife would say if she were here, at some point you have to determine what you're going to do with the animal. And if you don't have the resources to dispose of the animal or you don't have the land to dispose of the animal you have an issue, and the issue is not what I'm seeing in rural Illinois. If these owners love those horses so much why are they driving so many of them to a rural area, removing them from the trailer, and letting them run loose and thinking that we have the means and the facilities and the time and the money to take care of them. This is just a sad fact of animal life. Death happens, injury happens, Cavel happens. So, okay, put Cavel out of business. But you go to those

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

people that lose their job and you tell 'em that they're now out of work and they'll draw twenty-six (26) weeks of unemployment. And what's the market for people who used to work in a horse slaughterhouse? Haven't seen a want ad for those people in years. But you go up there in... in the DeKalb area and you tell 'em I voted to put you out of work, tough potatoes. A job in my district is very, very important and we wouldn't back the very expeditiously to put anybody out of work, no matter how much we don't like what they do. This Bill is more about celebrity and headlines and being fashionable than it is about the nuts and bolts issue of what the Bill truly should address. I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Lang: Gentleman's Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've debated this many times so I don't think I'm gonna use my whole 5 minutes. But we... we don't allow people to eat horsemeat in Illinois. Why the heck would we allow anyone to slaughter a horse in Illinois? I have no idea. It just doesn't make any logical sense. And let's remember that we have passed Bills on this floor from time to time to protect animals. We passed a Bill not too long ago to make it a crime to kick somebody else's dog or cat or even pig or farm animal. think that where we are not allowing people to eat horsemeat in Illinois we're gonna allow someone to slaughter a horse just is beyond my imagination. I know what the Farm Bureau says and I know what the previous speaker said and I know what those who are against this say, but it just doesn't

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

make any sense. And then, of course, horses are also companion animals. We have ... if somebody wanted to open a dog slaughtering plant in Illinois or a cat slaughtering plant or even a parakeet slaughtering plant in Illinois we wouldn't pass... we wouldn't allow that to happen because those animals are closer to us. They are domestic pets. They are pets that are in our house. But somehow when it's a horse people have a different point of view. Now, I know that there will be some that say, 'What's the big deal? It's just a horse.' But we have a responsibility to be humane here on the floor of the House. We have a responsibility to be humane when we're talking children. We have a responsibility to be humane when we're talking about the elderly. We have a responsibility to be humane when we're talking about animals and what we do. And what we do relative to all of these issues, including what we do about animals, says a lot about us as a people, says a lot about us as a General Assembly, says a lot about us as a society. Do we really wanna go out into our districts and tell them that, no, you can't eat horsemeat, but we've allowed someone to open up a plant to slaughter horses that in the State of Illinois for shipment can't eat elsewhere? We have to have some consistency about how we Now, of those of you who are opposed to this Bill wanted to introduce legislation to allow horsemeat to be eaten in Illinois and then you opposed this Bill, I would say, well, fine, at least you're being consistent. those who are not for the eating of horsemeat but think it's perfectly okay to slaughter horses in Illinois for others,

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

you know, those heathens in other states to eat those... to eat the horsemeat, well, you're just not thinking this through from start to finish. It doesn't make any logical And I know that it's apparent that we're not required on the House Floor to think logically. I've been here 20 years. Very rarely do we think logically about anything. Very rarely do we take an idea from start to finish and try to figure out if what we're doing makes any sense. But Ladies and Gentlemen, it can't make any sense to slaughter somebody's pet in the State of Illinois and send it elsewhere to be eaten when that same pet can't be eaten in the State of Illinois. So I know not a single one of you is listening and I know not a single... Paul Froehlich's listening. And I know not a single one of you is gonna change your vote no matter who votes... who speaks on what side of this. But I think we need to say it plain, this Bill's a good Bill. It's a humane Bill and it's a logical Bill and you should be voting 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Pritchard: "The previous speaker mentioned that no one's listening. Mr. Lang, I am listening. And I hope that this Body listens because this is an issue that faces our state and is a part of a larger problem of how do we live together in a state that is very diverse that has different views on just about any subject you want to bring up. I attended a reception last night for the Illinois Housing Coalition where they were lobbying for additional funding for housing.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

This morning there was a reception for a different housing program, supplemental housing, and the question was, 'Where do we come up with state money to do these kinds of things?'. So I'm very concerned about many issues that this state has. My district is the location of the current plant. Now, Mr. Lang said, you know, why would we want to start up different kinds of specie slaughtering facilities. This issue isn't about that. We're talking about an issue where there is an existing plant that but for a stay order would be operating today, and they plan to operate as soon as the U.S. Department of Agriculture follows procedures. It is a business that offers employment for people, that pays property taxes, and contributes some thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) to our economy, dollars that are important for paying for housing and for many of our human service programs that we need money so desperately to fund. So, money does make a matter in this issue. But what I'd like to do is speak just a little bit more about the issues that we as policymakers face. You know, citizens have lots of opinions about things and they have been writing us about those opinions, and they can be very passionate. It's not responsibility, however, to think through their unintended consequences, to figure out how we're going to come up with funding to take care of the horses that we put in, perhaps, some of the shelters and are we going to invest public dollars in those kinds of animal shelters or are we going to invest dollars for taking care of people and providing housing and food and other programs. matter about choices that we as policymakers have to make.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

And what I ask you to consider is not necessarily the emotion of this issue, but the unintended consequences of how are we gonna take care of animals and if there is concern about the way that animals are treated in these last days of their life, let's deal with those issues. I have met several times with Representative Molaro saying, 'Where can we compromise on this issue?' Can we invest perhaps in a recognition system like the Europeans do that is a microchip embedded in the horse's skin; and therefore, the slaughter plant could read that chip and know that an owner did not want that animal to be slaughtered and protect that If we're concerned about humane transport of animals, let's deal with those issues. We've dealt with those issues in other species of livestock that are a part of our food system. We can do that. Let's deal with those issues that people have and... and try to accommodate the different tastes, the different values that we have in this country. I've received several letters, as you have, about this issue. One I would like to share with you. It's from a horse owner that is a longtime resident of my district and raises horses, uses them in a carriage operation. And they said, 'I want you to know that I love my horse; however, horse slaughter makes good sense and is sound livestock management. It is no different than the way we operate our animal shelters or manage our deer or wildlife populations. Our limited government funds are needed for education, health care, roads, and defense. It's not prudent to spend millions of tax dollars each year to support unwanted horses. Slaughter is humane, an effective management tool

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

that is required to maintain a strong and viable equine industry. This is a..."

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

Pritchard: "I will, Mr. Speaker. This is an issue that is important to this individual as it is to all horse owners. It is a matter of choice. In our diverse state I hope we can continue to embrace diversity, continue to look at different ways that people can consume different foods or live different lifestyles. I would ask for you to consider that this is an issue that we all need to consider the long-term consequences. And I would ask that we not pass legislation that singles out one location in this state. As has been mentioned many time, we're passionate about issues that affect our district. This issue affects my district and I would ask for your consideration in not singling out just one individual. Thank you."

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

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. As a preliminary matter, my light got turned off before when the previous speaker was called on. I occasionally get phone calls from constituents from DeKalb thinking that they're getting me. Our names are just too close and I think we're gonna have to find a new name for the other Member at some point in time. On a more serious note, well yes, there's a celebrity here. I have... in the 11 years I've been here I've never seen somebody be mocked for coming down to this Body to advocate on something they believe in, celebrity or not. People being involved in

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

the process is an important part of the process. I... you know I... it's better than you to mock somebody to come down here for something that they believe in, and you know that. You... you... you and I can talk about this later on if you want. I'm saying this respectfully. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Let's give the Gentleman our attention.

Representative Fritchey has the floor and is entitled to his time, Representative Black. Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentleman from Vermilion would have you believe that if this Bill passes we're gonna have excess horses walking through the fields and streets all across Illinois. This Bill does not ban horse slaughter. This Bill bans horse slaughter when there is knowledge that the horsemeat will be used for human consumption. You're right, death is part of the cycle of life. People die. Horses die. Dogs die. And we need a way to dispose of those animals and we try to find a humane way to do that. This Bill says do not knowingly slaughter horses when you know they are going to be used for human This is not consumption. This is not a overt reach. something that does not make sense. I received over six hundred (600) e-mails from people around this state, around the world on this issue. Do people have an emotional attachment to their animals? Of course they do. Representative from Vermilion said that he feels about his dog the same way I feel about mine. And you know what? day our pets are gonna die, our horses are gonna die. Find a way to take them, if it's a rendering plant, whatever it may be. But to knowingly have horses slaughtered for human

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

consumption is something that does not sit well with the people of this state, of this country, and most of the civilized world. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had three in support and two in opposition. The rules provide one additional speaker in opposition. Representative Sacia, would you like to speak in response or opposition?"

Sacia: "In opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Proceed."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Many of the Bills that come before us here I don't know a great deal about. This one I know a lot about. have raised horses my entire life. Eleven (11) stand on our farm to this day. I stand in strong opposition to this Bill, as I did several years back. I think what troubles me most about the legislation is I doubt that many of us in this Body have not been taken to the second floor and shown the video of horses being slaughtered. I promise you something, Ladies and Gentlemen, that picture was never taken at Cavel International. That picture was never taken in the United States of America. Absolutely not. here's why. That video would have you believe that horses are slaughtered, they're grabbed by the hind legs, and bled to death as they hang from a ceiling. Absolutely untrue in the United States of America. Cavel International was shut down two weeks ago by a judge and basically what was accomplished is we put fifty-five (55) good people out of This was absolutely a travesty because we said the DH... the Department of Ag inspectors did not have the proper

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

authority with Cavel International. Here are the facts, Ladies and Gentlemen. And for those of you that support this Bill, you must... absolutely must understand this. this Bill passes there will be no horse slaughter plants in the United States of America. Guess what that means. what that means for those of you applauding. That means horses get packed in semis and get transported to Mexico or Canada where there is no Department of Agriculture inspector and they are not humanely terminated. The Gentleman, two people ago... well, Mr. Lang spoke of humane disposition. Ladies and Gentlemen, Cavel International, I have been there three different times. They are humanely terminated. those of you that don't like it, it's a bolt to the head and they are instantly deceased. It is a humane way of terminating animals. What happens ever year... and I... I always am amazed at those who say, 'What happens to a horse? A horse is a companion animal.' Go to any county fair, Ladies and Gentlemen, and watch little Suzie drag her two-(2)-year-old steer into the ring knowing that someone like Jim Sacia is gonna buy it at auction and it's gonna be sent to slaughter the next day. These young people accept that. They understand it. But I want you to know that that calf is every bit as much a companion animal as that horse is to No one is forced to slend... send their horse to slaughter, no one in this great state. But every year in the State of Illinois... two hundred thousand (200,000) horses we have in this state, Ladies and Gentlemen, and fifteen thousand (15,000) of them will face an end-of-life issue. I ask you, vote against this Bill for the very obvious reason

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

that if you support it you're putting 'em on semis and they're gonna be transported to Mexico or Canada. And for those of you that will argue, oh, that couldn't happen because you can't transport them across a... a border and say they're for slaughter. Well, I was born at night but it wasn't last night. And anybody can figure out how to get a semi load of horses across the border. It absolutely will happen. Ladies and Gentlemen, very seldom would I ask for anything on this House Floor from you. Many times many of you have issues that are so important to your district. may involve condominiums in Chicago. Every time I will stand with you if it's important to you and you need the vote. This is a desperately needed Bill by the agriculture community to be defeated. Agriculture needs to see this Bill defeated, Ladies and Gentlemen, so the animals can be humanely terminated and brought to an end of life in a sensible... in a sensible manner, not put on a semi and sent to Mexico or Canada. I strongly ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, vote against this Bill. Thank you so much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro, you're recognized to close."

Molaro: "Thank you. You know, sometimes when I hear all six speakers, both my side, for and against, sometimes I have to relook at the Bill to make sure that I called the right Bill. And I know that sounds... I know that sounds kind of funny, but what happens... what happens... even when we call gun Bills or abortion Bills, we get off on a tangent and we don't go right to the Bill itself. Let's... let's just go back to the Bill and let's understand what we're trying to

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

do here. And it's a pretty simple concept, okay. are... there's one horse slaughter plant. Now, let's understand what horse slaughter means so we know what to vote for. The previous speakers are right, let's understand what we're voting for. Horses die. People die. Dogs die. Cats die. We all die. Okay. So, you can... when you have a pet... and remember, horses are in the Companion Animal Act. Horses, dogs, cats, companion animals. So what you do... and just like other Representatives, I had a dog we had to put We all cried like four-(4)-year-old down recently. grandchildren. What you do is when your dog is sick two things happen. They either die of natural causes or if you see it suffering you euthanize the dog. You'll get a needle... or you call the vet and they're euthanized. what happens to seven hundred thousand (700,000) horses a year. Seven hundred thousand (700,000) horses a year and about two million (2,000,000) cats and dogs. companion animals and what you do is euthanize 'em or they die of natural causes. Now, with horses, when they die of natural causes or euthanize 'em, you send them to rendering plants after their death. And in rendering plants, they're Illinois businesses owned by Illinois residents employing Illinois people. So when they go to rendering plants you use them for medical research, sometimes soap. You use them for a lot of things. They're dead. The problem with slaughter is this. Let's make this clear. Here's what slaughter means. You cannot euthanize them. You can't put drugs in their body. What you must do is you must hit 'em over the head with this captive bolt, you must get this big

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

hammer and knock 'em out, and you must cut their throats so they bleed, then you chop 'em up for food. slaughter. So all I'm saying is we have to do what we do with seven hundred thousand (700,000) other horses and we don't bring 'em and the reason is this: cattle, chickens, lambs, they're feed animals. So when they're feed animals they're bred to be feed animals and what you do is you... you take 'em to be slaughtered and because they're feed animals they go one by one, they get along. Horses are like dogs. If you walk your dog down the street and he sees a dog in the backyard they bark at each other. You can't transport horses and go to kill 'em and slaughter 'em. They're flight animals. That's why it takes so long to slaughter 'em. You can't just lead 'em down the primrose lane. You have to hit them over the head; you have to cut their throat. My point is this. My point is this. When it comes to this plant, we hear about the jobs. This plant Cavel. Well, the Texas was closed down by the Texas courts and the Texas Legislature. It's a company called Beltex owned by the Belgiums and said, 'We'll close down if you... if the court closes us then everybody loses their job.' Two weeks later they reopened as a cattle slaughter, bison slaughter plant and nobody lost their job. Nobody. I submit to you that the same Belgium company, if this Bill passes and they're closed down... they spent five million dollars (\$5,000,000), they'll convert it easily into a cattle plant and no one will lose their job. They'll do exactly what the Belgium plant did in Texas, nothing more, nothing less. We hold these animals out. There isn't a single battle that we went through that we

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

were not on horseback. Right now in Afghanistan, special hor... Special Forces are on horseback. There's been no major infrastructure project in the United States prior to 1960 that didn't use horses. I just saw a teamster. their card. They have horses on there. We have decided in the State of Illinois that horses are companion animals like dogs and cats. They're in high esteem. Go look at the murals in this building. We hold them in higher esteem. And for us to say we're gonna breed you as a companion, as a work animal, and never ever breed you as a feed animal, but at the end of your life, even though we're not gonna eat it here or serve it here, here's what we're gonna do to you animals at the rest of your life, we're gonna take ya and treat you like a feed animal and we're gonna slit your throat and hit you with a captive bolt and then we're gonna send the food overseas. How hypocritical is that? So if you wanna..."

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

Molaro: "If you wanna make the culture, that's your culture, fine. If you wanna say that horses should be in higher esteem, just like we do by putting in a Companion Act, then you vote 'yes' on this Bill. You'll be proud of this vote. Your children and grandchildren will be proud of ya. And it's one of those votes that after you take it you'll feel good because it's the right thing to do. And I ask you for an 'aye' vote."

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

For what reason do you rise?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Sacia: "To ask for verification, Sir."

Speaker Hannig: "So the Gentleman's asked for a verification. So the... he's within his... he's within his rights to request one. So the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1711 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative, do you persist in your request? Okay, so the Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. And on this question, there are 74 voting 'yes' and 41 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Collins, for what reason do you rise?"

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I punched my button 'yes' but it didn't show up so I would like to be recorded as voting 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record will reflect your intentions, Representative. We're going to go to House Bill 950. Mr. Clerk, would you read that Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is another horse Bill only this Bill exempts the purchase of horses from sales taxes. In 196... 1987 horse purchases were... the sales tax on horses were exempt, especially for breeding of horses. This will... there was a lawsuit that was passed in 1987. It was the Estate of Graham v. the Department of Revenue and there was an error created at that time. This

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

exemption was an exemption that we wanted to continue and this legislation simply continues the exemption for people who breed horses that when they wanna sell those animals that their sales tax is exempt. This legislation is supported by the... well, I won't say supported the Department of Revenue, but they are aware of this error. This was not the intent when we changed the law and I'm just trying to rectify that at this point. This exemption would be retroactive to May of 2000 and it would delete any unpaid li... tax liabilities that may have been created since that time. And I move for the adoption of House Bill 950."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jefferson, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2787."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2787, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2787 hopes to create a fund that will allow school districts to receive small professional development grants so that they can further the cause of civics edu... education. The small grants are approximately

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250), but a school can receive no more than three thousand dollars (\$3,000). These grants are awarded once every three (3) years by way of the State Board of Education through the regional offices of ... of education. In order to be eligible for the grant the Bill requires the schools to have submitted a civic audit to verify the completion of the audit with the regional offices The civic audit is a process by which you... of education. the schools examine exactly the type of civic education that they provide, the manner in which they provide it. Once audit is complete, it will be reviewed subsequently, approved by the regional offices of education and if they are awarded again, they will receive small professional development grants to help further the cause of civics education. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. And in response, Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan, did you wish to speak in response?"

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

Mulligan: "Representative, how did you decide that the regional superintendents were the ones to apply these grants or give them out?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I think the… the reason we decided on the regional offices of… or the regional superintendents or offices of education was to try to create a more equal way of distributing dollars throughout the entire state versus it just being solely up to the State Board of Education."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Mulligan: "And how many grants would each superintendent have?"

Davis, W.: "Well, in order to at least be eligible for a grant,
a superintendent must, at very least, those school districts
must at least fill out what is called a civic audit. And
it's a kind of a questionnaire, a multiple page
questionnaire, which it encourages the school districts to
at least examine the manner in which they are teaching
government or civics in their... in their... in their respective
schools. And then that auvit... that audit is reviewed by an
organization called the Civic... Illinois Civic Mission
Correlation... Coalition. They will examine and determine
what information is being provided by... by those audits."

Mulligan: "So, is there a criteria how to give it out because when you have a regional superintendent that's elected over quite a large area giving the grant out may be considered political or controversial. So, is there criteria on how the grant would be applied or who could apply for it or how they would judge it? Would it be from this federation or would it just be solely in his office on their... or her office... on their own?"

Davis, W.: "No, not at all. Again... again, each high school principal must complete a civic audit. So, in essence, in order to at least be eligible for the dollars they have to complete an audit. So, that's up to the discretion of the high school. The regional office can't complete a civic audit for a school, so the schools have to complete it. So, in other words, we're saying that if you wanna be eligible then at minimal you have to complete this audit in order to... to have opportunity to receive some of these dollars."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Mulligan: "Okay. So, would there be a criteria for what they could use it for for civic education, would it be narrow enough so they couldn't use it to go on a field trip? They would have... have to actually, unless it was something that was, say, to a court or to a Legislature or to something that would actually give them some kind of civic education?"
- Davis, W.: "Well… well, remember the… the purpose of the… of the dollars is for professional development. So, it's for the teacher actually to be able to go…"
- Mulligan: "All right. I misunderstood. Okay. So, if it's for the teacher to go and get additional training on how to teach civics?"
- Davis, W.: "Correct. And so... so a school district, if they were to receive it so that this money could pay for a substitute for that day to allow the teacher, if they found some seminar or a day-long seminar that they could attend, it could pay for the seminar or just help supplement that school's... help supplement what that school is doing so that the teacher can receive whatever additional training or education they desire to help bring it back into their classrooms."
- Mulligan: "And where would the funds come from? Would they be appropriated through the education budget?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, currently, it is subject... it is subject to appropriation, but if we're able to get the dollars that we're talkin' about, it would be a line item in the budget of the State Board of Education."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Davis to close."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2787 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
 voted who wish? Representative Crespo, Flowers, Ford, do
 you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr.
 Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116
 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having
 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed. Representative Lindner, you have House Bill 3022.
 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3022, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill creates a protocol for mental health courts and was done by the Conference of Chief Judges which is made up of the chief judges from all over the State of Illinois. And it is... has no opposition."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Representative Feigenholtz on 1277. Representative Flider on House Bill 1963. Representative Flider, do you wish us to read that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1963, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Flider."
- Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 1963 would increase the appropriation for rural township bridges from fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) to thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) per year. And this comes to us from Shelby County in my district which has a considerably large number of bridges that are in disrepair for which they do not have the resources to repair nor do other rural counties have the resources to repair. And what's significant about this legislation is that the amount of funding for downstate rural bridges in this instance has not increased since the early 1980s. So, we believe in this... in the context of how important it is for us to have rural transportation routes in the rural counties that this legislation is vitally important. And I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "This in on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Oh, I'm sorry, no."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The Gentleman does not wish to speak.

Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins and May, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes' and 8 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Flider, you also have House Bill 736. Out of Representative Flowers, you have House Bill the record. Representative Flowers. Out of the Representative Mathias, you have House Bill 2786. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2786, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2786 is very similar to a Bill that was signed into law in the last General Assembly. It basically deals with travel plans and past and future travel plans. This Bill is an initiative of... actually, of the Illinois Life Insurance Council and... and the United Jewish Federation supports it. It basically states that a life insurance issuer or producer cannot discriminate against someone based on their past or their lawful future travel plans to a country that may be on the State Department's travel warning. We initially passed this Bill dealing only with past lawful travel and we've now added future lawful travel basically at the initiative of the Illinois Life Insurance Council. And we ask for your 'aye' vote."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Golar, you have House Bill 3653. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3653, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Listen, what I would like to do is to return this Bill to Second Reading."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, let's return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor."
- Golar: "Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "And then, Representative Graham, you have House Bill 796. Do you wish us to read that Bill? 796. 79... Out of the record. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Hernandez, you have House Bill 1072. Representative Mitchell, Jerry Mitchell, you have House Bill 1648. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1648, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I bring you House Bill 1648 which would create the P-20 Council which has become possible... popular in many

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

The P-20 Council will address all of the other states. education problems and issues that our state faces. to the General will report back Assembly with recommendations on many of the problems that we've dealt with over time. Curriculum alignment is one of the most important issues that we have. Accountability would be another. One of the things that we wanted and one of the reasons why we went to a P which is pre-K 20 which would be at the graduate level is to make sure that we articulate the needs that our K-12 education system has when it comes to teachers and those that teach the teachers usually are at the Ph.D. level. I think there's an awful lot of questions The P-20 Council hopefully will get together out there. with the Governor and answer those questions. suggestion or recommendation is one that came from the campaign of both individuals that ran for Governor of this state and both have vowed that it would be an important tool that they would use. So, I think the Governor certainly would be onboard. The makeup of the committee may change at... over time. It may change in the Senate. We put it out there the way it is to make sure that we've covered as many bases as possible and to make sure that everybody that... that requested a seat at that Council would have an opportunity. There's been a couple of other groups that have approached me, that will probably be addressed in the Senate and this may be coming back. But I'm very proud to have... to carry this Bill and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

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

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

"Representative, you mentioned in debate that both Mulligan: gubernatorial candidates had this as an issue. Verv interesting since the Workforce Investment Board with federal funds from WIA had been doing this before this Governor was in office and this should have been done... the people that are backing this, a lot of people that were backing it, were part of that and that they did some studies and were actually working together for education and business, labor, all to work together in order to create an educational system that would actually train a workforce. I'm gonna support your Bill, but I find it very interesting that now we're gonna go do it another way, find other money, when we're supposed to be using our federal money, the WIA funds, from the Workforce Investment Board that this Governor has not exactly upheld in the way that the intent of the federal legislation and what was done prior to him becoming Governor did. It would have done exactly this and it wouldn't have cost the state any money and was in place and did a number of studies already. So, I just wanted to put that on the record because I find it very interesting and we'll see what happens and perhaps the funding for this oughta come back from the Governor through the Workforce Investment Board perhaps they could give you some funding to get this actually done and put this in So, I will support your Bill but I find it interesting that we were doing this at one point with federal dollars and it seems now we're not any longer."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Mitchell, J.: "Well, I certainly agree with you, Representative. The Joint Education Committee did a lot of the work that will be taken over by this. This has a little broader representation and you're absolutely right. The Joint Education Committee has been basically a nonplayer. They don't meet and nothing's ever... nothing ever happens now with that particular committee which was made up of... of K-12, Higher Ed and Workforce Development."
- Speaker Hannig: "We're gonna move this to Standard Debate to accommodate some Members. Representative McCarthy, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

McCarthy: "Well, thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will..."

Speaker Hannig: "Spon..."

McCarthy: "Representative Mitchell, I just returned from the rail, but... and I heard about the funding. Did you identify a funding source for this Council?"

Mitchell, J.: "The funding source simply will come out of General Revenue Funds and it shouldn't cost... All of these people that serve on this do it voluntarily. They're only reimbursed for their expenses to go to meetings and come from meetings. So, it's... it's more...

McCarthy: "Do you have an estimate?"

Mitchell, J.: "Covering their expenses but not..."

McCarthy: "Do you have an approximate cost?"

Mitchell, J. "No. There shouldn't be any great, fiscal cost to the State of Illinois."

McCarthy: "Okay. Has the... the state board gonna staff this Council and help facilitate the meetings?"

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Mitchell, J.: "The state board has requested that they have a seat at the table. I said that we would try to accommodate them. The pro... the... it's made up right now of four (4) business community leaders, two (2) persons from elementary and secondary education community, one (1) higher ed member, one community college member, one (1) member appointed by each of the fou (4) Leaders of the House and the Senate and the Governor and/or his designee. That's one (1) of the two (2) groups, Representative McCarthy, that did talk to me. They are in support of the Bill, but they have asked that they would be at the table and certainly they should be."
- McCarthy: "Okay. And you said it's gonna be minimal cost, but...
 and it's it was GRF. But do you anticipate that that would
 be through the State Board of Education or through another
 group? I mean, it won't be directly from..."
- Mitchell, J.: "Yeah. I... I would assume that probably would come from State Board of Education. Basically, it could come from the Governor himself."

McCarthy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion?

Representative Mitchell, you're recognized to close. Rep...

Representative Mitchell..."

Mitchell, J.: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "...you're recognized to close."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is... this is a committee that basically is long overdue. Hopefully, we can get some consensus between the business, the education community and ourselves. Hopefully, we can attack many of the problems that education faces right now and do

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

so at a time when we're looking for answers for the pre-K programs, for housing for them and for curriculum alignment all the way from pre-kindergarten through the twelfth grade. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1648 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Representative Flowers, do you wish to be
recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,
there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Representative Jakobsson, you have House
Bill 3677. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Mr. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3677, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3677 amends the Critical Health Problems and Comprehensive Health Education Act requiring secondary schools to provide sexual educa... assault awareness education. It also amends the Public University Acts and the Public Community College Act to require universities and community colleges to provide some form of sexual assault awareness education to all coming... to all incoming students. And this can be through a seminar or online training or ya know, any way that the institution chooses. I would encourage people to cast an 'aye' vote."

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

Speaker Hannig: "So, we're gonna put this on the Order of Standard Debate. And Representative Black is recognized for 5 minutes. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me congratulate the Clerk of the House on his election victory. It's always good to have at least one winner in the chamber. Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Black: "Representative, I've read this as carefully as I can and I only have one and a half questions. This is a mandate, right, a curriculum mandate?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Black: "Right?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Black: "And it's exempt from reimbursement, right?"

Jakobsson: "Right."

Black: "That's all I need to know. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I'm the only 'no' vote, I've had it, no more unfunded mandates. The School Code, when I came down here was thin enough to put in your back pocket, now ya... now ya need to wear one of those antihernia belts that they have at Home Depot and Lowe's to pick the School Code up. It's another unfunded mandate. If it's so important and so vital and known... and so necessary, find the money to pay for it. I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

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

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

- Eddy: "Representative, my questions are similar but one's been answered, the fact that it's a increase that's not subject to any reimbursement for the school district. It's a problem. Who… who decides what the curricula will be?"
- Jakobsson: "I believe that the schools can decide that, but since the… I know the University of Illinois has some sexual assault awareness education that they provide and I would hope that where there is some education already being provided, other institutions may want to…"

Eddy: "So..."

Jakobson: "...get information from them."

Eddy: "So, the answer to the question really is, the school district decides completely what they teach in the… as part of the comprehensive health education program that already exists, they decide what curricula. There's no… there's nothing that… there's no guidelines? The State Board of Education isn't the one that decides, the school district is the only decision maker?"

Jakobsson: "Yes, the school districts will decide how they will put this into their program."

Eddy: "Okay. So, you're just... It's wide open and it's also wide open; therefore, public universities and community colleges to also provide students... incoming students with a seminar, online training or other son... or, excuse me, some other form of sexual assault education."

Jakobsson: "That's right."

Eddy: "So, community colleges and all public universities would have a cost to incur regarding this as well. Is there reimbursement to the public universities or community

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

colleges for the expense related to this for the seminar and online training?"

Jakobsson: "Ya know, they're already required to address sexual harassment. This expands it to cover sexual assault in a some... same programs that they already have."

Eddy: "So, the public universities now have to do sexual..."

Jakobsson: "Sexual harassment education."

Eddy: "...harassment. So, in that same seminar in the same amount of time or in the same online training, they need to expand it to include the new mandate on..."

Jakobsson: "Including sexual assault, yes."

Eddy: "...sexual assault. Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate the answer to the question. I will not be supporting it and I can't vote for it. I... We have enough mandates and I really am concerned about the fact that we'd be adding another one, but I do appreciate your clarification on the questions that I have."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bassi."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Bassi: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. At this point public schools in America today are expected to teach good nutrition habits; train students in pulmonary-coronary resuscitation; give specialized instruction for the hard of hearing, the blind and the neurologically impaired; treat the emotionally disturbed; train the mentally retarded; teach the gifted; do eye testing; give inoculations; teach first aid procedures; provide pregnancy counseling; assist in disease prevention; inculcate morals, ethics and values;

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

collect money to rebuild the Statue of Liberty; stress the prevention of drug, alcohol and tobacco abuse; help students develop political know-how; develop civic responsibility; provide sex education; provide suicide counseling; maintain birth information and age certification data; provide instruction in good health care and AIDS prevention; teach driver training; provide civil rights and racial tolerance; foster integration; teach the principles of free enterprise; provide career information; assist in career planning; detect and report child abuse; teach the telephone manners and etiquette; instruct in speed reading; eradicate head scabies and other diseases; assist in charity fundraising; provide vocational training; build economic awareness; serve hot lunches and breakfasts; surplus milk; do job placement; stress bicycle safety and pedestrian safety; promote physical fitness; assist with bilingual language development; counsel delinquents; foster metric education; provide transportation; teach consumer education; counsel students with problems; follow due process procedures; protect student privacy; provide computer literacy; teach them to like broccoli; unteach them the four food groups; teach the pyramid; teach humaneness and individual responsibility; eliminate sex discrimination; assist in bladder control; develop an appreciation of other people and other cultures; promote the uses of information; develop the ability to reason; to avail patriotism and loyalty to the ideals of a democracy; promote understanding of the heritage of our country; build respect of the work and dignity of the individual; develop skills

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

for entry into a specific field; teach the management of money, property and resources; provide income tax counseling; develop curiosity and a taste for learning; develop skills in the use of leisure time; teach pride in work to develop a feeling of self-worth or self-respect; avoid religion and teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. And with all due respect, Representative, I cannot support another mandate. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. I know all of those have been passed by this Body or a previous Representatives who were in here and I believe there was one that was just passed a few weeks ago on citizenship, requiring that to be taught, by one of our previous speakers. I urge an 'aye' vote. I think it's very important that the… this is included to make sure that our children are getting the kinds of education they need to protect themselves. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3677 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Representative Meyer, do you wish to be
recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,
there are 72 voting 'yes' and 41 voting 'no'. And this
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. We're gonna go to the Order of the
Supplemental Calendar #1 and move some Bills from Second to
Third. Representative Eddy, you have House Bill 263. Do
you wish us to read that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 263, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Fritchey on 419.

 Do you wish us to move that? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 419, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Black on 587.

 Do you wish us to read that? Representative Black, do you wish us to read House Bill 587? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 587, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lang on 611.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 611, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Black on House Bill 632. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 632, 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."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Molaro on House Bill 858. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 858, a Bill for an Act concerning interstate compacts. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Tryon on House Bill 962. Representative Tryon. Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act concerning vacancies in public office. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Nekritz on House Bill 1619. Out of the record. Representative Ford on House Bill 1685. Representative Ford, do you wish us to read this on Second? Move it from Second to Third? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lang on House Bill 1752. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1752, 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."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Lang on House Bill 1753. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1753, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1

37th Legislative Day

- was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Nekritz on 1872.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1872, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative Sommer on House Bill 1876. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. On the Order of Resolutions, on Supplemental Calendar #1, is House Resolution 243.

 Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a measure that names April 26, 2007 the Scleroderma Awareness Day in the State of Illinois. This is a autoimmune disease that is sometimes difficult to diagnose and the Scleroderma Foundation is trying to raise awareness and establish information and educational programs about this problem. I urge your adoption."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 243. Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Clerk, you wanna read the… Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions."

37th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 283, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 284, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 285, offered by Representative Beiser. House Resolution 286, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 287, offered by Representative Krause. House Resolution 289, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 291, offered by Representative Younge. House Resolution 293, offered by Representative Younge. House Resolution 294, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 295, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 298, offered by Representative Tryon. And House Resolution 299, offered by Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Howard, for what reason do you rise?"
- Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say to my colleagues that I really appreciate the warm welcome that you gave the delegation from South Africa this morning and remind you about the breakfast reception in the morning at the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus House at Cook and Capitol. Thank you very much. Cook and College, that is. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Smith, for what reason do you rise?"
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for an announcement. The Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will not meet

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

today. That meeting is canceled. Elementary & Secondary Committee meeting will not meet."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to be distributing a list of the committee meetings shortly, so bear with us. Representative Gordon, for what reason do you rise?"

Gordon: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, on Monday morning I had the Gordon: privilege of attending a ground breaking at a business that will be coming into Seneca, Illinois, which is my district. It's Nova Biosource Fuels, Incorporated. And what this business is it will be the largest biodiesel plant in the world that is going to use this specific technology. It's a greener technology than what's already out there and what was interesting about it is that the CEO of this company who is a retired executive from Haliburton, he made... during his speech he said, 'I would like to be closer to home in Texas, but Texas doesn't have the vision that Illinois has when it comes to alternative fuels.' So, we had representatives from the labor community, the business community, the agriculture community, the local taxing bodies were there because obviously they're happy about the new revenue coming in and it was a way that everyone worked together and accomplished a truly amazing goal. And I thank everyone in here because we've gone out of our way to make sure that Illinois is a good place to bring in alternative fuel technology. And I wanted to thank the Body for that."

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

37th Legislative Day

- Chapa LaVia: "For a purpose of announcement. Local Government Committee will be meeting immediately following Session in Room 122-B. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read the committee... the committee schedule for the rest of the evening."
- Clerk Mahoney: "The following committees will meet immediately following Session at 5:30. The Labor Committee will meet in Room 118, Labor Committee in Room 118. State Government Administration will be meeting in Room 115, State Government Administration in Room 115. Environment & Energy will meet in Room C-1, Environment & Energy in Room C-1. Higher Education in Room 114. Human Services in Room D-1. Local Government Administration in Room 122-B. Fifteen minutes following Session: Registration & Regulation will meet in Room C-1 in the Stratton."
- Speaker Hannig: "Are there any other announcements? So, now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19 at the hour of 10 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 258, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 424, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning education. And Senate Bill 505, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning education. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being no further

37th Legislative Day

4/18/2007

business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."